



## Education + Training

Students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy: does the teaching method matter?

Ernest Abaho, Donath R. Olomi, Goodluck Charles Urassa,

### Article information:

To cite this document:

Ernest Abaho, Donath R. Olomi, Goodluck Charles Urassa, (2015) "Students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy: does the teaching method matter?", Education + Training, Vol. 57 Issue: 8/9, pp.908-923,

<https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-02-2014-0008>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-02-2014-0008>

Downloaded on: 02 April 2019, At: 05:25 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 58 other documents.

To copy this document: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 1363 times since 2015\*

### Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2015), "Estimating the effect of entrepreneur education on graduates' intention to be entrepreneurs", Education + Training, Vol. 57 Iss 8/9 pp. 874-890 <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-03-2014-0030">https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-03-2014-0030</a>

(2016), "Predicting entrepreneurial motivation among university students: The role of entrepreneurship education", Education + Training, Vol. 58 Iss 7/8 pp. 861-881 <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2016-0019">https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2016-0019</a>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:431992 []

### For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit [www.emeraldinsight.com/authors](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors) for more information.

### About Emerald [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

\*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

ET  
57,8/9

# Students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy: does the teaching method matter?

908

Received 3 February 2014  
Revised 20 June 2015  
Accepted 23 June 2015

Ernest Abaho

*Makerere University Business School, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda*

Donath R. Olomi

*Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship Development,  
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and*

Goodluck Charles Urassa

*Department of Marketing, University of Dar es Salaam,  
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to examine the various entrepreneurship teaching methods in Uganda and how these methods relate to entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE).

**Design/methodology/approach** – A sample of 522 final year students from selected universities and study programs was surveyed using self-reported questionnaires.

**Findings** – There was a statistically significant positive relationship between ESE and lecturers' business experience. Interacting with successful people, personal reading and handout notes, class presentations and imaginary case studies had a statistically significant positive relationship with ESE. There was no statistical significance in the relationship between ESE and some teaching methods. A positively significant correlation was also observed between lecturers' business experience and the choice of teaching method(s).

**Research limitations/implications** – Further research should explore how various methods are used to teach different aspects of entrepreneurship as well as the attitudes and perceptions of entrepreneurship educators about entrepreneurial experience and its relevancy in entrepreneurship education.

**Practical implications** – Lecturers should seek opportunities for attaining business experience through practice and business networks. Institutions should orient lecturers through different teaching styles and train them on how to relate learning outcomes to learning environments as well as investing in learning aids.

**Originality/value** – The study provides insights about the most feasible methods of activating ESE in the most practical and efficient ways. It also informs readers about the state of learning technologies from a developing country's perspective.

**Keywords** Teaching methods, Entrepreneurial self-efficacy, University students, Entrepreneurial lecturers

**Paper type** Research paper

## 1. Introduction

The role of entrepreneurship in development is now universally acknowledged. This has led to interest in the development of entrepreneurial values and skills for socio-economic transformation. Economic transformation can be manifested through an economy's resource productivity driven by superior human capital (WEF, 2009). Therefore, human capital of a nation empowered with entrepreneurial values plays a tremendous role of driving other factors of production through resource mobilization, value addition, distribution and wealth regeneration (Thornton, 1999; Kongolo, 2010).



Entrepreneurial values encompass a set of beliefs associated with dynamism, including risk propensity and tolerance for ambiguity (Sitkin and Pablo, 1992), innovativeness (Schumpeter, 1934), need for achievement (McClelland, 1961) and entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) (Rotter, 1966; Bandura, 1990). While a general framework of entrepreneurial values is essential in explaining development disparities across economies (Granato *et al.*, 1996) through enabling national competitiveness (Keat *et al.*, 2011), technology diffusion (WEF, 2009) and resource productivity, one key driver of such dynamism is ESE.

The concept of self-efficacy has been applied in social sciences by many researchers. It was developed by Bandura (1969) to describe human behavior. Notable areas where this concept has been applied include ESE (Chen *et al.*, 1998), leadership and academic self-efficacy (McCormick, 2001). In a generic perspective, self-efficacy refers to an individual's ability, willingness and confidence to produce good results. Because of its psychological and behavioral properties, it has been referred to as internal locus of control (Bandura, 1990), optimism (Rotter, 1966) and self-confidence (Gibb, 2007). It is argued that people with a high level of self-efficacy believe themselves to be in control of their destinies unlike those with a low level of self-efficacy who believe themselves to be controlled by others or chance (Rotter, 1966; Gibb, 2007). Therefore, people with a high level of self-efficacy attribute their behavior to their own abilities not external events and forces.

According to the Locus of Control theory (Rotter, 1966), an individual perceives the outcome of an event either within or beyond personal control and understanding. People who believe that they have some control over their destinies and that control resides within themselves are referred to as internal locus of control oriented or internals (Bandura, 1986). By contrast, people who perceive an external locus of control believe that their destinies are determined by factors extrinsic to themselves such as fate or luck and are called externals (Bandura, 1986). In the context of entrepreneurship, people prefer to take and hold of unmistakable command to themselves instead of leaving things to external factors (Bandura, 1990).

Self-efficacy through social learning develops when a certain behavior has positive rewards through reinforcement and the behavior reduces when there is less or negative reward due to negative reinforcement (Bandura, 1969). Socialization as an antecedent to self-efficacy can be seen in avenues such as education where learning facilitates confidence building (Howorth *et al.*, 2012).

In the context of work and business, people with high levels of self-efficacy are believed to perform well in harder tasks because they recognize that tasks are not to be avoided but to be mastered without considering absconding as an alternative (Niemi-virta and Tapola, 2007). ESE fuels the motivation to start a business venture (Boyd and Vozikis, 1994) hence it has become an important area of emphasis in entrepreneurship education. Even after start-up, people with high levels of ESE have an advantage of robust success in their businesses (Chen *et al.*, 1998). Thus, the strength of ESE is in its ability to detonate fear of failure in business venturing. Individuals' self-efficacy becomes high when they are succeeding at their tasks and it slows down when they consistently fail in a given task (Bandura, 1986).

Whilst scholars argue that ESE is a budding catalyst for development especially through business start-up and growth, entrepreneurship researchers are still perturbed by its antecedence. An ongoing debate hinges around the "born" vs "made" schools of thought. The born side argues that ESE is born hence genetic. Alternatively, the made scholars emphasize that ESE can be nurtured (Rotter, 1966; Ajzen, 1991; Henry *et al.*, 2005) and has nothing to do with genetics (Alberti *et al.*, 2004).

Focussing on the nurture school of thought, entrepreneurship education programs are reported to develop and strengthen students' ESE and this debate appears to have reached reasonable consensus (see Byabashaija and Katono *et al.*, 2011). Entrepreneurship education is a relatively recent academic discipline which started in 1938 by Shigeru Fijii at Kobe University in Japan (McMullan and Long, 1987). Since then, it was adopted throughout the USA and the twenty-first century has seen it robustly gaining acceptance in most African business schools to the extent that in some countries like Uganda, it is offered at the secondary level of education.

In this study, the term entrepreneurship education is used in accordance with Alberti *et al.* (2004) who synthesized it as the structured formal conveyance of entrepreneurial competencies, in reference to the concepts, skills and mental awareness by individuals. Therefore, entrepreneurship programs raise awareness about worlds of employment and enterprise development. This helps to nurture critical skills and positive attitudes toward work and eventually influence ESE (Bagheri and Pihie, 2010).

Kirby (2004) proposes that in order to realize the purpose for which entrepreneurship education was developed, there is need to devise innovative delivery strategies in "teaching for" entrepreneurship and shift from "teaching about" entrepreneurship. While this change toward teaching "for" is important in the transformation of entrepreneurship education, the teaching methods are not specific and have not yet been generally agreed upon by entrepreneurship scholars (Gerba, 2012). Therefore, since people develop behaviors from the natural and/or the "nurtural" environment (Bandura, 1990), the effect of entrepreneurship education programs may depend on the methods of learning. Consequently, the choice of teaching style and method should relate to the nature of learners, their environment and surrounding entrepreneurial opportunities (Jones and Colwil, 2013). That is why to date there has not been any agreement on the content, method and logical presentation of entrepreneurship knowledge in an academic perspective as earlier observed by Alberti *et al.* (2004).

It is therefore imperative to establish the available teaching methods as generic options, examine the preference of those methods in the perspective of the learners and determine the extent of usage of those methods by entrepreneurship facilitators. This study focusses on two key questions; what is the level of utilization of different entrepreneurship teaching methods, is there a relationship between different entrepreneurship teaching methods and ESE? This study gives insights to entrepreneurship educators about the most relevant and pedagogically feasible methods in the development of students' ESE as an important learning outcome in the venture creation process and the development of productive human capital.

## 2. Teaching styles and ESE

There is a strong debate about how entrepreneurship should be taught and by whom (Kirby, 2004). These fundamental questions skew towards the choice and frequency of teaching methods in entrepreneurship. According to this study, a teaching method in the context of entrepreneurship is described as a learning process which emphasizes holistic, integrative learning through practical and creative learning strategies where the learners are participative and are empowered to adapt to the ever-changing world of work and general life environment with an intention of grooming their proclivity toward self-sustainability and success. Literature supports the suggestion that people who study entrepreneurship have a high likelihood of developing ESE

(Cooper *et al.*, 2004; Samah and Omar, 2011). Because of the confidence in the role of education toward the development of ESE, global efforts were made to introduce entrepreneurship education in higher learning institutions (UNCTAD, 2010).

Effective teaching styles involve activities that promote individual skills, attitudes, behaviors and capabilities that foster the development of learners' ESE (Jones and Colwil, 2013). Subsequently, learners are able to acquire knowledge, skills, abilities and positive attitudes (Ali, 2013) toward actual, potential and current entrepreneurs to succeed in life especially with alertness to business opportunities (Solesvik *et al.*, 2013, p. 751). In studying the role of teaching methodologies, there are three fundamental questions that need to be addressed; what should be taught? (contents of the curriculum), how should it be taught? (pedagogy, process and learning stakeholders' interaction and relationship) and who should facilitate it? (nature of facilitators, their educational experience and other extra-curricular competencies).

Looking at the question of who to teach entrepreneurship in terms of experience, personality and other human resource specifications, it is argued that effective entrepreneurship education is delivered by facilitators with an entrepreneurial orientation and experience (Abaho, 2013). Therefore, while education as an independent concept is perceived as a social infrastructure (Kolb and Kolb, 2001), an entrepreneurial curriculum cannot be effective if the facilitators are not entrepreneurial (Kirby, 2004; Abaho, 2013). In order to develop an entrepreneurial student, the lecturers need to have some level of entrepreneurial experience either in business or at least demonstrate evidence of entrepreneurial success beyond just academic excellence (Williams *et al.*, 2013; Gibb, 2007).

In teaching entrepreneurship, there is also need to involve students in the business processes so that they interface with reality (Plumly *et al.*, 2008; Pihie and Sani, 2009) and successful people (Samah and Omar, 2011). Comparable findings were made by Mueller *et al.* (2006) in Australia, China, Korea, Germany, New Zealand, Singapore, USA. In order to have effective entrepreneurial education, there is need to incorporate experiential learning through new venture creation so as to provide the realism and functional approach toward ESE (Jones and Matlay, 2011). Experiential learning involves activities such as business idea generation, business clinics and startups (Kirby, 2004; Cooper *et al.*, 2004).

Since ESE is about attitude change and perception toward successful living (Ali, 2013; Kirby, 2004), the teaching of entrepreneurship should encompass learning that promotes entrepreneurial competences using appropriate teaching methods and creating a conducive environment within which entrepreneurial awareness, interest, desire and action can thrive more easily (Gartner and Vesper, 1994). Experiential learning increases self-esteem and innovativeness to perform better (Kolb and Kolb, 2001; Cheung and Au, 2010). This helps students to solve practical problems creatively and strategically (Gibb, 2007). One of the strategies proposed in what should be in an entrepreneurial curriculum is simulation games (Wawer *et al.*, 2010). It is argued that simulation exercises help students to develop expansive behaviors of goal setting and profit targets.

In addition to simulation games, Gartner and Vesper (1994) argue that effective entrepreneurship education is delivered by taking learners through venture plan writing, use of case studies and direct lectures. Seeking to answer the same question of how entrepreneurship education can best be delivered, Solomon (2007) suggests business planning exercises, class discussions and student interaction with guest speakers as effective means through which learners can be able to observe, practice

and acquire entrepreneurial confidence. In a study about the most frequently used entrepreneurship teaching methodologies in South African Universities, Co and Mitchell (2007) found that straight lectures, creation of business plans, discussions, case studies and guest speakers were most preferred by both students and facilitators.

Mwasalwiba (2010) embarked on a comprehensive review of literature relating to entrepreneurship teaching methodologies. It was established that while there is a number of delivery methods based on different students' audiences and levels, the most reported methods include business simulations, videos and filming, real venture start-up, business games and competitions, projects, workshops, class presentations, discussion and group work, industry study visits, case studies, role models and guest speakers, business plan creation and theory based lectures. Of the most commonly used methodologies, business plans, use of guest speakers and class discussions were the most frequent. Some of these methods have been challenged as ineffective and unnecessary. For example it is argued that the usage of business plans in teaching entrepreneurship facilitates convergent thinking among students; something that encourages them to think "inside the box" (Honig, 2004, p. 269).

Whereas the list of entrepreneurship teaching methods and styles is a long one, there is no one or a set of proven methods. This could be attributed to a myriad of differences in the level of education, nature of students, learning outcomes and nature of educators (Mwasalwiba, 2010). This study therefore uses the Ugandan evidence to present the most used teaching methods in entrepreneurship education, the most preferred methods in the context of learners and how these methods relate to ESE.

### 3. Research context and methodology

The study was quantitative and cross-sectional. It is based on the objectivism philosophy which argues that valid knowledge can only be established using scientific means (Cohen and Maldonado, 2007). This school of thought favors quantitative data in the understanding of social phenomena (Kieran, 1997). The use of cross-sectional quantitative studies in ESE research is not new because it has received acceptance from past studies notably Lebusa (2011), Chen *et al.* (1998) and Boyd and Vozikis (1994). The only limitation with this methodology is that it does not capture the changes in the students' ESE before and after the intervention of the curriculum. Such a limitation can be explored in future studies. However, the effects of this methodology were minimized by including those that had not studied entrepreneurship. Even then, this method has been successfully used in previous studies such as Malebana and Swanepoel (2014) while investigating whether students with different levels of exposure to entrepreneurship education would perceive their own ESE differently from those without such exposure among students from two South African universities.

The study was carried out in Uganda, East Africa among final year university students. Students were selected from various degree programs. The choice of studying students was because they are the future change agents due to their educational attainments hence intellectual human resources of national economies. These students also get a chance of improving knowledge, skills and changing their attitudes to cope up with the changing environment (Ali, 2013). Multistage stratified sampling with clusters (Bartlett *et al.*, 2001) was used to determine the sample size.

A random selection of clusters was made and a sample taken from the selected clusters. The strength of this technique is that it is useful in large populations with dispersed attributes both culturally and geographically. In this study, the population was geographically dispersed because all universities in Uganda were sampled. There are

different cultures in the different regions of Uganda where these universities are located as well as differences in ownership in form of private and public ownership. For stratification, the university student population in Uganda is divided into externally heterogeneous but internally homogeneous groups. A sample was drawn from each of the groups. The main difference between cluster and stratified sampling is that whereas the earlier allows for the sampling of clusters from a pool of clusters, the latter must have samples selected from each of the strata (Bartlett *et al.*, 2001). This technique has a low sampling error because it facilitates representativeness, allows for inter and intra-group comparisons and has a high level of precision hence reducing sampling error (Kadam and Bhalerao, 2010).

#### *Measurement of variables*

Independent variables included the different teaching methods in entrepreneurship education (business simulation games, interacting with successful people, business plan competition, guest lecturers, video presentations, handouts, class discussions and presentations, quizzes, written course works and use of case studies as generated from literature review). Lecturers' business experience was measured using business ownership, past or concurrent job in the private sector and consultancy experience. The dependent variable was ESE. Teaching methods were anchored on two five-point Likert scales whereby the teaching methodology frequency was scaled based on how often a certain method is used ranging from "very often" to "never", preference was scaled based on the level of preference (from "highly preferred" to "not preferred at all"). ESE was scaled on the level of agreement with the statements that measure ESE from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Reverse coded items were adjusted to ensure consistency. Imputation was used to replace missing values as recommended by Rubin (1996). For reliability, all the variables had the recommended values of  $> 0.60$  (Nunnally, 1978) whereby teaching methods had 0.75 with 11 items and ESE had 0.93 with 18 items.

#### **4. Results**

Majority of the respondents were in the age group of 18-24 (85.4 percent) and the least in number were in the age group of 38 years and above (1.2 percent). For gender, 56.1 percent were female while 43.9 percent were males. This may suggest that because of the "educate the girl child" promotion in Uganda, more females are getting opportunities to join university education in the country Table I.

The most frequently used method was personal reading and handout notes while the least frequently used method was use of hypothetical case studies Table II.

The most preferred teaching methods were interacting with successful people, personal reading and handout notes, class discussions and presentations while the least preferred was business simulation games (Table III).

A statistically significant positive relationship was observed between ESE and lecturers' business experience. For ESE and teaching methods, it was observed that interacting with successful people, personal reading and handout notes, class discussions, presentations and use of hypothetical case studies had positive and statistically positive relationship ( $r = 0.089$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $r = 0.107$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $r = 0.170$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ;  $r = 0.122$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , respectively). This implies that as more of these methodologies are applied in the learning process, students gain more entrepreneurial ESE. Although a positive relationship was observed between the methodologies and students' ESE, there was

**Table I.**  
Teaching method's  
frequency of usage  
in Uganda

	TMF1	TMF2	TMF3	TMF4	TMF5	TMF6	TMF7	TMF8	TMF9	TMF10	TMF11
<i>n</i>	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522
Mean	3.358	2.963	3.167	2.955	3.215	3.673	3.437	3.106	3.517	2.918	3.144
Mode	5.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
SD	1.5427	1.3058	1.4502	1.3707	1.4222	0.8033	0.8675	1.3185	0.8938	1.0921	1.5220
Minimum	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Maximum	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Notes:** TMF1, business simulation games; TMF2, interacting with successful people; TMF3, business plan competitions; TMF4, guest lectures; TMF5, video presentations; TMF6, personal reading and handout notes; TMF7, class discussions and presentations; TMF8, quizzes; TMF9, take home course works; TMF10, use of hypothetical case studies; TMF11, actual business creation projects

	TM1	TM2	TM3	TM4	TM5	TM6	TM7	TM8	TM9	TMF10	TMF11
<i>n</i>	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522
Valid	3.042	3.587	3.169	3.154	3.207	3.519	3.582	3.157	3.397	3.244	3.355
Mean	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Mode	1.1645	0.8561	1.0639	1.1629	1.1870	0.9944	0.8780	1.1758	0.9850	1.0539	1.1452
SD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Minimum	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum											

**Table II.**  
Teaching method  
preference by  
university students  
in Uganda

**Table III.**  
Correlations

	EYSE	LBE	TMF1	TMF2	TMF3	TMF4	TMF5	TMF6	TMF7	TMF8	TMF9	TMF10	TMF11
Spearman's $\rho$													
ESE	1.000	0.159**	0.024	0.089*	0.076	0.085	0.021	0.107*	0.170**	0.053	0.064	0.122**	0.061
Sig. (2-t)		0.000	0.590	0.041	0.083	0.053	0.631	0.015	0.000	0.224	0.147	0.005	0.167
<i>n</i>	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522
LBE	0.159**	1.000	-0.036	-0.067	0.016	0.025	0.009	0.123**	0.203**	0.025	0.110*	0.091*	-0.054
Sig. (2-t)			0.410	0.128	0.711	0.568	0.836	0.005	0.000	0.564	0.012	0.039	0.215
<i>n</i>	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	522

**Notes:** Key: LBE = lecturers' business experience. \*\*, \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 and 0.05 levels (two-tailed), respectively

lack of statistical significance between business simulation games, business plan competitions, guest lectures, video presentations quizzes, take home course works and actual business creation projects.

As for lectures' business experience and the choice of teaching methodologies, a positive and statistically strong correlation was observed between lectures' business experience and personal reading and handout notes, class discussions and presentations, take home course works and use of hypothetical case studies ( $r = 0.123$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $r = 0.203$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ;  $r = 0.110$ ,  $p < 0.05$  and  $r = 0.091$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , respectively). This implies that the more the exposure to business experience of the lecturers, the more they prefer to use these methodologies. However, the strongest relationship was observed in class discussions and presentations which denote increased participatory learning. By contrast, even when insignificant, negative relationships were revealed between the lectures' business experience and the choice of teaching methodologies. These included business simulation games ( $r = 0.036$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), interacting with successful people ( $r = 0.067$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) and actual business creation projects ( $r = 0.054$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) (Table IV).

The table above indicates the regression model of the study variables. In model 1 the relationship between teaching styles had a strong coefficient. The inclusion of lectures' business experience in the explanation of ESE strengthens the relationship by 0.04 (4 percent) which is a significant intervention. Column three presents the  $R^2$  which is the proportional improvement in prediction from the regression model, compared to the mean model. It indicates the goodness of fit of the model. It ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating that the proposed model does not improve prediction over the mean model and 1 indicating perfect prediction. Improvement in the regression model results in proportional increases in  $R^2$ . In this case, an improvement from 0.076 to 0.100 (0.24) was revealed hence marking a proportionate improvement. The model predicts 7.9 percent of total variance in students' ESE based on the improvement from 5.6 percent without the intervention of lectures' business experience. After the inclusion of lectures' business experience, the model indicates a significant improvement.

It is acknowledged in this study that the main thesis was not about the extent to which selected teaching methods predict ESE but rather on the relationship between these methods and ESE as well as the moderating effect of the lectures' in the perspective of their business experience. The statistic however informs the study that there are other predictor variables of ESE other than the teaching method(s) and the influence of lectures. A significant  $F$ -test ( $p < 0.001$ ) was observed which indicates that the observed  $R^2$  was reliable and not using counterfeit data. Hence, the proposed relationship between the teaching methods, lectures' business experience and ESE was statistically reliable.

## 5. Discussion

A positive statistically significant relationship was observed between ESE and lecturers' business experience. These results were similar to what had earlier been established.

Model	$R$	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$ e	SE of the estimate	$R^2$ Change	Change statistics			
						$F$ change	df1	df2	Sig. $F$ change
1	0.276 <sup>a</sup>	0.076	0.056	0.59573	0.076	3.822	11	510	0.000
2	0.316 <sup>b</sup>	0.100	0.079	0.58852	0.024	13.563	1	509	0.000

**Notes:** <sup>a</sup>Predictors: (constant), TM11, TM7, TM5, TM2, TM1, TM6, TM4, TM10, TM8, TM9, TM3; <sup>b</sup>predictors: (constant), TM11, TM7, TM5, TM2, TM1, TM6, TM4, TM10, TM8, TM9, TM3 and LBE

**Table IV.**  
Model summary

For example, Kirby (2004) emphasized that entrepreneurial lecturers are an anchor into students' ESE because of the role modeling and inspiration that learners obtain. Similar arguments are presented by Abaho (2013) under the argument that without an entrepreneurial experience, entrepreneurship lecturers deny students an opportunity to learn from them as the closest role models. Thus, on top of academic excellence, entrepreneurship educators need to be the primary source of inspiration to their students by setting the example (Williams *et al.*, 2013; Gibb, 2007). It is a common experience for students to ask about the type of business that their lecturers undertake. Therefore, to accelerate their ESE, a lecturer needs to have relevant evidence.

For ESE and teaching methodologies, it was observed that interacting with successful people, personal reading and handout notes, class discussions, presentations and case studies had positive and statistically significant relationship. This implies that as more of these methodologies are applied in the learning process, students gain more ESE. Key issues to note here include an understanding that some methods are more effective than others. That is why although a positive relationship was observed between the methodologies and students' ESE, there was lack of statistical significance between business simulation games, business plan competitions, guest lectures, video presentations, quizzes, take home course works and actual business creation projects. Honig (2004) has previously argued that business planning is not a prerequisite to business success. Hence, it is not surprising that in this study, teaching methods such as usage of business plans and business plan competition do not have a significant influence in ESE. It could be due to its perceived irrelevance (Ali, 2013). Other methods could have been insignificant because of students, institutional and facilitator factors. For example, methods such as video presentations lack specific content targeting particular topics. The choice of videos to present sometimes depends on the facilitators; something that may not necessarily appeal to the learners. This subsequently creates a mismatch between the learning needs and outcomes. In other instances, the learners focus on the video as a "movie" not as a learning resource which affects attention and the desired knowledge.

While some methods are convenient to the facilitators in assessment such as group coursework, there are so many free riders (those who only wait for team members to finish the assignment and come to sign) there are limitations of missing out on the learning of free riders who are falsely seen to have learned. Thus, while it is argued that students need to be involved both as individuals and groups to share experience about reality (Pihie and Sani, 2009), there is need for facilitators' intervention to ensure active participation.

The results established that the most preferred method of teaching was personal reading and handout notes, and it was still the most frequently used. What is not known is whether the preference is because of the frequency or frequency is due to preference. Other most preferred methods by students were interacting with successful people, class discussions and presentations. By contrast, the least preferred were business simulation games while the least frequently used was actual business creation projects. The above results confirm that most of the teaching at universities in Uganda is more theoretical and could explain why there is less graduate business start-up activity in Uganda.

What should be done is to improve the way entrepreneurship is taught by investing more in student venture projects because these projects help to present the challenges of business and use the time and resources available within the university resource environment to address those challenges. As argued by various scholars, the support of

student investment clubs reinforces the students ESE because the continuous interaction with successful people and sharing the strategies of addressing those problems helps them to; get rid of learned helplessness (Ajzen, 1991); develop the "if others can, I can" attitude; master the art of staying strong and focussed even when the business is not going well; and getting an opportunity to learn from their successful projects and mistakes committed to avoid them when they join the real-life businesses. Therefore, some methods such as use of handout notes, straight lectures need to be condensed and substituted with interactive learning in order to develop expansive behaviors full of self-esteem (Mauchi *et al.*, 2011; Fini *et al.*, 2009; Cheung and Au, 2010) and the desire for self-sustainability (Gartner and Vesper, 1994).

About lectures' business experience and the choice of teaching methodologies, a positive and statistically strong correlation was observed between lectures' business experience and personal reading, handout notes, class discussions, presentations, take home course works and use of hypothetical case studies. This implies that the more the exposure to business experience of the lecturers, the more they prefer to use these methodologies. However, the strongest relationship was observed in class discussions and presentations which denote increased participatory learning. Even when insignificant, negative relationships were revealed between the lectures' business experience and the choice of teaching methodologies. These included business simulation games, interacting with successful people and actual business creation projects.

Questions arise as to why lecturers with an entrepreneurial experience would not prefer to use business simulation games and bridging the interaction with other successful people. Some of the probable reasons could be that because they feel their experience is adequate, they do not see need for extra exposure to other peoples' experience. For other methods such as business simulation games, it may imply that some experienced lecturers in business observe weaknesses in those games and do not see any value of using them to teach entrepreneurship. Principal to note is also that some methods are costly. This means that even when the students may prefer them, the facilitators and institutions may not use them either at all or may use them less adequately. It is therefore a major constraint especially in matching resources, teaching methods with learning objectives (Arasti *et al.*, 2012; Lackéus and Middleton, 2011).

Stephanie *et al.* (2012) boldly stated that although facilitators are important because their knowledge, experience and attitude with regard to entrepreneurship matters. Not always are they the best teachers when it comes to business matters if they cannot mentor the learners. Because of that, the authors recommend that institutions should focus on working with entrepreneurs, chief executives, bankers, venture capitalists and business angels to instigate the spirit of entrepreneurship among the students. The recommendations imply that entrepreneurship lecturers should be availed with opportunities to get exposed to the actual business processes and practices. This enables them to deliver relevant and pragmatic knowledge.

## 6. Conclusions

According to the findings and literature, it can be concluded that entrepreneurship lecturers with an entrepreneurial and business experience enable students to develop ESE whilst the experience of entrepreneurship lecturers influences the choice of teaching methods to use but these choices are constrained by the institutions' resources and preference of those methods by the learners. Relatedly, interacting with successful people, personal reading and handout notes, use of hypothetical case studies, class discussions and presentations have a strong influence on students' ESE.

Lecturers should be encouraged to seek opportunities for attaining business experience by interacting with practicing business people and getting involved in their business networks. This helps to observe their entrepreneurial behaviors and their drivers of business instinct. If well interpreted, lectures can utilize these experiences to lift the entrepreneurial spirits of the learners. Practically, lecturers can gain business experiences by taking active roles through starting up business ventures. This helps them to combine theory and practice in their teaching activities. The benefit of using practical experience is that it helps learners to believe what they are being taught as well treating their lecturers not just as teachers but as role models, coaches and mentors. Apart from that, experience helps a lecturer to decide on the most effective teaching styles since they will be treating students as mentees. For policy, institutions should expose lecturers to different teaching styles and train them on how to relate them to the expected learning outcomes. Institutions should also invest in learning aids because sometimes the lecturers know the best teaching styles but lack the tools to use in delivery.

Like any other study, we observed some limitations such as the one snapshot of data using a cross-sectional method. This denies an opportunity to observe differences amongst the student cohort prior to exposure to entrepreneurship training and after. The qualitative aspects of the learning process and dynamics are also not captured in this study. Further research should thus explore experimental approaches for comparison purposes. Even then, additional research can explore qualitative methods to establish (in more detail) how various methods are used to teach different aspects of entrepreneurship. This will help to discover the strategies of matching the learning environment, learners' needs, nature of facilitators and institutional resource capacities. The benefit of such a study is that it helps to determine the most feasible approaches of activating ESE in the most practical and efficient ways. It would also be interesting to study about the attitudes and perceptions of entrepreneurship educators about entrepreneurial experience and its relevancy in entrepreneurship education as well as the antecedents to students' choice of learning methods.

## References

- Abaho, E. (2013), "Entrepreneurial curriculum as an antecedent to entrepreneurial values in Uganda: a SEM model", *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 085-092.
- Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 179-211.
- Alberti, F., Sciascia, S. and Poli, A. (2004), "Entrepreneurship education: notes on an ongoing debate", *14th Annual International Entrepreneurship Conference International Entrepreneurship, University of Napoli Federico II, July 4-7, Napoli*.
- Ali, D.F. (2013), "The process of impact of entrepreneurship education and training on entrepreneurship perception and intention", *Education+Training*, Vol. 55 Nos 8/9, pp. 868-885.
- Arasti, Z., Falavarjani, M.K. and Imanipour, N. (2012), "A study of teaching methods in entrepreneurship education for graduate students", *Journal of Higher Education Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 2-10.
- Bandura, A. (1969), "Social-learning theory of identificatory processes", in Goslin, D.A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, Rand-McNally, Chicago, IL, pp. 213-262.
- Bandura, A. (1986), *The Social Foundations of Thought and Actions*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, NJ.

- Bandura, A. (1990), "Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency", *Applied Sport Psychology*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 128-163.
- Bartlett, J.E., Kotrlik, J.W. and Higgins, C.C. (2001), "Organizational research: determining appropriate sample size in survey research", *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 23-29.
- Boyd, N.G. and Vozikis, G. (1994), "The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 63-77.
- Byabashaija, W. and Katono, I. (2011), "The impact of college entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention to start a business in Uganda", *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 127-144.
- Chen, C., Greene, P. and Crick, A. (1998), "Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 295-316.
- Cheung, C.K. and Au, E. (2010), "Running a small business by students in a secondary school: its impact on learning about entrepreneurship", *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 45-63.
- Co, M.J. and Mitchell, B. (2007), "Entrepreneurship education in South Africa: a nationwide survey", *Education + Training*, Vol. 48 No. 5, pp. 348-359.
- Cohen, L. and Maldonado, A. (2007), "Research methods in education", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 446-446.
- Cooper, S., Bottomely, Y. and Gordon, J. (2004), "Stepping out of the classroom and up the ladder of learning: an experimental learning approach to entrepreneurship education", *Industry and Higher Education*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 11-22.
- Fini, R., Grimaldi, R. and Sobrero, M. (2009), "Factors fostering academics to start up new ventures: an assessment of Italian founders' incentives", *Journal of Technology Transfer*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 380-402.
- Gartner, W.B. and Vesper, K.H. (1994), "Executive forum experiments in entrepreneurship education: successes and failures", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 179-187.
- Gerba, D.T. (2012), "The context of entrepreneurship education in Ethiopian universities", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 35 Nos 3/4, pp. 225-244.
- Gibb, A.A. (2007), "Entrepreneurship: unique solutions for unique environments. Is it possible to achieve this with the existing paradigm?", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, Vol. 5 No. 5, pp. 93-142.
- Granato, L.J., Inglehart, R. and Leblang, D. (1996), "The effect of cultural values on economic development; theory, hypotheses and some empirical tests", *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 607-631.
- Henry, C., Hill, F. and Leitch, C. (2005), "Entrepreneurship education and training: can entrepreneurship be taught?", Part II, *Education+Training*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 158-169.
- Honig, B. (2004), "Entrepreneurship education: toward a model of contingency-based business planning", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 258-273.
- Howorth, C., Smith, S.M. and Parkinson, C. (2012), "Social learning and social entrepreneurship education", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 371-389.
- Jones, C. and Matlay, H. (2011), "Understanding the heterogeneity of entrepreneurship education: going beyond Gartner", *Education+Training*, Vol. 53 Nos 8/9, pp. 692-703.
- Jones, P. and Colwill, A. (2013), "Entrepreneurship education: an evaluation of the young enterprise wales initiative", *Education+Training*, Vol. 55 Nos 8/9, pp. 911-925.

- Kadam, P. and Bhalerao, S. (2010), "Sample size calculation", *International Journal Ayurveda Research*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 55-57.
- Keat, O.Y., Selvarajah, C. and Meyer, D. (2011), "Inclination towards entrepreneurship among university students: an empirical study of Malaysian university students", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 2 No. 4, p. 207.
- Kieran, E. (1997), *The Educated Mind*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Kirby, D.A. (2004), "Entrepreneurship education: can business schools meet the challenge?", *Education + Training*, Vol. 46 Nos 8/9, pp. 510-519.
- Kolb, A. and Kolb, D.A. (2001), *Experiential Learning Theory Bibliography 1971-2001*, McBer and Co, Boston, MA.
- Kongolo, M. (2010), "Job creation versus job shedding and the role of SMEs in economic development", *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4 No. 11, pp. 2288-2295.
- Lackéus, M. and Middleton, M. (2011), "Venture creation entrepreneurial education through real-life content", paper presented at interactive paper session at Babson College. Entrepreneurship Research Conference, Conference, Syracuse, NY, June 8-11.
- Lebusa, M.J. (2011), "Does entrepreneurial education enhance under-graduate students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy? A case at one university of technology in South Africa", *China-USA Business Review*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 53-64.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961), *The Achieving Society*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ.
- McCormick, M.J. (2001), "Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: applying social cognitive theory to leadership", *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 8 No. 11, pp. 22-33.
- McMullan, W.E. and Long, W.A. (1987), "Entrepreneurship education in the nineties", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 261-275.
- Malebana, M.J. and Swanepoel, E. (2014), "The relationship between exposure to entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial self-efficacy", *Southern African Business Review*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 1-26.
- Mauchi, F.N., Karambakuwa, R.T., Rumbidsai, N.G., Njanike, K., Silas, M. and Gombarume, F.B. (2011), "Entrepreneurship education lessons: a case of Zimbabwean tertiary education institutions", *International Research Journals, Educational Research*, Vol. 2 No. 7, pp. 1306-1311.
- Mueller, J., Dewberry, J., Liang, T.W. and Hanjun, H. (2006), "Action means more than words: how effective can a global action-learning program for entrepreneurship education be? A comparison of the outcomes in Singapore, China, Korea and New Zealand", *3rd AGSE International Entrepreneurship Research Exchange Conference, Auckland, 8-10 February*.
- Mwasalwiba, S.E. (2010), "Entrepreneurship education: a review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators", *Education+Training*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 20-47.
- Niemivirta, M. and Tapola, A. (2007), "Self-efficacy, interest, and task performance: within-task changes, mutual relationships, and predictive effects", *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*, Vol. 21 Nos 3/4, pp. 241-250.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd ed., McGraw Hill, New York, NY.
- Pihie, S.A.L. and Sani, A. (2009), "Exploring the entrepreneurial mindset of students: implication for improvement of entrepreneurial learning at university", *The Journal of International Social Research*, Vol. 2 No. 8, pp. 341-345.
- Plumly, L.W., Marshall, L.L., Eastman, J., Iyer, R., Stanley, K.L. and Boatwright, J. (2008), "Developing entrepreneurial competencies: a student business", *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 17-28.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966), "Generalized expectancies of internal versus external control of reinforcement", *Psychology Monographs*, Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 1-28.

- 
- Rubin, D.B. (1996), "Multiple Imputation after 18+ years", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 91 No. 434, pp. 473-489.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934), *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and Business Cycles*, ISBN 9780674879904, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Sitkin, S. and Pablo, A. (1992), "Reconceptualising the determinants of risk behavior", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 9-38.
- Solesvik, Z., Westhead, M., Matlay, P., Harry, N. and Vladimir, P. (2013), "Entrepreneurial assets and mindsets", *Education + Training*, Vol. 55 Nos 8/9, pp. 748-762.
- Solomon, G. (2007), "An examination of entrepreneurship education in the United States", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 168-182.
- Stephanie, J., Robert, b.A.D. and Hisrich, Á.C. (2012), "The importance of education in the entrepreneurial process: a world view", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 500 -514.
- Thornton, P.H. (1999), "The sociology of entrepreneurship", *Annual Review Sociology*, Vol. 25 No. 9, p. 46.
- UNCTAD (2010), "Entrepreneurship education, innovation and capacity-building in developing countries", Geneva, January 19-21, 2011.
- Wawer, M., Muryja, M.P. and Rzemieniak, M. (2010), "Business simulation games in forming of students' entrepreneurship", *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences (IJEMS)*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 49-71.
- WEF (2009), "Educating the next wave of entrepreneurs; unlocking entrepreneurial capabilities to meet the global challenges of the twenty-first century", a report of the G Education Initiative, April.
- Williams, D., Smith, K., Yasin, N. and Pitchford, I. (2013), "Evaluating the state of enterprise training for postgraduate researchers in the UK", *Education + Training*, Vol. 55 Nos 8/9, pp. 849-867.

### Further reading

- Campo, J.L.M. (2011), "Analysis of the influence of self-efficacy on entrepreneurial intentions", *Prospect*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 14-21.

### Corresponding author

Ernest Abaho can be contacted at: [eabaho@mubs.ac.ug](mailto:eabaho@mubs.ac.ug)

---

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

**This article has been cited by:**

1. BarriosAndres, Andres Barrios, ReficcoEzequiel, Ezequiel Reficco, TabordaRodrigo, Rodrigo Taborda. Training effects on subsistence entrepreneurs' hope and goal attainment. *Education + Training*, ahead of print. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
2. Alexander Newman, Martin Obschonka, Susan Schwarz, Michael Cohen, Ingrid Nielsen. 2019. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: A systematic review of the literature on its theoretical foundations, measurement, antecedents, and outcomes, and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **110**, 403-419. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Krzysztof Zięba, Jakub Golik. 2018. Testing Students' Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy as an Early Predictor of Entrepreneurial Activities. Evidence From the SEAS Project. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation* **14**:1, 91-108. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Ghulam Nabi, Francisco Liñán, Alain Fayolle, Norris Krueger, Andreas Walmsley. 2017. The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* **16**:2, 277-299. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Sarah Robinson, Helle Neergaard, Lene Tanggaard, Norris F. Krueger. 2016. New horizons in entrepreneurship education: from teacher-led to student-centered learning. *Education + Training* **58**:7/8, 661-683. [[Crossref](#)]