



# How Do Entrepreneurship Education and Self- Efficacy Influence Entrepreneurship Intention?

\*Ibrahim Al-Jubari<sup>a</sup>, Aissa Mosbah<sup>b</sup>, Zunirah Talib<sup>c</sup>, Masrul 'Aine Khalid<sup>d</sup>, Norhidayah Azman<sup>e</sup>, <sup>a,b,c,d,e</sup>Faculty of Business Management and Professional Studies Management & Science University.

**Corresponding Emails:** \*[aljubari@msu.edu.my](mailto:aljubari@msu.edu.my)<sup>a</sup>, [mosbah\\_aissa@msu.edu.my](mailto:mosbah_aissa@msu.edu.my)<sup>b</sup>, [zunirah@msu.edu.my](mailto:zunirah@msu.edu.my)<sup>c</sup>, [masrul\\_aine@msu.edu.my](mailto:masrul_aine@msu.edu.my)<sup>d</sup>, [norhidayah\\_azman@msu.edu.my](mailto:norhidayah_azman@msu.edu.my)<sup>e</sup>

The main purpose of the current study is to uncover the effect of entrepreneurship education and perceived self-efficacy on people's intention to start their own businesses. Previous studies were examined, and support was found for the role of entrepreneurship education and self-efficacy in determining entrepreneurial intention, albeit the variations of such effects. The study findings stress the adoption of entrepreneurship education as national policy because it renders entrepreneurship activity more advantageous and generates confidence in building and realizing success in new ventures. The study also stresses the role of educational institutions and educators in designing more entrepreneurship programs and courses that could lead to successful business venture creation.

**Key words:** *entrepreneurship education, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial intention.*



## **Introduction**

Entrepreneurship education has gained growing prominence globally (O'Connor, 2013) given its role as a facilitator of entrepreneurship engagement. Higher education institutions around the globe have extended entrepreneurship education and increased the number of learning programs offered in order to contribute to creating more entrepreneurs in society and ultimately improve economic development and innovation (Nabi, Walmsley, Liñán, Akhtar, & Neame, 2018). The importance and growth of entrepreneurship education is based on the argument that entrepreneurship can be learnt since it is a process that can facilitate entrepreneurial intentionality and perceptions of self-efficacy and control of business ventures (Ahmed, Chandran, & Klobas, 2017; Othman & Nasrudin, 2016; Westhead & Solesvik, 2016). That is, entrepreneurship involves recognizing opportunities, formulating the business concept, identifying the resources and launching the business.

To come to the launching of the business and making it to the growth stage, it arguably, requires certain skills and competencies (Morris, Webb, Fu & Singhal, 2013; Mokgari & Pwaka 2018). Therefore, entrepreneurship education and training could help in unleashing entrepreneurial skills and developing the required competencies (Martin, McNally, & Kay, 2013; Robinson & Sexton, 1994). Although entrepreneurship can be learnt and thus taught and knowing that entrepreneurship education plays a role in shaping peoples' minds and self-efficacy (Barba-Sánchez & Atienza-Sahuquillo, 2018; do Paço, Ferreira, Raposo, Rodrigues, & Dinis, 2015; Fayolle & Gailly, 2015; Testa & Frascheri, 2015; Vanevenhoven, 2013), some studies found that entrepreneurship education does not play any significant role on self-efficacy (self-assessed entrepreneurial skills and even negatively related to entrepreneurial intention (Oosterbeek, van Praag, & Ijsselstein, 2010) or may just have a minimal effect on intention (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014).

Therefore, and to shed light on such conflicting findings, the purpose of the current study is to uncover, theoretically, the relationship of entrepreneurship education and self-efficacy with entrepreneurial intention. The paper is organized as follow: theoretical background discussing the "who the entrepreneur is" followed by entrepreneurship education and its role on shaping individuals' attitudes and skills. Thereafter, the role of self-efficacy is highlighted and the paper concludes.



### ***Overview of Who Entrepreneurs are: Schumpeter and McClelland Views.***

What entrepreneurship is and who the entrepreneurs are constitute an issue of debate and disagreement among researchers. The term “entrepreneurs” is rooted in the French language, and means to undertake and it is widely believed that it first appeared in the writing of Richard Cantillon, one of the Irish-French entrepreneurs’ in the seventh century, who also was an economist (Davis, 2006). Entrepreneurs are seen as innovators and creators of new ideas (Schumpeter, 1934), locators and implementers of ideas (Baumol, 1968), tuned to market alerts they find gaps in the market and fill them (Kirzner, 1973) (Carsrud & Brannback, 2011; Mohiuddin, 2018). They also may referred to as owners and guardians of business (Omar, 2011). As cited in Omar (2011), Hisrich and Peters (1989) look at entrepreneurs as individuals who have initiatives, take risks and accept failures, they are customer- focused and create value through proper management of resources.

These definitions could reflect the different approaches that entrepreneurship researchers have adopted to define who entrepreneurs are. For instance, entrepreneurs’ traits and personalities, economy and strategy are among the angles that entrepreneurs have been judged by in order to understand who they are and how their ventures are formed (Mitchell et al., 2002). Similarly, four approaches have been suggested to define entrepreneurs (Casson & Wadson, 2007). These approaches reflect the function played, role performed, and characteristics and behaviours displayed. The function they play may, for example, refer to how innovative and risk taking they are. The role they perform could reflect their employment status such as ownership status of the firm, self-employment or employing labourers. Some of their characteristics may include their personal culture, self-confidence, attitudes and optimism. Lastly, their behaviours such as leadership style, efficacy in making decisions and demonstration of taking initiative and making commitment (Casson & Wadson, 2007). These approaches have contributed much to understanding of this phenomenon, yet reflect how difficult it is to capture the meaning of it. That is, no one approach alone is able to capture the full characteristics of entrepreneurs or define who they are. Two prominent views regarding entrepreneurs are further detailed below.

#### ***Schumpeter’s View on who the entrepreneur is***

Joseph Schumpeter, a noted economist and the architect of the Theory of Economic Development (TED), made entrepreneurs central to TED and emphasized their role in developing the economy (Carree & Thurik, 2010). Schumpeter paid great attention to and made extraordinary efforts to the definition of entrepreneurship and innovative entrepreneurs. To him, entrepreneurship is something that disrupts market equilibrium and he considers it as



the essence of innovation. Entrepreneurs, in his view, are those not only who have the ability to create new ideas, but also who show willingness to convert them into innovative business. According to him, entrepreneurs' creative destruction affects industry dynamism and economic growth as they are the change agents and prime cause of economic development (Baycan-Levent & Kundak, 2009; Carree & Thurik, 2010). He argues that entrepreneurship occurs when innovating individuals (called entrepreneurs) carry out 'new combinations' (called enterprise) by means of productions to introduce a new product or method of production, open new markets, discover new sources of supply or develop a new venture (Schumpeter, 1934 as cited in Chell, 2008). It is obvious that Schumpeter viewed entrepreneurship as a function through which opportunities and possibilities are recognized and carried out in the economic sphere (Becker, Knudsen & Swedberg, 2012). Schumpeter argues that the function of entrepreneurship can be fulfilled by anyone without regard to his personality. In his own words, "Everyone is an entrepreneur only when he actually 'carries out new combinations,' and loses that character as soon as he has built up his business, when he settles down to running it as other people run their businesses" (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 78). He also explains what he calls as 'new combinations' as:

1. "The introduction of a new good - that is one with which consumers are not yet familiar - or of a new quality of a good.
2. The introduction of a new method of production, that is one not yet tested by experience in the branch of manufacture concerned, which needs by no means be founded upon a discovery scientifically new, and can also exist in a new way of handling a commodity commercially.
3. The opening of a new market, that is a market into which the particular branch of manufacture of the country in question has not previously entered, whether or not this market has existed before.
4. The conquest of a new source of supply of raw materials or half-manufactured goods, again irrespective of whether this source already exists or whether it has first to be created.
5. The carrying out of the new organization of any industry, like the creation of a monopoly position (for example, through trustification) or the breaking up of a monopoly position" (p. 66).

### ***McClelland's View on who the entrepreneur is***

David McClelland was amongst the pioneer behavioural scientists with an interest in entrepreneurship as he was one of the first to empirically study the field of entrepreneurship (Landström, 2005). McClelland's research in achievement motivation and personality is widely known and recognized (Chell, 2008). He suggests that achievement motivation is a



key to act entrepreneurially, where motivation affects the entrepreneur behaviour, however, some external characteristics could affect the personal motivation (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). He argues that the need for achievement is a fundamental factor for societies' economic development and growth (Collins, Hanges & Locke, 2004; Landström, 2005).

In his pioneering work, *The Achieving Society*, McClelland (1961) addresses the question: why do some societies develop more than others? (Landström, 2005; Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). Achievement need (nAch) is what drives people to excel and meet their goals. People who are high in achievement need are more likely to act with energy and innovation. They will spend time considering how to run things faster and better than other people or achieve tasks that are meaningful to them. The high achievers are distinguished from others as they prefer situations that they can contribute to solving problems as they think of them as a personal responsibility. They prefer tasks that require skills and effort and rapid feedback on their performance (Collins et al., 2004; Hansemark, 1998; Landström, 2005; Stewart & Roth, 2007).

Since this study considers entrepreneurship as a process, entrepreneurship education is crucially important, especially for university students, in creating new businesses. The following section sheds light on entrepreneurship education and its role in fostering business creation.

### ***Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intention*** ***Entrepreneurship Education***

Education plays a role in shaping people's behaviour, even though some successful entrepreneurs did not further their education. It is well-observed that many entrepreneurs have been greatly influenced by their education and established successful entrepreneurial ventures (Robinson & Sexton, 1994). Therefore, the importance of education in general and entrepreneurship education in particular should be realized as it helps individuals develop great ideas, execute them and launch and grow business ventures. It is optimal that universities and similar institutions provide an ecosystem that helps individuals realize their dreams through learning. Many great ideas have come out of such institutions that transform people lives. Since entrepreneurship is looked at as a process, education and training is required from as early as the ideation stage through implementation to the growth stage.

Just as there is no consensus on what entrepreneurship is and who entrepreneurs are, there is no definitive interpretation of entrepreneurship education. The traditional approaches to entrepreneurship education and delivery have been outlined in (Neck & Greene, 2011), who suggested the fourth option as presented in Table 1 below. According to them, educators use



these approaches separately or in combination of more than one approach. These approaches are: a) the entrepreneur approach, b) the process approach, c) the cognition approach and lastly, d) the entrepreneurial method approach. They are discussed next.

- a) The entrepreneur approach (entrepreneur as a hero): Based on this approach, entrepreneurs are individuals who possess super-heroic characteristics (Neck & Greene, 2011; O'Connor, 2013). Such a traits approach started with McClelland's identified need for achievement followed by other traits that are usually associated with entrepreneurs such as locus of control, propensity to take risk, tolerance for ambiguity (Brockhaus & Horwitz, 1986). According to this approach, entrepreneurship education can be in a form of lecturing, exams and combined with other methodologies such as guest speakers etc. This could help students raise awareness and reflect upon entrepreneurship and take guest entrepreneurs as their role models so that probably embrace entrepreneurship and act entrepreneurially (O'Connor, 2013). As entrepreneurs are considered champions in this view, teachers commonly use entrepreneurial assessments and self-examinations to see whether students have the right characteristics.
- b) The process approach (planning & prediction): This approach refers to the process of entrepreneurship starting from ideation and opportunity identification through execution and evaluation. The analytical approach is adopted in this view which looks at "teaching opportunity evaluation, feasibility analysis, business planning, and financial forecasting" (Neck & Greene, 2011, p. 59). The assumption of this view is that when involved in certain tasks of the process such as writing business plans and discussing case studies there is an influence on students behaviours and thus probably such behaviours and entrepreneurial outcome are more predictable (Neck & Greene, 2011; O'Connor, 2013).
- c) The cognition approach (thinking and doing): The focus of this approach is on the individual entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial teams. This focus is probably different from that in the entrepreneur approach, where thinking entrepreneurially is emphasized. Since entrepreneurial thinking and effective decision making are essential ingredients of successful entrepreneurs, teaching entrepreneurship, here, adopts tools such simulations and case studies in order to make sense and understanding of the mental processes of those entrepreneurs. This is to explore the entrepreneurial way of thinking and how decisions have been made and what course of action has been taken. This exercise of discovering and understanding could lead students to appreciate and embrace entrepreneurial thinking and may eventually lead to building new ventures (O'Connor, 2013).

d) The entrepreneurial method approach: The second approach “process” is somehow similar to “the method” approach in a sense that both of them involve ideation, opportunity recognition, implementation and evaluation. The word ‘process’ implies that the inputs and outputs are known in advance so that the process is predicted, and a destination should be arrived at. However, this is not the case in entrepreneurship where it is not predictable (Neck & Greene, 2011). According to Neck & Greene (2011), the entrepreneurial method approach rather “represents a body of skills or techniques; therefore, teaching entrepreneurship as a method simply implies that we are helping students understand, develop, and practice the skills and techniques needed for productive entrepreneurship” (p. 61). What differentiates the method approach from other approaches is that it focuses on value creation (Duval-Couetil, 2013). Neck and Greene (2011) state that the entrepreneurial method “requires going beyond understanding, knowing, and talking; it requires using, applying, and acting” (p. 61). This can be done by placing the students in entrepreneur roles through exposure to these learning experiences. In the entrepreneurial method approach, many educational techniques are adopted such as involvement in venture establishment, learning new venture creation principles, games and simulations and reflective practices as well (Neck & Greene, 2011; O’Connor, 2013). Table 1 below provides a summary of the world views of entrepreneurship education. Each view has a different focus, type of pedagogy and method of delivery, purpose and outcomes. Using one view or a combination of more than one view seems to be desirable and recommended as long as it serves the objective of creating awareness and fostering entrepreneurship among students.

**Table 1:** Summary of Entrepreneurship Education Approaches

Approach	Level of analysis	Focus	Pedagogy	Pedagogical Implications	Education Purpose	Objectives outcomes
Entrepreneur	Entrepreneur	Traits; nature versus nurture	Basics of business knowledge through lectures, exams assessments	Descriptive	Learning about it (entrepreneurship)	Emulating role models
Process	Firm	New	Case	Predictive	Learning for	Replication



		business creation	studies, business plans and modeling	n	it (entrepreneurship)	of the entrepreneurial process
Cognition	Entrepreneur and team	Decision-making to engage in entrepreneurial activity	Cases and simulations	Decision	Learning for it (entrepreneurship)	Deciding on becoming an entrepreneur
Entrepreneurial Methods	All	Collection of techniques of entrepreneurial practices	Gamification, observations, reflection, cocurricular activities and design	Action	Learning through it (entrepreneurship)	Adoption of entrepreneurial behaviours.

**Source:** Neck and Greene (2011); O'Connor (2013)

### ***Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intention***

Universities, colleges and other higher education institutions around the world have witnessed a rapid growth in entrepreneurship education (Katz, 2003; Martin et al., 2013) as it is believed to shape and foster individual's attitudes and perceptions towards entrepreneurship (Alharbi, Almahdi, & Mosbah, 2018). Despite some evidence that entrepreneurship education does not really play such a role (Oosterbeek et al., 2010), and perhaps in certain occasions is negatively related to entrepreneurial intention (Nabi et al., 2018), other evidence can be found in the literature in favour and support for entrepreneurship education (Ahmed et al., 2017; Fayolle, Gailly, & Lassas-Clerc, 2006; Morris et al., 2013; Sánchez, 2013; Tkachev & Kolvereid, 1999; Westhead & Solesvik, 2016; Yun, 2010).

In two recent meta analyses, entrepreneurship education and training were found to influence students' intentionality to pursue entrepreneurial venture. For instance, in their meta-analysis (Martin et al., 2013) that was guided by human capital theory, which suggests that individuals



with more knowledge and skills and a higher perception of their competences exhibit better performance than those who are less knowledgeable. Their study, which comprised 16,665 students show that entrepreneurship education led to various entrepreneurship-related perceptions and attitudes such as human capital assets, knowledge and skills, positive perceptions and intention to start their own business in addition to acting upon their intention and better performance. Similarly, another meta-analysis of 73 studies and a sample of 37,285 individuals by (Bae et al., 2014) found support for the role of entrepreneurship education on enhancing entrepreneurial intention. Particularly, they found that entrepreneurship education has an effect on intention to be an entrepreneur, but that it is not highly significant. However, entrepreneurship education has a stronger effect than a general business education.

Several other studies have found entrepreneurship education to be a significant predictor of entrepreneurial attitudes, efficacy, intention and the success of business venture in many cultural contexts. For instance, two different samples including middle and high school and MBA students from the United States were utilized in Wilson, Kickul, & Marlino's 2007 study. The sample size was more than five thousand students in American schools and universities. In their study, it was found that female MBA students have a higher perception of their self-efficacy in establishing their own businesses. Another study in the US utilized two samples including entrepreneurs and aspiring entrepreneurs and also found that that success of business ventures' success is affected by entrepreneurship education and training (Elmuti, Khoury, & Omran, 2012).

In line with these studies, similar findings are found in the Asian context (Keat, Selvarajah, & Meyer, 2011; Wu & Wu, 2008; Yun, 2010). Wu & Wu's (2008) study in China and Malaysia for instance found education in general and entrepreneurship education in particular have an impact on shaping engineering and entrepreneurship and non-entrepreneurship students' attitudes and intention to be entrepreneurs in one of the Chinese universities. They also found that those from an engineering background have more propensity to start business than those with an entrepreneurship background which is a clear indication that general education and targeted education have an impact on people attitudes and behaviours. Similarly, entrepreneurship education was found to have three advantages to management students including learning, inspiration and incubation resources and these affected intentions to be entrepreneur directly or indirectly through self-efficacy. The Keat et al., (2011) study found entrepreneurship education enhanced Malaysian students inclination towards starting their own business. In the Spanish context, similar support was found where entrepreneurship education played a role in students' self-efficacy perception and intention (Lanero, Vázquez, Gutiérrez, & García, 2011). The study employed a sample of 800 university students. Based



on the utilization of the Entrepreneurial Event Model (Shapero & Sokol, 1982), results show that perceived desirability and feasibility were influenced by education and in turn affects intention.

To conclude this section, entrepreneurship education and training is crucial in shaping individuals' attitudes, skills and intention regardless of some evidence that it does not. Therefore, educators, universities and even policy-makers are recommended to pay more attention to this issue and probably create a culture of entrepreneurial training and education in order to inculcate entrepreneurial mindsets which could lead to the establishment of new ventures that will be reflected in overall economic development.

### ***Self-Efficacy and Entrepreneurial Intention***

The role that self-efficacy plays in the study of entrepreneurship is increasingly emphasized, more particularly, in entrepreneurial preference and intention research (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994; Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998; Fuller, Liu, Bajaba, Marler, & Pratt, 2018; Hsu et al., 2018; Krueger & Brazeal, 1994; Naktiyok, Nur Karabey, & Caglar Gulluce, 2010; Schmutzler, Andonova, & Diaz-serrano, 2018; Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005). Self-efficacy (Albert Bandura, 1977, 1982) is defined as the “beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 408). It is reported to have an effect on personal choice of behaviour setting, where people tend to choose behavioural situations which they anticipate higher control over and avoid low personal control situations (Albert Bandura, 1977; Wood & Bandura, 1989). In choosing a career path, people evaluate their capabilities against the requirements of that career path. In other words, individuals will engage in behaviours that they feel they are more efficacious at and avoid others which they know they are less competent in completing (Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998; Rocío Fernández-Ballesteros, Díez-Nicolás, Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Bandura, 2002).

The construct of self-efficacy is grounded in social learning theory (Bandura, 1977, 1982; Wood & Bandura, 1989), which views individuals' behaviours through reciprocal causation among cognitive, behavioural, and environmental factors (Bandura, 1977; Chen et al., 1998). It means that each factor affects the other two and in turn is affected by them. The perception of the self and the environment can be changed by people's actions and, in turn, the behaviours and actions of people can be changed by the environment and perception of the self as well (Chen et al., 1998). It follows then that an understanding of this interplay between the identified factors is crucial for our understanding of self-efficacy determinants and consequences. Thus, self-efficacy has an influence on individuals' “choice of activities, goal



levels, persistence, and performance in a range of contexts” (Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005, p. 1266).

As starting business is an intentional and planned behaviour (e.g., Bird & Jelinek, 1988; Krueger & Brazeal, 1994), self-efficacy is one of the most important determinants and key components of intentional models (Barbosa, Gerhardt, & Kickul, 2007; Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998; Fuller, Liu, Bajaba, Marler, & Pratt, 2018; Mcgee, Peterson, Mueller, & Sequeira, 2009; Al-Jubari, Hassan, & Liñán, 2018). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) is defined as “the strength of an individual’s belief that he or she is capable of successfully performing the roles and tasks of an entrepreneur” (Chen et al., 1998, p. 301).

ESE is particularly linked to entrepreneurial intention, where a number of studies tested the ESE and intention relationship. For instance, the findings of Chen et al.'s (1998) study confirm that ESE has a positive influence on intention to become an entrepreneur. They utilized a sample of two groups: students and business executives. In line with previous research (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994), the findings suggest that students with entrepreneurship education showed higher ESE and intention. Business founding executives also showed that they had stronger ESE than non-founding executives.

More recent studies have yielded support for the role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in entrepreneurial intention as a determinant of intention and as a mediator between other variables (BarNir, Watson, & Hutchins, 2011; Chen & He, 2011; Fuller, Liu, Bajaba, Marler, & Pratt, 2018; Hsu et al., 2018; Piperopoulos & Dimov, 2015; Schmutzler, Andonova, & Diaz-serrano, 2018). The BarNir et al., (2011) study looked at the mediating effect of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in the relationship between exposure to role models and entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate students in the US. It was found that exposure to a role model has an impact on self-efficacy and in turn on entrepreneurial intention. Furthermore, female student self-efficacy was more strongly affected by the role model exposure than males and their efficacy had a stronger impact on intention. These findings give support to an earlier study that identified having a parental role-model was related to increased perception of self-efficacy and intention to start a business (Scherer, Adams, Carley, & Wiebe, 1989).

In a similar fashion, the self-efficacy construct was treated as a multidimensional factor by Chen & He in their (2011) study, where they tested the effect of strong of social groups ties on entrepreneurial intention through the mediating role of self-efficacy. This investigation into self-efficacy, as a multidimensional factor: opportunity, relationship, managerial and tolerance efficacies found three dimensions of self-efficacy existed: opportunity-



identification, relationship and managerial efficacy. These three dimensions mediated the strong ties and intention relationship, where opportunity-identification had the strongest mediation effect.

Similarly, higher practical self-efficacy teaching in entrepreneurship courses has a stronger effect on student entrepreneurial intention than study in theoretical courses (Piperopoulos & Dimov, 2015). In a similar vein, multiple self-efficacies such as creative self-efficacy, learning self-efficacy and entrepreneurial self-efficacy have a strong effect on intention through entrepreneurial cognition (Fuller et al., 2018). It was also found that entrepreneurial self-efficacy played a moderation role in the relationship between sociocultural environments such individualism and collectivism and entrepreneurial intention (Schmutzler et al., 2018). Hsu et al. (2018) recently found that entrepreneurial self-efficacy has a stronger effect on entrepreneurial intention when people perceive themselves to be a fit with entrepreneurship. When the fit with entrepreneurship is less or there is a report of no fit, then entrepreneurial intention becomes low without regard to self-efficacy.

In conclusion, the perception of entrepreneurial self-efficacy has a strong effect on entrepreneurial intention and probably is reflected in subsequent entrepreneurial behaviour. This efficacy, whether unidimensional or multidimensional is very important in entrepreneurship research and is influenced by many factors such as entrepreneurship education, culture, personal factors etc.

## **Conclusion**

Entrepreneurship is seen as a process that evolves from ideation through venture creation and development. Throughout this process, general and specialized programs can greatly improve the quality of initial ideas and business ventures so that such ventures not only operate in the right industries and sectors where need exists, but also survive the prevailing competitive environments and the avoiding failure traps that many ventures experience. With regards to competition, currently efficient approaches of entrepreneurship are shifting from the mere filling of existing needs to the creation and maintenance of needs. Education in general and entrepreneurship education, may play a significant role in enhancing people's preferences, mindsets, intentions, behaviours and skills. Of particular interest it is noted that this research aimed to explore the effect of entrepreneurship education and self-efficacy on entrepreneurial intention. A review of the existing literature on entrepreneurship education and self-efficacy in the entrepreneurship field makes clear that both factors play a crucial role in determining entrepreneurial intention. Although there are some variations and sometimes disagreement on



how they influence entrepreneurship, generally both factors have been instrumental in entrepreneurial intention research in various research contexts and cultural settings.

In conclusion, policy-makers, educational institutions and educators need to pay more attention to the design of programs and development of entrepreneurship curriculum and pedagogical methodologies which will better address entrepreneurship requirements as presented here. The potential benefits can be reaped in inculcating entrepreneurial mindsets and skilful personalities that will eventually build, sustain and grow successful business that contribute to the well-being of local communities and individuals alike. More entrepreneurs in the economy leads to improved national innovation and competitiveness.

#### REFERENCES

- Ahmed, T., Chandran, V., & Klobas, J. (2017). Specialized entrepreneurship education: does it really matter? Fresh evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 23(1), 4–19. <http://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-01-2016-0005>
- Al-Jubari, I., Hassan, A., & Liñán, F. (2018). Entrepreneurial intention among university students in Malaysia: Integrating self-determination theory and the theory of planned behavior. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*.
- Alharbi, J., Almahdi, H., & Mosbah, A. (2018). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education Programs (EEPs) on the Entrepreneurial Attitudes among Higher Education Students. *International Journal of Management, Economics and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 245–271.
- Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. (2014). The Relationship Between Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 38, 217–254. <http://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12095>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist*, 37,



122–147.

- Barba-Sánchez, V., & Atienza-Sahuquillo, C. (2018). Entrepreneurial intention among engineering students: The role of entrepreneurship education. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 24(1), 53–61. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2017.04.001>
- Baumol, W. J. (1968). Entrepreneurship in economic theory. *The American Economic Review*, 58(2), 64–71.
- Baycan-Levent, T., & Kundak, S. (2009). Motivation and driving forces of Turkish entrepreneurs in Switzerland. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 22(3), 283–308.
- Becker, M. C., Knudsen, T., & Swedberg, R. (2012). Schumpeter's Theory of Economic Development: 100 years of development. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 22(5), 917–933.
- Brockhaus, R. H., & Horwitz, P. S. (1986). The psychology of the entrepreneur. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The art and science of entrepreneurship* (pp. 25–48). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Carree, M. A., & Thurik, R. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth. In D. B. Acs, Zoltan J.; Audretsch (Ed.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research: An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction* (Eds, pp. 557–594). New York, NY: Springer Science.
- Carsrud, A., & Brannback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial motivations: What do we still need to know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 9–26.
- Casson, M., & Wadeson, N. (2007). Entrepreneurship and macroeconomic performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(3–4), 239–262.
- Chell, E. (2008). *The Entrepreneurial Personality: A social construction* (2nd ed.). London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(4), 295–316.
- Collins, C. J., Hanges, P. J., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of achievement



- motivation to entrepreneurial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Human Performance*, 17(1), 95–117.
- Davis, T. (2006). How many entrepreneurs does it take to change a nation? *Business Strategy Review*, 17(4), 68–73.
- do Paço, A., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2015). Entrepreneurial intentions: is education enough? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(1), 57–75. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-013-0280-5>
- Duval-Couetil, N. (2013). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programs: Challenges and approaches. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 394–409.
- Elmuti, D., Khoury, G., & Omran, O. (2012). Does entrepreneurship education have a role in developing entrepreneurial skills and ventures' effectiveness? *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 15, 83–99.
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2015). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention: Hysteresis and persistence. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(1), 75–93. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12065>
- Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: A new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701–720.
- Hansemark, O. C. (1998). The effects of an entrepreneurship programme on Need for Achievement and Locus of Control of reinforcement. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 4(1), 28–50.
- Katz, J. a. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283–300.
- Keat, O. Y., Selvarajah, C., & Meyer, D. (2011). Inclination towards entrepreneurship among university students: An empirical study of Malaysian university students. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(4), 206–220.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Landström, H. (2005). *Pioneers in Entrepreneurship and Small Business Research*. Boston,



MA: Springer US.

- Lanero, A., Vázquez, J. L., Gutiérrez, P., & García, M. P. (2011). The impact of entrepreneurship education in European universities: An intention-based approach analyzed in the Spanish area. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 8(2), 111–130.
- Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211–224.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaigns Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship.
- Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P. P., Morse, E. A., & Smith, J. B. (2002). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cognition: Rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 93–104.
- Morris, M. H., Webb, J. W., Fu, J., & Singhal, S. (2013). A competency-based perspective on entrepreneurship education: Conceptual and empirical insights. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 352–369.
- Mohiuddin, Z. A. (2018). Effect of Lifestyle on Consumer Decision Making: A Study of Women Consumer of Pakistan. *Journal of Accounting, Business and Finance Research*, 2(1), 12-15.
- Mokgari, M. T., & Pwaka, O. (2018). An Evaluation of Effectiveness of Oversight Committees: A Case of City of Johannesburg, Section 79 Committees. *International Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research*, 5(2), 48-67.
- Nabi, G., Walmsley, A., Liñán, F., Akhtar, I., & Neame, C. (2018). Does entrepreneurship education in the first year of higher education develop entrepreneurial intentions? The role of learning and inspiration. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(3), 452–467. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1177716>
- Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 55–70.
- O'Connor, A. (2013). A conceptual framework for entrepreneurship education policy:



- Meeting government and economic purposes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(4), 546–563.
- Omar, H. (2011). Arab American entrepreneurs in San Antonio, Texas: Motivation for entry into self-employment. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues*, 4(1), 33–42.
- Oosterbeek, H., van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442–454.
- Othman, N., & Nasrudin, N. (2016). Entrepreneurship education programs in Malaysian polytechnics. *Education + Training*, 58(7/8), ET-11-2014-0136. <http://doi.org/10.1108/ET-11-2014-0136>
- Robinson, P. B., & Sexton, E. a. (1994). The effect of education and experience on self-employment success. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(2), 141–156.
- Rocío Fernández-Ballesteros, Díez-Nicolás, J., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Bandura, A. (2002). Determinants and structural relation of personal efficacy to collective efficacy. *Applied Psychology*, 51(1), 107–125.
- Sánchez, J. C. (2013). The impact of an entrepreneurship education program on entrepreneurial competencies and intention. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 447–465.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shapiro, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In D. S. C. Kent & K. Vesper (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 72–90).
- Stevenson, H. H., & Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A Paradigm of Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 17–27.
- Stewart, W. H., & Roth, P. L. (2007). A Meta-Analysis of Achievement Motivation Differences between Entrepreneurs and Managers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45(4), 401–421.
- Testa, S., & Frasccheri, S. (2015). Learning by failing: What we can learn from un-successful



- entrepreneurship education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 13(1), 11–22. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2014.11.001>
- Tkachev, A., & Kolvereid, L. (1999). Self-employment intentions among Russian students. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 11(3), 269–280.
- Vanevenhoven, J. (2013). Advances and Challenges in Entrepreneurship Education. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 466–470.
- Westhead, P., & Solesvik, M. Z. (2016). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: Do female students benefit? *International Small Business Journal*, 34(8), 979–1003. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615612534>
- Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 387–406.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(3), 407–15.
- Wu, S., & Wu, L. (2008). The impact of higher education on entrepreneurial intentions of university students in China. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(4), 752–774.
- Yun, C. (2010). Does entrepreneurship education matter students' entrepreneurial intention? A Chinese perspective. In *Information Science and Engineering (ICISE), 2010 2nd International Conference* (pp. 2776–2779).
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1265–72.