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ABSTRACT
This paper is part of the study which focuses on the contribution of entrepreneurship education to the development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions among university students in Uganda. The paper explores the perceived effectiveness of methods of teaching entrepreneurship courses from the student’s perspective of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions. This study was motivated by the public concern that many students who study entrepreneurship at the universities in Uganda might not develop self-efficacy and intention to become entrepreneurs. The study was based on the assumption that a successful entrepreneurship education depends partly on the method of teaching that would develop entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention of the student.
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Introduction
Following a trend initiated in the USA in the 1970s, and considering the contribution of entrepreneurship education, the number of public and private initiatives to train and educate people to be more entrepreneurial multiplied on both sides of the Atlantic (Fayolle, 2006). Kee, Rodrigues, Kundu and Racine (2008) surveyed the status of entrepreneurship education in different countries and indicated that entrepreneurship education exists in the secondary, vocational, medium or at the graduate level through business management courses. A similar trend is being followed in African countries. Among the African countries Uganda is one of the economies that appreciate formal entrepreneurship education as a way of developing entrepreneurs. Formal entrepreneurship education was introduced in most universities in Uganda from 2001. This is in line Ocici’s (2006) observation that entrepreneurship was not championed in the traditional educational system, and it was just introduced in the curriculum of institutions of higher learning in the recent past. This paper starts by presenting an overview of
entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education in Uganda. The second part presents statement of the problem and objective of the study. The third part describes the methodology. The results and discussion have been presented in the fourth part. Finally the paper draws conclusion, gives recommendation and implications for universities and teachers.

Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurship Education in Uganda

Researchers have shown that education system plays a critical role in the economic advancement of nations since it is the primary developer of human resource (Kee, Rodrigues, Kundu and Racine; 2008). However, the quality of education in Uganda, and especially entrepreneurship education, leaves much to be desired. The focus is on rote learning and the education system does not actively encourage students to think on their own and take responsibilities. Ocici, (2006:1) reported that Uganda is one country whose education system still aims at producing skilled and semi-skilled labour, which is oriented towards entry into white-collar employment, academia and the civil service, where it is thought that a sustainable livelihood can be obtained. Anecdotal evidence (GEM, 2004:17) suggests that Ugandans regard white collar employment in the government service or established businesses as the most prestigious form of employment. Self-employment/entrepreneurship has a comparatively low status, and is undertaken only if one has to.

The general trend supported by the GEM report (2003) indicates that the few individuals who succeed as entrepreneurs only start business because they had dropped out of school and had no other employment options. This gives entrepreneurship a negative image that it is only for those who have failed in academics and explains why entrepreneurship education was not incorporated in the education system for a long time. This is in line with Ocici’s (2006) observation that entrepreneurship was not championed in the traditional educational system, and it was just introduced in the curriculum of institutions of higher learning in the recent past.

GEM (2004) investigated the extent and quality of training in starting or managing small, new, or growing businesses through the educational system at all levels in Uganda – from primary school to postgraduate courses. The result of the interview ranked entrepreneurship education and training number one (named by 33%) as a contributing factor. The GEM report (2004) also indicates that colleges and universities had enough courses and programmes on entrepreneurship. Much as the GEM report (2004) has documented this, no empirical study has been conducted to measure how the courses are stimulating to the students in terms of their entrepreneurial self efficacy and intentions. The context of entrepreneurship education in the universities in Uganda are also not clear.

In school context, entrepreneurship education can be divided into three aims that are learn to understand entrepreneurship, learn to become entrepreneurial and learn to become an entrepreneur (Hytti, 2004). Entrepreneurship education is about learning for entrepreneurship,
learning about entrepreneurship and learning through entrepreneurship (Gibb, 2001; 2003). Therefore entrepreneurship education should be considered both as a content of learning as well as a method of learning.

Although the course titles and objectives may be stated differently, they all focus at the same end result of equipping the learner with entrepreneurial skills so as to give the students the confidence and willingness to choose entrepreneurship as a career. For example, Makerere University Business School, which offers Bachelor of Entrepreneurship and Master of Science in Entrepreneurship, had part of the objectives of its entrepreneurship programmes (2007) as follows: (i) to provide specialist knowledge and skills to students about how to start and manage small businesses, (ii) to inspire graduates of the programmes to start-up and grow businesses and (iii) to inculcate an entrepreneurship culture in graduates of the programmes.

Statement of the Problem

Given the course titles, and objectives of offering entrepreneurship education by the universities in Uganda, it is presumed that entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions would be enhanced through appropriate teaching method. It is for this objective that universities try to ensure that students graduate and become entrepreneurial. Yet there has been a debate regarding teaching method. The debate questions how entrepreneurship should be taught. Even when entrepreneurship education is taught, there are still people who argue that it is all purely academic, meaning that students do not acquire the skills that make them job creators or entrepreneurial. The general concern was in line with, Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, GEM (2003) and National Council for Higher Education, NCHE (2006) which pointed out that the education system in Uganda is too academic and does not deliver any practical entrepreneurial know-how and skills. The education system does not promote entrepreneurship as a career option. The debate on the effectiveness of method of teaching entrepreneurship education was the genesis of this study and it was important for answering the sub-question: Does the method entrepreneurship education contribute to the development of entrepreneurial self efficacy and intentions? This question is in line with the observation made by Kennedy and Peterman (2003), that the impact of entrepreneurship education, as distinct from general education, on attitudes and intentions of entrepreneurs were still not clear. Although researchers have been investigating in the field of entrepreneurship education, a few studies have been conducted on the sub-component of teaching methods. Accordingly, the purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of teaching of entrepreneurship education on students’ perceived self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions among university students in Uganda.
Objective and Hypothesis

One of the objectives of the study from which this paper emerges was to examine the effectiveness of the methods of teaching entrepreneurship course to developing self-efficacy and intention of university students. A corresponding hypothesis was stated:

**HA:** There is a significant relationship between method of teaching and development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions among university students.

Literature Review

The literature on teaching and learning is available but in general field of education. Research by Nunan, Rigmor and McCausland (2000) contribute some good literature on teaching and learning. The change in the environment has also led to changes of focus of universities from teaching to learning. Guskin (1994) cited by Nunan, et al (2000), described the situation as follows:

*Focusing on student learning turns our thinking about the future of our colleges and universities upside down: from faculty productivity to student productivity, from faculty disciplinary interests to what students need to learn, from faculty teaching styles to student learning styles, from classroom teaching to student learning.*

This shift relocates the position of teaching staff from one of power to one of facilitation: from being the psychological centre of student learning, to a role that responds to the ways that students manage their own learning processes; from prime transmitter of information to being one of many learning resources as well as one of the elements of a teaching and learning environment. What Guskin (1994) cited by Nunan, et al (2000) is saying, is basically a change of strategy from teacher centered to learner centered approach. The information is very good but what it does not say is whether students managing their own learning process adds value to their self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions.

Fayolle (2006) identified two processes of learning – one on how to become an entrepreneur and secondly, is aimed at helping individuals position themselves as regards entrepreneurship and become more enterprising. Learning process to become an enterprising individual is meant to develop individuals’ entrepreneurial spirit, to make them more entrepreneurial; first in their minds, then through their actions. Education can influence students’ perceptions of entrepreneurs as it enables them to better understand the roles and action of entrepreneurs, their values, attitudes and motivation.
Approaches to entrepreneurship education

Notwithstanding the above, the common approach to entrepreneurship education is often defined as something concerned with learning and facilitating entrepreneurship (what to do and how to make it happen), and less with studying about it (in a detached manner as a social phenomenon). It can be noted that both approaches, however, are necessary but not sufficient for a wider concept of high-level entrepreneurship education, which is often conceived as having highly practical subject matter and reflecting a functional curriculum. It is important for entrepreneurial students to acquire competencies that give them confidence to operate in any environment. This can be achieved through pedagogical methods. In the field of entrepreneurship teaching, there is a wide range of methods, approaches and modalities (Hindle, 2007). The choice of techniques and modalities depends mainly on the objectives, contents, type of course as well as the backgrounds of the teachers concerned; and constraints imposed by the institutional context.

Ohe (1996) cited by Levie (1999) reported two types of course in entrepreneurship education. One type is “for entrepreneurship” and the other type is “about entrepreneurship”. Teachers of “for entrepreneurship” courses tend to be more connected with real entrepreneurial activity, and clearly wish their students to get near entrepreneurial experience in the form of business plan preparation and interaction with entrepreneurs. Considerable more effort is made in production of in-house cases in “for entrepreneurship” type courses than in “about entrepreneurship” courses. Courses about entrepreneurship tend to be taught in a traditional manner, through lectures, textbooks, essays, and in the end of course written exams. The teaching /learning methods for both types of courses are summarized in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of teaching for Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Methods of teaching about Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>Set Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>Individual Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Plans</td>
<td>Individual Written Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Oral Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site-visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Derived from Ohe (1996) categorization of entrepreneurship courses

Solomon (2007) sought to provide an analytical overview of the state of entrepreneurship education in the USA for the years 2004 – 2005. He performed an extensive review of the literature in entrepreneurship education and enhanced the review by conducting a national survey of 2 and 4 year colleges and universities. The findings confirm that traditional teaching method of requiring students to create a business plan was still used and was popular. Finally, the data
show that entrepreneurship education were increasingly using guest speakers and class discussions more frequently than traditional approach of class lectures.

Mckeown, Millman, Surnsani, Smith, Martin (2006) conducted a study to review the progress made by UK Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) to deliver the entrepreneurship education agenda. The key areas for research included the type, content, and delivery methods of graduate entrepreneurship education being offered in UK. The methodology was by e-mailing questionnaires to 123 HEIs in the UK together with a brief introduction stating the purpose of the research. The findings was that provision of entrepreneurship education was varied, with both entrepreneurship and innovation courses. Overall delivery methods proved to be more traditional than anticipated, with few instances of action learning or use of technology to support learning.

**Constructivist learning theory and Pedagogical methods**

They make up the 'how' of pedagogical issues, which follows the 'why' (objectives) and 'what' (contents). Although some teachers tend to overemphasise it, pedagogy is not an end in itself. Pedagogy is meant to serve the objectives. As soon as objectives have been set and specific constraints have been identified, methods can be selected. In the field of entrepreneurship teaching, there is a wide range of pedagogical methods, approaches and modalities (Carrier, 2007; Hindle, 2007). Given below is a quick overview of some of them and these are: elaboration or evaluation of business plans by students, development of a new venture creation project, guidance of young entrepreneurs through support missions to help them in their project, interviews with entrepreneurs, computer simulations, videos and films, behavioural simulations and traditional lectures.

There is no universal pedagogical recipe to teach entrepreneurship. The choice of techniques and modalities depends mainly on the objectives, contents and constraints imposed by the institutional context. 'Learning by doing', which is often praised by teachers in the field, is well suited to some pedagogical situations, while it may be particularly inappropriate in others. The watchword here is to be cautious, and all the more so as little research has been conducted on the assessment of entrepreneurship teaching (Fayolle, 2005). It remains to be proved that one pedagogical approach is better than another, which provides interesting challenges. To choose a better mix of the pedagogical approaches, it requires a deeper understanding of the theory of learning.

Hein (1991) pointed out that the latest catch word in educational circles is “constructivism” which is applied both to learning theory and to epistemology---both to how people learn, and to the nature of knowledge. We do need to think about our work in relation to theories of learning and knowledge. Constructivism refers to the idea that learners construct knowledge for themselves---each learner individually and socially constructs meaning as he or she learns.
Learning is constructing meaning and nothing else. The consequences of this view are twofold: First, we have to focus on the learner in thinking about learning not on the subject being taught. Secondly, there is no knowledge independent of the meaning attributed to experience (constructed) by the learner. This implies that there is no knowledge which is independent of the knower, but only that which we construct for ourselves and learn. Learning is not understanding the “true” nature of things, but rather a personal and social construction of meaning.

Considering knowledge to be about some “real” world independent of us, or knowledge to be our own making makes a big difference. In the teaching profession our epistemological views dictate our pedagogical views. If we believe that knowledge consists of learning about the real world, for instance about entrepreneurship, out there, then we endeavour first to understand that world and, as teachers, present it to the learner so as to make clear to the learner the structure of the world independent of the learner. We help the learner understand the world, but we do not ask him or her to construct his or her world so as to learn from. It is this tension between our desire as teachers to teach the truth, to present the world “as it really is”, and our desire to let learners construct their own world which requires us to think seriously about epistemology and pedagogy.

**Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy**

This section covers the underpinning theory of self-efficacy, and helps to explain why it is important to develop entrepreneurship skills. To increase levels of entrepreneurship motivation, it is proposed that it is essential that programme influence self-efficacy of individuals so that they will try, learn and persist in the pursuit of entrepreneurship (Lucas and Cooper, 2004). Self-efficacy as a construct is conceived by Bandura (1986) as one’s judgement of ability to execute an action, and is therefore a largely perceived construct. This construct is established as a reliable predictor of a wide variety of goal directed behaviours. Chen, Greene and Crick (1998) cited by Lee (2005) defined self-efficacy in the context of entrepreneurship as the strength of a person’s belief that he or she is capable of successfully performing the various roles and tasks of entrepreneurship. The authors reported that self-efficacy is positively related to one’s intention in setting up a business.

Krueger and Dickson (1994) postulated that high levels of self-efficacy are associated with strategic risk taking while Krueger et al (2000) argued that self-efficacy is a critical antecedent of entrepreneurial intent. Individuals with high self-efficacy have more intrinsic interests in entrepreneurial tasks, and are more willing to make an effort and show persistence when faced with obstacles and setbacks. Regardless of the context, the effects and determinants of self-efficacy are the same. Self-efficacy influences the choices we make, the effort one puts in, how long one persist at a task and how one feels about it. If a person believes that the performance of a certain task is within their capability, he/she will act, even if the task is difficult because he/she perceives the successful completion of the task as a feasible goal given the belief in self. Self-
efficacy is therefore related to perceptions of feasibility. To this extent self-efficacy mediates entrepreneurial intentions (Zhao, Seibert and Hills, 2005) which are determined by perceptions of feasibility and desirability.

Sources of self-efficacy are the same regardless of context. Self-efficacy develops from mastery of experience (enactive mastery) or task accomplishment, vicarious experience (from observing others), verbal persuasion (or encouragement) as well as management of emotional states (Boyd and Vozikis, 1994). In the same way Bandura (1997) asserts that peoples conceptions about themselves and the nature of things are developed and verified through four different processes: direct experience, vicarious experience, judgement voiced by others, and derivation of further knowledge by using rules of inference. External influences also play a role, thus while it is true that conceptions govern behaviour, conceptions themselves are partly fashioned from direct or socially mediated transactions with the environment. Empirical researches such as those by Cox, Mueller, and Moss (2002/2003) have generated a great number of studies that demonstrate the positive relationship between self-efficacy and different motivational and behavioral outcomes in clinical, educational, and organizational settings. Self-efficacy has also become important construct in behavioural management and Bandura (1982) defines self-efficacy as peoples judgements of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance.

Self-efficacy involves a generative capability in which cognitive, social, and behaviour sub skills are organized into integrated courses of action; requiring perseverant effort and self doubters are quick to abort this generative process if initial efforts are deficient (Bandura, 1997). Thus there is a marked difference between possessing sub skills and being able to use them well under diverse circumstances. Competent functioning requires both skills and self-beliefs of efficacy; operative efficacy calls for continuously improving multiple sub skills to manage ever changing circumstances, most of which contain ambiguous, unpredictable and often stressful elements. Efficacy beliefs alone can rise and sustain motivation but will not produce performance if sub-skills necessary are completely lacking. Of course people do not hold efficacy beliefs devoid of any underlying capability. Nor does perceived self-efficacy involve only a one-way dependence on sub-skills. But through the proactive exercise of efficacy belief in self-development, capacity is converted to capability.

As affirmed previously self-efficacy is linked to initiating and persisting at behaviours under high uncertainty, to setting higher goals and to reducing threat rigidity and learned helplessly (Bandura, 1986). Although many studies have found a positive relationship between self-efficacy and performance, studies such as Vancouver (2002) found a strong positive correlation between self-efficacy and performance, at the person level of analysis, yet at a within person, across time level of analysis, self-efficacy is negatively related to subsequent performance. Unlike personality traits self-efficacy can be developed through training and modeling. Efficacy judgements are tasks specific and regulate behaviour by determining task choices, effort and
persistence. Self-efficacy also facilitates learning and task performance particularly early in the learning process and can also change as result of learning, experience and feedback (Gist and Mitchell, 1992).

The foregoing literature explains the relationship between self-efficacy, beliefs and intentions. The explanation is generally on entrepreneurial behaviour regardless of educational status. Bandura (1997) on the other hand, enumerates sources of self-efficacy and on close examination it does not say much on entrepreneurship education as an academic discipline which could be considered a source of self-efficacy. They do not state how entrepreneurship education could be linked to self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions of university students. Their explanation therefore leaves a gap that this study was set to fill.

Entrepreneurship Education and Self-efficacy

Important in the decision to start a venture is the confidence and self-belief that an individual or group of potential founders has in their ability to undertake successfully the many sub-activities that are required. Self-efficacy is central to the willingness to act in an entrepreneurial way, to identify and seize opportunities. First postulated by Bandura (1997) self-efficacy beliefs are people’s judgement of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to produce a given attainments and have the consequence that people’s level of motivation, affective states, and actions are based more on what they believe than on what is objectively true. High and low levels of self-efficacy have serious consequences for an individual’s belief in their ability to perform in a range of situations. High levels of self-efficacy have been linked to various behaviours such as innovation and opportunity recognition in entrepreneurship (Ardichvili et al. 2003).

A person’s willingness to act is influenced by their perceived abilities and skills with respect to that area of activity. Researches indicate that it is possible to influence the likelihood that somebody will consider becoming an entrepreneur. Several authors (Kolvereid and Moen, 1997; Gorman, 1997; Noel, 2001; Tkachev and Kolvereid, 1999; Varela and Jimenez, 2001) have shown that there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial education and the propensity of becoming an entrepreneur. An observation which was confirmed by Noel (2001) show that students who graduated in entrepreneurship reached higher scores in entrepreneurial intention and entrepreneurial self-efficacy than students who graduated in other disciplines. Similarly, Varela and Jimenez (2001) indicate that there is a correlation between a university’s investment in the promotion of entrepreneurship and the percentage of students becoming entrepreneurs. However, the literature seems to have paid limited attention to the importance of specific educational variables, such as curriculum design, teaching and assessment. There is insufficient research regarding the outcomes of entrepreneurship education which link it to self-efficacy and intention. This study sought to fill the gap by linking entrepreneurship education, self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions.
Self-efficacy linked to Entrepreneurship

As the literature review has indicated, self-efficacy is anchored in a model of entrepreneurial potential; is proposed as the entrepreneurial self-efficacy construct. These links are now examined: The notion of entrepreneurial potential seems causally prior to intentions (Krueger and Brazeal, 1994), one may have great potential without corresponding intentions. Krueger and Brazeal (1994) offer a model of potential, which situates Shapero’s model within the context of the intentions process. One important conclusion by way of their model remains the position of perceived feasibility (self-efficacy). Self-efficacy has a number of practical and theoretical implications for entrepreneurial success because initiating a new venture requires unique skills and mindsets; which may be far different from those required for managers in a fully established organization (Chen, et al, 1998) in De Noble et al (2000).

The valuable role of self-efficacy has towards understanding intentions have been acknowledged in the preceding section. Chen, Greene and Crick (1998) propose entrepreneurial self-efficacy construct to predict likelihood of individual being an entrepreneur that is, entrepreneurial self-efficacy refers to strengths of person’s belief that he/she is capable of successfully performing various roles and tasks of entrepreneur. Those with high entrepreneurial self-efficacy tend to assess the environment as more opportunistic rather than fraught with risks; they belief in ability to influence achievement of goals; and they perceive a low probability of failure. Their study based on two-surveys found that entrepreneurial self-efficacy was positively related to the intention to set up one’s own business. The study also provides preliminary evidence that entrepreneurial self-efficacy has the potential to be an individual construct.

As interpreted by Chen, et al (1998), the self-efficacy perspective is highly appropriate for the study of the entrepreneur. As a task specific construct rather than a global disposition, it helps address problem of lack of specificity in previous entrepreneurial personality research, and as a belief of one’s career capabilities, entrepreneurial self-efficacy is relatively more general than task self-efficacy.

Entrepreneurial Intentions

Intentionality is rooted in socio-psychology theories of behaviour; it underlies theories of rationality in strategic management and serves as the reason for teaching entrepreneurship. According to Bandura (2001) an intention is a representation of a future course of action to be performed; it is not simply an expectation of future actions but a proactive commitment to bringing them about. Intentions center on plans of actions. Intentions represent the belief that one will perform certain behaviour. Logically, intent precedes action.

Entrepreneurial intention has been extensively researched in the past decades and continues to be of interest to researchers due to its importance. Review of the literature finds strong arguments for intentions, with existing applications of intentional models and self-efficacy showing...
constant support (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994; cited by Urban 2004). Krueger (1993) cited by Urban (2004) defines entrepreneurial intentions as a commitment to starting a new business. Intentional behaviour helps explain why many entrepreneurs decide to start a business long before they scan for opportunities (Krueger et al, 2000). This is accepted as a more encompassing concept than merely to own a business, since the creation of a venture is central to the definition of entrepreneurship as embodied for this thesis. Starting a business or initiating a new venture is often described as purposive and intentional career choice with the role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy has been emphasized as a key antecedent (Chen, Greene and Crick, 1998).

The question in this study is whether entrepreneurship education courses are effective in terms of developing entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention among the students or not. For this reason it is important to know the relationship between entrepreneurship education, self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intentions. The research in this thesis studies two effects. On the one hand, the effects of self-efficacy and participation in entrepreneurship education on the entrepreneurial intention of students. On the other hand, the moderating effects of self-efficacy on the attitude towards entrepreneurship and participation in entrepreneurship education were investigated. While there has been significant previous research on the causes and effects of entrepreneurship, only a limited number of studies focused on entrepreneurial intent among university students (Luthje and Frank, 2003).

Earlier studies focusing on antecedents to entrepreneurship have been devoted to evaluating the extent to which a person’s traits and personality characteristics lead to entrepreneurship actions (Lumpkin and Dess 1996; Begley and Boyd, 1987; Miner, et al, 1989; Lumpkin and Erdogan, 1990) cited by De Noble, Dong Jung and Ehrlich, (2000). Static personality characteristics, traits or predisposition at the individual level of analysis however, have not proven effective at consistently predicting entrepreneurial activity. The underlying assumption of these investigations has been that there are unique characteristics of entrepreneurs that may be isolated and identified. However, studies (Brockhaus, 1982; Brockhaus and Horwitz, 1986; Gartner, 1985; Low and MacMillan, 1988) cited by Boyd and Vozikis (1994) confirmed that most of these factors have not been found to be unique to entrepreneurs, but rather they are common to many successful individuals. This reflects that entrepreneurship should be looked at as a “process of becoming rather than a state of being” (Bygrave, 1989:21 cited by Boyd and Vozikis, 2000). Thus, attempts to develop personality traits of the typical entrepreneur have been largely unsuccessful (Low and MacMillan, 1988). As suggested by Zimmer and Scarborough (1998), entrepreneurship is not a genetic trait but a “learned skill” (p. 7).

In an attempt to go beyond descriptive research that identifies the specific characteristics of the entrepreneur, Bird (1988) proposed a framework that focuses on the conscious and intended act of new venture creation. Ajzen (1991) modified the framework and became popularized as Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). It is part of a larger intentional model to try to explain the
emergence of entrepreneurial intention. The theory has received recent empirical attention in the field of entrepreneurship. In the context of this research it is considered as a relevant tool to model the development of entrepreneurial intention through pedagogical processes.

The purpose of this research was to do an analysis to predict variance in entrepreneurial intentions of a sample of final year university students by partly adapting Ajzen’s model to include entrepreneurship education and self-efficacy as antecedent factors. Intention models predict behaviour better than either personality trait or situational variables, and the predictive power is critical to better explanations of entrepreneurial behaviour (Krueger, Brazeal, 1994 and Krueger, et al 2000). As stated earlier, Ajzen’s TPB is a relevant tool to model the development of entrepreneurship intention through pedagogical processes. It provides a useful framework to analyse how entrepreneurship education programmes might influence one or several antecedents of intention. The central factor in Ajzen’s (1991) TPB is the individual’s intentions to perform a specific behaviour. Thus, the stronger the intention to perform certain behaviour, the more likely it will be performed. The theory has been repeatedly applied and empirically tested, providing a validated research tool. Krueger and Carsrud (1993) were the first to apply the TPB to the field of entrepreneurship.

Based on Krueger and Carsrud’s (1993) work, other researchers Kolvereid, 1996; Autio et al, 1997; Tkacher and Kolvereid, 1999; Fayolle, 2002) derived models designed to understand the development of entrepreneurship intention among students. These various contributions show that it is possible and relevant to use the TPB to study the development of self-efficacy and the entrepreneurial intention and how entrepreneurship education might affect them. There is an urgent need to better understand and develop this area not only by analyzing the supply side in terms of the courses taught but also the demand side focusing attitude of students, future potential entrepreneurs, to new venture creation. By doing so, this study contributes to the understanding of whether, and if so, how, entrepreneurship education affect university students’ self-efficacy and entrepreneurship intention.

Research Methodology

Study Design

The paper reports on the effectiveness of methods of teaching entrepreneurship courses to developing entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions among university students in Uganda. To achieve this objective, a cross-sectional survey design was used since it provides a quantitative or numeric description of attitudes or opinions of a population by studying a sample or cross-section of the population (Creswell, 2003) as well as collection of data from a sample from varied sources at one point in time. The cross-sectional survey is the most commonly used research method in social research (Amin, 2005) and can produce data which permit the establishment of casual relationships (Sarantakos, 2005).
This research employed a mixed methodology approach using quantitative and qualitative design (Creswell, 2003) which is highly grounded in the philosophy of social sciences literature. The quantitative data was to help establish the relationship and its magnitude between methods, self efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions of university students. On the other hand, the research methodology relied on qualitative data where the body of data consisted of texts and narration to help in explaining what was happening in as far as teaching entrepreneurship in the selected universities was concerned. The choice to collect the data using a combination of methods was based on the idea of triangulation for creating a richer and deeper understanding of the phenomenon as well as increasing the validity of the research findings.

**Target Population**

Population of interests for the study was final year students (who studied entrepreneurship course) from three universities out of a population of 22 universities in Uganda at the time of the study (2006 – 2009). The targeted universities were: Makerere University Business School, Kampala International University and Uganda Martyrs University. The three universities were purposively selected because they had been teaching and examining business and entrepreneurship courses for more than five years. From these universities, all the final year students (2008/2009) studying entrepreneurship in their programmes were the target. A total of 2,042 students were identified from Makerere University Business School, 85 from Uganda Martyrs and 96 from Kampala International University giving a total of 2,223 to form the student population. In addition to the student population, a total of 37 university managers and academic staff directly involved in managing the programmes and teaching the entrepreneurship courses for each of the three universities were included. This category included: Deputy Vice Chancellors/Principal/Directors in charge of Academics Affairs, Academic Registrars, Deans of Faculty housing the entrepreneurship education course/programme, Head of Departments and Academic Staff involved in the implementation of the entrepreneurship education programme.

**Data collection and Analysis**

Questionnaire was the main data collection instrument. Besides the questionnaire, focus group discussion and interviews were also used to gather more information from Students, Lecturers, Heads of Department, and Deans. Data obtained from the questionnaires was analysed using SPSS 17.0 software programme.

**Research Results**

In the field of teaching of entrepreneurship, there is a wide range of pedagogical methods, approaches and modalities (Carrier, 2007; Hindle, 2007; Fayolle, et al, 2008 and Lonappan et al, 2011). A quick overview of some of the methods are given, as an illustration and these are: elaboration or evaluation of business plans by students, development of a new venture creation
project, guidance of young entrepreneurs through support missions to help them in their project, interviews with entrepreneurs, computer simulations, videos and films, behavioural simulations, traditional lectures, guest speakers, action learning, seminar. From the list of the common methods of teaching entrepreneurship presented, it was appropriate to present which methods are used by each university in Uganda. This is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Methods of Teaching and how they are used by the Three Universities in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University*</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>How each Method is used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUBS</td>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>Group work given and presented in the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Prepared cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Students come up with their ideas and guided by the lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies/Business Plans</td>
<td>Delivered in the form of lecture notes during lecture hours. Lecturer takes full control of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Major form of assessment at the end of the course, usually in a given semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual assignments and Written exams</td>
<td>Extracted from various sources given to students to read and answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Prepared lectures delivered within a prescribed periods given the timetable. Lecturer centred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Major form of assessment at the end of the course, usually in a given semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMU</td>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>Students are given questions or cases and they prepare and present in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Plans</td>
<td>Prepare individual Business Plan and present to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Out reach programme for local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set Texts and Newspaper clippings</td>
<td>Reference books in the library and relevant articles from newspapers displayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>Written exams at the end of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Not common though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Extracted from various sources given to students to read and answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIU</td>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>Students are given questions or cases and they prepare and present in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Plans</td>
<td>Prepare individual Business Plan and present to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Prepared lectures delivered within a prescribed periods given the timetable. Learning by taking notes. Lecturer centred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set Text</td>
<td>Reference books in the library. Learning by reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>Written exams at the end of the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results point out the most common methods used in teaching entrepreneurship course the three universities to be: group projects, case studies, lectures and business plans. Although these were common methods, it was found that they were classroom based where students prepare and present in the classroom basically for purposes of fulfilling coursework requirements. Only one university mention debate as a method but not used. Some lecturers did not have strong support for written exams, community development and business plans because they consider them as assessment not as teaching methods. Others said business plan is more of content which require method of teaching on its own.

Given the variety of teaching methods, analysis was done to determine a better mix of the pedagogical approaches. This was done by exploratory factor analysis. The exploratory factor analysis displayed Bartlett’s Test with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.72, which was high and therefore allowing further statistical analysis to proceed. The twelve item scales were reduced to nine items which loaded on four factors with Eigenvalue greater than one (1). The result of the rotated component matrix was presented in Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Teaching Dimensions</th>
<th>Interpersonal analytical model</th>
<th>Didactical model</th>
<th>Experiential model</th>
<th>Personal decision making model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Internship</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Group Projects</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Individual Written Exams</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Individual Assignment</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lectures</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Guest Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lectures by Business Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Business Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization, a Rotation converged in 6 iterations.
These four factors, which were referred to as entrepreneurial teaching models, were interpreted as interpersonal analytical model, didactical model, experiential learning model, and Personal decision-making model (Oyugi, 2011). The first component referred to as interpersonal analytical model, explains 16.6% of the methods. This is achieved through two ways as presented in table 2. The first description identified in the first item related to internship with coefficient of 0.69. This is used to support internalization of learning and create empathy with ‘real’ client groups. The second item, group project with loading of 0.66, is used to develop planning, skills, initiative and explore the value of group concepts in practice.

The second component is interpretable as didactical model, accounted for 16.3% of the variance in methods consisting of individual assignment 0.78, individual written exams 0.76, and lectures 0.68. These are basically the traditional method of teaching used for imparting and testing knowledge which encourage learning without pressure of immediate objectives. During the focus discussion with staff of KIU they indicated that about 95% of teaching is by lecturers exclusively with students as passive listener. Since students contribute only 5% in the classroom, 75% indicated that they learn for fear of mistakes and failure in exams not because they are driven by intention to start a business. Apparently this is what predominated (83.9%) of the respondents on the methods in the universities in Uganda at the time of this study. Students tend to prepare mainly for examinations rather than readiness for entrepreneurship.

The third principal component loaded on a factor that was interpreted as experiential learning model, which accounted for 15.5% for the variance in method of teaching. It brought together two items, guest speakers with loading of 0.86 and lectures by business owners with the loading of 0.79. These are used to link theory with practice as the art of good enterprise teaching in which the guest speakers bring anecdotes of their experiences.

The fourth component, interpretable as personal decision-making model accounting for 11.5% of the method of teaching. This brings together business plans with coefficient of 0.78 and case studies loading of 0.57. These are used to underpin key points made in lecturette, as a basis for use of judgement in decision making, practice in analysis, and use of frames of reference and concepts. Although business plan contributes most to personal decision-making, the overall contribution of personal decision-making to methods is the least. As noted in the methods used by the universities, a business plan is often placed at the centre of entrepreneurship education. Yet there is little evidence to demonstrate that such plans are central to entrepreneurship at the start-up stage. This confirms the fact that business plan is more of content than method.

In summary, the four factors accounted for 59.9% of the variance in method of teaching. This result pointed out that these were the finer dimension of methods of teaching entrepreneurship. The results also indicate that there is no single method that is effective in teaching entrepreneurship. The choice of techniques and model depends on objectives, content, assessment and other constraints not revealed by the study.
Further analysis was done to establish the relationships between methods, self efficacy and intention of university students. In examining the relationship between entrepreneurial self efficacy, intention and the actual preparation that the students would undergo in pursuing the course, it was found that there was a significant positive correlation between methods and self efficacy $r(255) = 0.137, p<0.05$; self efficacy and intention $r(255) = 0.418, p<0.01$ partly supporting the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between method of teaching and developing entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions among university students.

The result did not show a significant correlation between methods and intention. The correlation coefficient shows a weak relationship between method and self efficacy, $r(255) = 0.137, p<0.05$; but relatively strong relationship between self efficacy and intention, $r(255) = 0.418, p<0.01$). Based on observations and results of interviews with 7 staff and 20 students, it was found that lectures still dominate with very little emphasis on practical aspects of the course. This finding is consistent with the findings of Solomon (2007) which confirm that traditional teaching method of requiring students to create a business plan was still used and was popular. Another consistent findings was by Mckean, et al (2006) who found out that provision of entrepreneurship education in 123 Higher Education delivery methods proved to be more traditional than anticipated, with few instances of action learning or use of technology to support learning. Another finding from a focus group discussion in one of the selected universities, was that one of the problems in connection with method is that the lecturers who teach entrepreneurship are academics with no background in entrepreneurship. This finding explains why lecture method dominates. On the other hand it was found that the method is also compromised by our education system which still focuses on examination as the main form of assessment. In this case, 7 lecturers and 20 students interviewed think that other methods like project, on-site-visit, internship, case studies, which rank highly as recommended method, would waste time.

Traditionally lessons in the many university education systems are in short slots of one hour. These are somewhat inadequate to allow: learning by process of repeated doing, repeated practice and small group work aimed at developing enterprising behaviours, greater ownership of learning to be given to participants, the opportunity to move outside the classroom to work with external organizations to create something rather than observe and gain insight into the ‘community of practice’, and most importantly experimentations with a wider range of pedagogies.

The key to entrepreneurial learning as described above is very careful linkage of pedagogy with enterprising outcome. Each of the pedagogies should be linked with such outcomes. For example debating builds capacity to persuade, construct argument, have empathy with other points of view and make intuitive judgments in instant response to messages. Case studies are used to practice personal decision making, innovative problem solving, understand ways of
doing things, practice in analysis and use of frames of reference and concepts. Following the above, it can be argued that teaching and education have different meanings and do not meet the same objectives. The notion of education seems more appropriate to situations intended for developing learners’ minds, raising their awareness of the entrepreneurial phenomenon, giving them keys to their personal development and professional orientation, and giving them the incentive to act entrepreneurially. The notion of ‘teaching’ is more appropriate to contexts of knowledge transfer of entrepreneurial themes and dimensions. Both notions of teaching and educating must therefore be combined in the entrepreneurship courses and programmes. Opposing these two notions, separating them or favouring one at the expense of the other would no doubt be detrimental to the field.

Discussion

The result did not show a significant correlation between methods and intention. However, the correlation coefficient shows a weak relationship between method and self efficacy \( r(255) = 0.137, p<0.05 \); but relatively strong \( r=0.418, p<0.01 \) relationship between self efficacy and intention. Based on the observations and results of interviews with staff and students, it was found that lectures still dominate with very little emphasis on practical aspects of the course. This was partly due to the general nature of education system in Uganda which focuses more examinations than skills (Oyugi, 2011). This finding is consistent with the findings of Solomon (2007) which confirm that traditional teaching method was popular. Another consistent finding was by McKeown, et al (2006) who found out that provision of entrepreneurship education in 123 Higher Education Institutions in UK was varied, with both entrepreneurship and innovation. Overall delivery methods proved to be more traditional than anticipated, with few instances of action learning or use of technology to support learning.

Very little is still known about effective teaching techniques for entrepreneurship educators (Brockhaus, 2001) and research and knowledge about how to teach entrepreneurship remains relatively underdeveloped, despite the growing demand for most entrepreneurial-oriented graduates (Kirby, 2002). Most of the learning activities engaged in by people with an entrepreneurial orientation are the self-directed mode (Young, 1997). According to this learning mode, students are primarily engaged in the acquisition of competencies that takes place in very different settings, such as the office, the field, at home or in the classroom. Of course, this does not imply that entrepreneurs learn alone, but they often learn on their own. As far as this source of entrepreneurial learning is concerned, some authors (Solomon et al. 1998, Shepherd and Douglas, 1997) have tried to discuss the most appropriate pedagogies for transferring entrepreneurial skills and knowledge. Although the key to a successful entrepreneurship education is to find the most effective method, there no universal pedagogical recipe to teach entrepreneurship and the choice of techniques and modalities depends on the objectives, contents and constraints imposed by the institutional context (Zahra, Mansoreh, and Narges, 2012).
Ahiaarah (1989) conducted a survey, finding that the most widely used pedagogical combination for entrepreneurship education system emphasized as set of values and abilities which were harmful to entrepreneurial spirit. Davies and Gibb (1991) have gone further on this and have suggested that using traditional education methods to develop entrepreneurship could be interpreted as teaching ‘to drive using the rear mirror’. In this respect, it is believed that conventional pedagogy should be balanced with more advanced techniques, so that entrepreneurs can develop both vertical and lateral thinking in problem solving (Kirby, 2002): the former is objective, analytical, logical and resulting in one or a limited number of solutions; the latter is creative, imaginative, emotional and resulting in multiple solution. Traditional methods of teaching entrepreneurship are beginning to give way to new methods that come out of an increased understanding of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship students can be depicted as independent individuals who dislike restraints, restriction, and routine. They are capable of original thought, especially under condition of ambiguity and uncertainty. Many of them need to develop better communication skills and become more aware of how others perceive their behaviours.

Contrary to the general tendency towards the development of non traditional teaching techniques, Fiet (2001a) underlines the need not to forget the relevance of deductive learning, meaning that traditional lectures based on theory should represent the core of entrepreneurship courses. In some cases the reengineering of courses led to a situation where we ‘throw the baby out with the bath water’ and we become irrelevant as teachers when we fail to apply theory as a tool to answer student questions. Fiet (2001a) advocates for a combination of deductive and inductive learning. In line with Fiet (2001a) this study proposes a theory of entrepreneurship learning to be developed to guide the teaching and learning of entrepreneurship.

The debate on the teaching methods of entrepreneurship education is closely related to the debate on who should teach entrepreneurship. Many educators still come from other fields in business studies and economics or are adjuncts, who are not interested in research on entrepreneurship per se but who are mainly concerned with consulting and practicing entrepreneurship (Katz, 2003). There is a common idea on the need to keep on developing a tenure-track department or faculty in entrepreneurship, not only because it would be a fruitful way to legitimate the way (Meyer, 2001), but also because only academic teachers could meet the challenge of teaching the right contents. On one hand, adjuncts cannot be effective as academics in teaching theory based contents, since they are more familiar with practice rather than theory (Fiet, 2001a); on the other hand, the teaching of the suggested none traditional content requires a pedagogical sensitivity that only experienced academics can have. The argument of who should teach entrepreneurship is endless and is not an issue. There are issues that are taken for granted that should be addressed. The issue is not who should teach but how it should be taught and how this should be taught depends much on the content, objective, assessment and the audience. The content, objective, method and their contribution to development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention was the motivation for this study.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Entrepreneurship education is rapidly becoming part of the curriculum at more and more universities. As it does so, it is causing a challenge in as far as appropriate method of teaching it is concerned. The current methods do not seem to lead to the achievement of the objective of entrepreneurship education. This paper concludes that there is no significant relationship between method of teaching and the development of entrepreneurial intentions among the students. The overall delivery method is more of traditional approach with few instances of action learning although there are specific techniques that can be effective if used appropriately.

There is no universal set of technique that is effective. The choice depends on the content, objective, mode of assessment and the institutional framework. The pedagogical processes for new venture creation rarely address the problem of identifying, measuring, and tracking the outputs of their efforts.

Since there are multiple methods of teaching entrepreneurship, there is need for curriculum designers to link pedagogy with the entrepreneurial outcomes of each category of the learners. To minimize the traditional methods of delivery which put greater emphasis on theory and examinations, lecturers should encourage idea generation and hands on activities. The curriculum designers and university senate should emphasize using parallel-integrated methods and applications, such as lectures, project assignments, presentations and multiple contacts with local industry and entrepreneurs that inspire the students make them own their learning. In order to enhance hands on training, student training for entrepreneurial promotion (STEP) project should be implemented by the university management.

The result of this study indicates that it is possible through entrepreneurship courses to build confidence among students and nurture those skill requirements essential to the entrepreneurial process. Entrepreneurship educators can be better informed in the design of course content and overall curriculum development. For example, entrepreneurship educators can invoke intention model to better understand the students’ motivations and intentions, and thus provide better teaching methods that contributes to the development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions among university students in Uganda.
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