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CHAPTER ONE

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship education has attracted the attention of many. For the past few decades, teaching programs have mushroomed at universities across the globe, leading to massive resource allocations. This is done to stimulate new venture creation leading to new jobs, new innovations and country’s general level of competitiveness. Student numbers have been rising rapidly, and with this growing popularity of entrepreneurship, the academic debate has come along. Questions that need clearance range from the popular discussion regarding whether entrepreneurs can be ‘made’ at universities, to the more practical ones relating to the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of the currently applied teaching methods (Fayolle et al, 2006; Hannon, 2006; 2005). This dissertation is built around these debates, and focuses on assessing the impact of university entrepreneurship education (further called UEE) in Tanzania, where the teaching of entrepreneurship is now part of the national development agenda. The main research question was formulated to read: ‘What is the influence of the Tanzanian University Entrepreneurship Education on students’ entrepreneurial intentions; and which characteristics of University Entrepreneurship Education hamper and or facilitate their inclinations towards entrepreneurship as a possible career?’ This question, as presented at a later stage, is broken-down into more specific sub-questions which facilitated the examination of specific characteristics of the Tanzanian UEE model, the profile and expectations of its audiences, and level at which it meets both its teaching objectives and the expectations of its different stakeholders.

With its focus on impact assessment this study contributes not only to the calming down of the ever-occurring debate on the teachability of entrepreneurship, but it also sheds more light on important theoretical, policy and practical considerations that lead to the understanding of crucial instructional design and implementation issues that come to play in entrepreneurship educational programs, both in the Tanzanian context and in general. Again, despite the growth in research in the field of entrepreneurship and its education, this area is among the less researched in Tanzania and Africa in general. Naude’ and Havenga (2003) explain that for entrepreneurship development efforts
to be successful, more rigorous research in African entrepreneurship [and its education] will have to be undertaken, reviewed and disseminated. This study, therefore, works as the much needed research effort within this context.

In the next sections of this chapter, a brief discussion on the essence, definition and objectives of entrepreneurship and its education will be given, followed by a presentation of some contextual information on Tanzania relating to its geographical location, economic profile, higher education and the general entrepreneurial environment. Background information on the problem statement, research questions, the conceptual framework and research approach are presented next. The chapter ends with a brief overview of each of the subsequent chapters.

1.2 ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND ITS EDUCATION IN A DEVELOPING CONTEXT

1.2.1 Defining entrepreneurship as opportunity-driven activities

Entrepreneurship, as a growing field of study, is characterized by many definitional disagreements. This necessitates scholars to explain what they really mean when they talk about entrepreneurship and its related topics (Gartner, 1990). For the purpose of this study, definitions of entrepreneurship and its education are based on the reflections, meanings and needs that most key stakeholders (mainly policymakers, private sector representatives and students) put on the phenomena and on the desired objectives of its education. This follows Fayolle and Gailly’s (2009) point that the needs of these groups should somehow be addressed, when formulating the teaching objectives. It is obvious that most stakeholders view entrepreneurship in terms of its economic roles, which are centered on new ventures creation, which in turn create jobs, intensify competition, and may even increase productivity through technological change (Acs, 2006; Gartner, 1989). Kuratko (2005), though suggesting that entrepreneurship is about the mindset as well, also follows this reasoning and views new venture creation as the focal aspect of entrepreneurship. If entrepreneurship is focused at new venture creation, one of the important issues that need consideration concerns the reasons for individuals to start a new venture, which in many places it is argued to be centered in the need to exploit a business opportunity (Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). This implies that the creation of a new venture is a means to an end within an entrepreneurial process. Having these issues in mind, entrepreneurship in this study is
defined as: the founding, owning and managing of a business venture in order to exploit a business opportunity. The choice of this definition causes this study to have an orientation on “opportunity-driven entrepreneurship”, as opposed to “necessity-driven entrepreneurship”. The former happens when an individual enters into entrepreneurship in order to exploit a perceived business opportunity; this is different from the latter where an individual is said to be pushed into entrepreneurship because all other options for work are either absent or unsatisfactory.

According to GEM (2005) the ratio of opportunity-to necessity-based motives for starting a business is more favorable in developed countries than in developing countries. An explanation for this is that people living in high income countries have more alternative income options available, which limits the pressure to start a business out of necessity. Within the African context, where most countries fall within the GEM cluster of low income countries, entrepreneurship is typically perceived and studied as a necessity driven activity rather than as an opportunity driven activity (Kelley, Bosma, & Amorós, 2011; McDade & Spring, 2005; Rosa, Kodithuwakku, & Balunywa, 2006). And consequently, most of the past African (and Tanzanian) entrepreneurship studies concentrate on issues of poverty alleviation, gender, or small scale informal enterprises (McDade & Spring, 2005). This fact puts in question the appropriateness of an opportunity-centered definition of entrepreneurship, when studying entrepreneurship education in Tanzania. However, like in other parts of the world, Tanzania is in urgent demand for opportunity-driven entrepreneurs. It is this type of entrepreneurs that has the potential to drive structural transformation through innovation, the provision of intermediate inputs and services, and by increasing employment and productivity (Gries & Naudé, 2010a, b; Gries, Naudé, & Matthee, 2009; Naudé, 2010a, b). And indeed, there is sufficient evidence that opportunity-driven entrepreneurs do exist in Tanzania (Marsden, 1992; Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001).

Regardless of context, one of the key factors that differentiate opportunity-based from necessity-driven entrepreneurs is their education levels (Jenssen & Kristiansen, 2004; Reynolds et al., 2001; Thompson, Jones-Evans, & Kwong, 2010). Although in Tanzania, necessity and informal continue to dominate in numbers, entrepreneurs with post-secondary education of which there are an increasing number in Tanzania, tend to be more opportunity-driven than those with lower levels of education as reported by a GEM 2005 (see Minniti et al, 2005). This can be explained partly because they have better access to information that can serve as a source of opportunities and partially by the different types of labor market context to which they are exposed (Minniti et al, 2005; Reynolds et
al., 2001): people with better education simply have better job alternatives. Indeed, in Tanzania university graduates still enjoy a somewhat unsaturated labour market (Al-Samarrai & Bennell, 2003; Wedgwood, 2007) leading most graduates to go for paid-employment. The minority that opts for self-employment are likely to do so in pursuit of business opportunities rather for survival purposes.

1.2.2 Essence of entrepreneurship education

Both in developed and developing countries, there are three major sources of pressure for the current growth of entrepreneurship education, namely: the policy-makers, the students and academicians. The policy-makers strongly believe that entrepreneurship is the way out of economic problems like unemployment. Students’ demand for entrepreneurship education is said to be a result of changing structure of the economy, downsizing by larger companies, changing business patterns, movement to different markets, and increasing policy attention (Hynes, 1996; Jones & English, 2004). Graduates facing these environments have turned their attention to what Henderson and Robertson (2000) termed a ‘portfolio of careers’, which includes periods of paid-employment, non-work, and entrepreneurship. When entrepreneurship becomes a serious career option, it is not surprising to see that students are keen to enroll in entrepreneurship courses and programs to enhance their entrepreneurial capacities. Finally, academicians from many different fields of specialization (e.g. economics, social sciences, and educational sciences) are driven to entrepreneurship, both as field of research and a topic for teaching, by their usual tendency to keep pace with new topics and in response to both policy-makers’ directives and students’ demands for the subject.

In Tanzania, the factors behind the introduction of entrepreneurship courses are not different from those of other countries. From the political arena, there is evidence of politicians who used to be socialists but are now calling for more entrepreneurial graduates. For example, the Guardian quotes Mwapachu (the former Secretary of the East African Community) addressing East African University dons, saying: “…majority of universities are teaching students for the purpose of making them seek jobs after completion, but that is not the way it should be…” (The Guardian, 2011). This speech reflects early statements in a number of policy documents like the Trade Policy of 2003. In this policy document a concern is expressed about the low levels of graduate entrepreneurship, and universities are blamed for their tendency to produce more job-seekers than job-creators (URT, 2003). Moreover, while the changed political ideology had implications on the media and political speeches, the renewed East
African Association brought to Tanzania graduates from Kenya and Uganda, who became employers’ favorites due to their aggressiveness and entrepreneurial mindsets. These changed the job market for Tanzanian graduates, leading to the need for entrepreneurial teaching to help them to either face the competition or be able to start their own firms. It is also read from the National Higher Education Policy of 1999, that training institutions need to review their curriculum so that to integrate the teaching of entrepreneurship (URT, 1999a).

From the above discussion, it is evident that entrepreneurship education has emerged to address multiple roles and needs among its key stakeholders. McKeown et al (2006) summarized the objective of entrepreneurship education to include: to develop an entrepreneurial culture, to promote enterprises, to create new ventures, and to foster entrepreneurial mindsets. In view of these multiple objectives, a team of experts from the European Commission defined entrepreneurship education in two ways: (1) A broader concept to include the development of entrepreneurial attitudes and skills as well as personal qualities and which should not be directly focused on the creation of new ventures; and (2) A more specific concept of entrepreneurship education dealing with new venture creation (European_Commission, 2002).

This suggests that there is a possibility of designing courses to specifically pursue one of the two objectives, or even to have a training program that combines multiple objectives. In any arrangement, it is thought that an entrepreneurship course can be multi-dimensional by preparing students who may either become entrepreneurs by forming their own ventures; or who may end up working in existing organizations (termed intrapreneurs); or even who are going to become public servants, bankers and insurance officers etc but with a facilitative role towards entrepreneurship.

1.3 TANZANIA IN CONTEXT

While chapter 3 is entirely dedicated on the examination the Tanzanian entrepreneurial context, the following section will present the contextual information mainly for introductory purposes.

1.3.1 Geographic and economic profile

Tanzania is located in Eastern Africa. It borders the Indian Ocean in the east and is situated between Mozambique and Kenya. The other border countries of Tanzania are Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Zambia and Malawi (see Figure 1.1).
Tanzania is 945,087 sq km with Mount Kilimanjaro being the highest point at an elevation of 5,895 meters (Mapsofworld.com, 2007).

Figure 1-1 Map of Tanzania

Tanzania, with an average GDP growth of above 7% in the past five years, is one of the best performing countries in East Africa. Yet, Tanzania remains one of the poorest countries in the world (Colijn, 2009) ranking number 151 out of 182 on the human development index (Loman, 2010). The estimated population is around 42.5 million inhabitants (51 % female and 49 % male) reaching a population density of 45 people per square kilometer. The distribution of the population shows that 74.5 % of the people live in rural areas, equivalent to 25.5 % in urban areas. The population growth rate is 2.9 % per annum (resulting in a growth of 10 million people in the last 10 years) with an under 15 years old population of 44.0 % (URT, 2007). In 2010, the Gross National Income per Capita of Tanzania is just below 530 US Dollar with a highly skewed salary distribution.
as is common in developing countries. Out of the population, 36% lives below the poverty line of one dollar a day and is unable to meet their basic daily needs. For women this percentage is even worse: sixty per cent of all female Tanzanians have to survive on less than one dollar. Poverty is most common amongst the illiterate part of the population which is estimated at 24% of the adult population. The employment rate shows 18.3 million people have a paid job and 2.3 million are unemployed. A large, yet shrinking majority of 76.5% of the population works in agriculture, with informal and other sectors growing rapidly but following far behind with respectively 9.3% and 8% of the population (CIA, 2011; The World Bank Group, 2011; URT, 2007).

1.3.2 Higher education in Tanzania

Higher education in Tanzania is defined as education leading to the award of advanced Diploma, bachelor degrees, masters, postgraduate diploma and PhD degrees (Abeli, 2010). In this study however, the term university is used to represent all institutions of higher education as the overall empirical setting for this inquiry. According to year 2006/2007 data, Tanzania has a total of 33 institutions of higher learning which includes: 8 publicly funded universities, 13 publicly funded polytechnics/specialized colleges, and 12 privately funded universities or colleges (SARUA, 2009). In Tanzania, usually students join a university after 7 years of primary school, followed by 4 years of ordinary level secondary school, and 2 more years of advanced level secondary school. On the average, a student can complete the bachelor's degree in three years, although some majors (e.g. medicine and law) may require more time. Most of the universities in Tanzania run on an academic year starting from September/October. English is the main language used from secondary school to university-level.

Recent figures for 2009/2010 indicate that there are about 128,240 studying in higher education in Tanzania. There has been an increase in the gross enrollment rate (GER), from 1.2% in year 2005/06 to 4.2% in year 2009/10. Despite this increase in enrollment, Tanzania remains to have the lowest GER in the African region (Abeli, 2010). Also like in any other parts of Africa, universities in Tanzania face challenges like shortage of resources, poor infrastructure, the inadequate number/deterioration of staff, decline in quality of teaching and research, and an increase in the number of students, which is not matched with funding, staff or infrastructure (Morley, Leach, & Lugg, 2009; SARUA, 2009). Moreover, universities in Tanzania experience gender imbalance where the average female ration is 35%, which is more pronounced in science faculties. Also it also evident
more concentration on universities establishing social and business faculties than science faculties, but this is also coupled by limited connection between universities and to business community, which impairs the ability of commercializing innovations (Abeli, 2010).

1.3.3 Tanzania’s entrepreneurial environment

Previous research on entrepreneurship in the African context, typically stresses on the inhibitive nature of the informal institutions and culture in Africa. Particularly, the collectivist African culture is among the most implicated (Takyi-Asiedu, 1993; Tshikuku, 2001). Many scholars are of the view that the old framework of African solidarity negatively affects entrepreneurial tendencies like opportunistic behavior, individualism, risk-taking and capital accumulation. Unfortunately, many scholars fail to notice that Africa is a continent of 54 countries which has over 2000 different ethnic groups. This makes Africa to be a continent of many cultures (Jenssen & Kristiansen, 2004; Palmberg, 2001a). To be specific, Tanzania alone has about 120 ethnic groups, each with own language and different ways of life. Some of these ethnic groups e.g. the Chagga from Kilimanjaro, are said to be more entrepreneurial than the rest (Tillmar, 2006). In this case therefore, while it is here acknowledged that culture plays an important role in shaping entrepreneurship in Africa, there is however no single African culture that would singularly influence entrepreneurship in a certain common way.

What does need to be brought to attention, regarding the relevance of culture in African, are the changes that have taken place in Africa, and Tanzania in specific from the late 1980s. This fact makes most of the past studies on culture to be a bit dated. As Tillmar (2006) observes, Tanzania is a society in transition, from a socialist-traditional society towards a post-traditional and modern society. Since its independence from the British in 1961, Tanzania has undergone major reforms. For example, while its neighbors Kenya and Uganda continued to operate their economies within the frameworks inherited from their colonial rulers, Tanzania adopted a socialist political orientation termed the *Ujamaa na Kujitegemea* (socialism and self-reliance). This led to nationalization of all major economic sectors. During this era private entrepreneurship was actively discouraged in favor of government-owned, community-based ventures and cooperatives. However, economic and political problems in the 1970s (e.g. the break-up of the East African Community, the international oil crisis of the early 1970s and the costly war to remove Iddi Amin from Uganda) led Tanzania to embark on a series of economy transformation programs, which included the privatization of all sectors of the
economy in the year 1986 (Makombe, 2009; UDEC, 2002). The reforms involved massive retrenchments of civil servants (Kristiansen, 2001) and strong encouragements for individuals to embark on entrepreneurial activities.

The adoption of market-led economic policies in Tanzania had positive effects on entrepreneurship development; it has created opportunities, and built political and social legitimacy of entrepreneurial activities in Tanzania. This is said to have encouraged even highly educated people to go into business (UDEC, 2002), not for necessity but as a preferred career choice (Al-Samarrai & Bennell, 2003). The private sector is now seen as the engine of economic growth and the government’s role is to facilitate the smooth operation of enterprise. A number of policies have been put in place to support the move to an entrepreneurial Tanzania. The most remarkable is the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (NSGRP), which specifically states that the promotion of entrepreneurship is one among major strategies to economic growth. There a number of specific programs that the government has taken, the most relevant being the BEST program (Business Environment Strengthening for Tanzania). BEST was established with five components: (1) Better Regulations (to examine all acts and their regulations, which govern the conduct of business in the country; (2) Commercial Dispute Resolution (to improve enforcement of contracts); (3) Change of Civil Service Mindset (to make civil servants investor friendly); (4) Tanzania Investment Centre (to make a one stop investment agency); and (5) Private Sector Advocacy (to improve the capacity of business associations to advocate and lobby the Government). However, as discussed in chapter 3, the Tanzanian entrepreneurial environment is still far from being friendly. Entrepreneurs in Tanzania have to survive amidst restrictive business legislations procedures, inhibitive banking facilities, corruption, crippling taxation rates, and negative attitudes against entrepreneurs which have their origin from the then socialistic era (Nkya, 2003; Temu & Due, 2000). Recent rankings by the World Bank’s Doing Business 2011 Report placed Tanzania as 128th (out of 183 countries) in ease of doing business. This ranking was based on ease or difficulties that an entrepreneurs faces in a number of indicators including: registering property (3 ranks 151); access to credit (ranks 89); protecting investors (ranks 93); paying taxes (ranks 120); closing a business (ranks 113); and cross-border trade (ranks 109).

In view of the reform, there has been significant increase in the participation by the private sector in the economy with increased production (Temu and Due, 2000). Moreover, the generation
of youth has become encouraged to adopt new trends, including entrepreneurship (Tillmar, 2006; Tshikuku, 2001).

1.4 RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

The need for more graduate entrepreneurs is global; in each country, [educated] entrepreneurs are related to innovations, competitiveness, economic growth and development (Nabi and Holden 2008; Cuervo 2005; Ronstadt 1990). Nabi and Holden (2008) observe that there is a strong global drive towards encouraging a greater proportion of students to consider and pursue venture creation as an alternative career path. However, and despite massive policy and educational efforts in boosting graduate entrepreneurship, there are world-wide concerns that the rates of graduates entering into self-employment or entrepreneurship do not reflect the level of investment endowed (Al-Samarrai & Bennell, 2003; Mukyanuzi, 2003; Nabi & Holden, 2008). It is further observed that even for the graduates who have attempted to start a business, the nature and quality of their ventures are “hardly likely to make the Japanese tremble” (Rosa, 2003).

In the Tanzanian case, boosting graduate entrepreneurship is a national development agenda (URT, 1999b). The adoption of entrepreneurship courses is a response to strong policy initiatives by the government, seeking to engage educated Tanzanians in entrepreneurship and self-employment (cf. URT, 1999a, b, 2002, 2003, 2005). Such urgency culminated in curricular reviews and over a decade of teaching entrepreneurship at universities, as part of almost all fields of specializations. However, Tanzania is sharing the global concern on whether the courses lead to any fruitful results. Globally, it is unclear whether educational interventions have actually fostered entrepreneurial activities (Carroll & Mosakowski, 1987; Kailer, 2005; Kirby, 2004). It is even less clear if such courses have any impact in Tanzania, where not only that the entrepreneurial environment is far from being supportive, but also is characterized by different cultural and economic realities which act upon both the UEE and students’ career perceptions. Specifically, the SME Policy (2002) expresses a concern that the education system has tended to create employment seekers rather than job creators. This concern is also proved in tracer studies by Al-Samarrai and Bennell (2003) and Mukyanuzi (2003) which have reported falling rates in graduate self-employment in Tanzania. Moreover, Olomi (2006) noted that, although graduates show interest in doing business, and others run businesses as part-time activity, there is a very low rate of transition from employment to full-time entrepreneurship.
While falling rates in graduate entrepreneurship could be explained by a number of factors, this study however, takes notice of two main factors as mentioned by Olomi (2006): (1) the inhibitive nature of the entrepreneurial environments in which graduates are to operate; and (2) the level of effectiveness of UEE in preparing students for an entrepreneurial career. These considerations have led to the need to understand the specific factors that shape graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania, to identify the objectives that the UEE is attempting to achieve, its methods, its link with the local context, and its overall impact on students’ attitudes, perceptions, and intentions towards entrepreneurship as another career opportunity. Hence, the following main question was developed: ‘What is the influence of the Tanzanian University Entrepreneurship Education on students’ entrepreneurial intentions; and which characteristics of University Entrepreneurship Education hamper and or facilitate their inclinations towards entrepreneurship as a possible career?”

The main question was broken into four sub-questions:

1. What are the generic objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators in entrepreneurship education?

2. What does the process of becoming a graduate entrepreneur entail in the Tanzanian context and how is this reflected in UEE in Tanzania?

3. What is UEE attempting to achieve in Tanzania and in what ways is this objective implemented?

4. To what extent and in which ways does UEE in Tanzania influence students’ attitudes, perceptions and intentions towards entrepreneurship as a possible career?

In summary, research question 1 aims at taking stock of state-of-the-art of global entrepreneurship education by identifying its generic objectives, methods, audiences and impact indicators. This question is crucial for informing the rest of the study, and provides the justification in choosing specific definitional terms and criteria used in other parts of the study. Research question 2 attempts to unearth some of the contextual factors that affect graduates’ progression from university to a career in entrepreneurship in Tanzania, and help to assess how the Tanzanian UEE incorporates in its teaching approach some of the practical issues that students will face in their entrepreneurial attempts. Research question 3 seeks to characterize the Tanzanian UEE, in terms of understanding what it is [or is not] attempting to achieve among the students. This will also
1.5 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study is informed by: the Theory of Planned Behaviors – TpB (Ajzen, 1991); the 3P Model of Teaching and Learning (Biggs, 2003) and the concept of entrepreneurial embeddedness (cf. Kloosterman, 2003; Jack & Anderson, 2002). The theory, model and concept become interrelated in a single conceptual framework, such that, within the UEE, the TpB is used to explain the profile of the students and how this changes after undergoing the UEE intervention; the 3P model helps in assessing the state of alignment among the UEE model; and the concept of entrepreneurial embeddedness help to examine the entrepreneurial environment in which affect both the UEE and its products (graduates). The following sections give a more detailed discussion of each of them, and later summarized in figure 1.2.

1.5.1 Entrepreneurial intentions

Entrepreneurship is considered to be a planned behavior because the act of starting a new venture creation is preceded by intentions to do so. The fact that this study is conducted among university students, who have yet to enter into the world of employment, provides a rationale for determining their entrepreneurial potential by observing their career intentions (Fayolle et al., 2006). Intentions are said to be a strong predictor of future entrepreneurial behaviors (cf. Fayolle, 2005; KruegerJR, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000; Liñán, 2008; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Al-Laham, 2007). This notion has led to the development of the so called Entrepreneurial Intentional Models, which borrow their concepts mainly from the Theory of Planned Behavior – TpB by Ajzen (1991).

Intentions to perform a given behavior are a convergence of three major motivational constructs, namely: (1) personal attitudes towards the act, (2) subjective norms, and (3) the individual’s perception on feasibility and ability to perform the act (or termed perceived behavioral control). Personal attitudes, here, represent a person’s evaluation of an object as good-bad, harmful-beneficial, pleasant-unpleasant, and likable-dislikeable. Subjective norms are related to how an individual feels obligated to comply with social values and opinions of other people towards the
performance of the act. Martinelli (2004) and Linan (2008) have shown that an individual’s perception of what important people in their life will think about them becoming entrepreneur, has a significant impact in their decision to embark on this career (or not). Also perceived behavioral control relates to an individual’s perception of own confidence or ability to successfully perform entrepreneurial roles and tasks (Ajzen, 1991; KruegerJR et al., 2000; Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005).

1.5.2 UEE as an intervention to entrepreneurial intentions

Intentions can be shaped through educational interventions focusing on one or more of the three already-mentioned antecedents. In the field of entrepreneurship education this approach has proved to hold some significant relevance (Ajzen, 2006; Fayolle et al., 2006; Souitaris et al., 2007). Yet the actual achievement of an intentions intervention program is typically dependent on a number of design issues within the program, including the state-of alignment among the main components of the programs.

The state-of-alignment within an intervention program can well be examined using the 3P model of teaching and learning (Biggs, 1996; 2003). In his 3P Model of Teaching and Learning, Biggs (1996) sees teaching as a complex system with three components: (1) the presage i.e. components before the learning process, comprising two levels namely the teaching context (i.e. objectives, teachers, methods. assessment and things that at the control of the university) and the students’ factors (e.g. past experiences, motivations, learning expectations, abilities etc). The teaching context and students’ factors need to be considered together or aligned before teaching starts; (2) the process which includes teaching activities/learning activities. To this, Biggs argues that what matters is not what the teacher does to teach, but what the student does to learn. Overall Biggs call for learning activities that will captive a learner in situations that lead to the intended learning outcome; and (3) the product, which refers to both qualitative and quantitative learning outcome. At this stage, one needs to also to consider what assessment methods twill likely measure what has been learnt in relation to the objectives. In this study, the two concepts (i.e. the TpB and the 3P model) are considered to interact in the following way: On one hand TpB is used both to explain the state of students’ entry-level profile (i.e. attitudes, perception and intentions) and to provide a theoretical model for characterizing the students’ factors as among the “presage” components within the UEE as a teaching/learning. The UEE, on the other hand, is represented by the 3P model of teaching and
learning which comprises of the presage factors (includes students’ profiles as in the TpB), process, and the product which is again measured using impact indicators from TpB variables.

1.5.3 Context on UEE effectiveness and entrepreneurs performance

Writing on the role of context on learning, Tesmer and Richey (1997), defined a multilevel body of factors in which both learning and performances [of the learned skill] are embedded. From this point of view, it is assumed that there is a need to have a contextual assessment that is geared to identify macro and micro level factors that affect both the design and implementation of UEE teaching models, and the overall performance of graduate entrepreneurs in real world.

At macro-level, contextual embeddedness also affects [graduates] entrepreneurs in terms of their entrepreneurial motives and performance. According to Martinelli (2004), the socio-cultural and politico-institutional environment sets the tone for entrepreneurial attitudes and motives, present both constraints and opportunities for starting and expanding a business, limit or enhance the availability of resources for starting a business, and create the overall cultural climate that set the legitimacy for entrepreneurial activities in the community. Entrepreneurs and their businesses are embedded in manifold ways and at different levels, such that there are some factors that may be seen to be within the control of individual entrepreneurs, which are in most cases informal (e.g. family ties, personalized non-family connections, and patronage relationships), and factors that operate beyond the control of individual entrepreneurs, which in most cases are formal, encompassing dominant economic, social, cultural, and political forces at work in the larger society (Kloosterman and Rath, 2001). These forces are defined by market dynamics, demographic developments, technological innovation, government policies, geopolitical relations and institutional legacies from the past. Together, mixed, they set the rule of the game, present both opportunities and threats to entrepreneurs, and have the potential of inhibiting and facilitating entry and exit in entrepreneurship at the same time.

At the micro-level, at the university-level, embeddedness may be viewed on the basis of the following dimensions (1) how internal arrangements affect teaching; (2) how the UEE model accommodates external contextual factors to enhance teaching. While the first argument is trying to explain that the effectiveness of UEE is partly dependent on how internal arrangements (e.g. internal philosophies relating to entrepreneurship, teaching venues, resources, teachers’ profile, and
teaching facilities) are aligned to support the teaching objective; the second argues to a context-rich instruction approach that addresses critical elements of the real world that affect the performance of entrepreneurs (e.g. policies, budget resources, the labor market, and the friendliness of the business environment). Tesmer and Richey argue that effective instruction is context-rich, it considers the learners' immediate learning environments and their supportive organizational structures, as well as future environments that learners will likely encounter. If there is a lack of contextual accommodation within the teaching model, may lead to situations where the intervention is seemingly effective immediately after the intervention but will lack sustainability in the long run as students are not adequately prepared to cope with the contextual huddles in the real world (Tesmer and Richey, 1997). Being embedded within the context of a university might be seen as an advantage for UEE as this position allows the participants to maintain a close link with practitioners and local entrepreneurs, such that to students will be able to relate what they learn with experiences of entrepreneurs/role model, and to the university to maintain establish a market for different innovations and business ideas, as well as have avenues for different experiments.

1.5.4 Summary of framework

While a more detailed discussion of the concepts will be presented in the following chapter, figure 1.2 summarizes the basic framework underlying my research on the basis of the arguments presented above. As shown in Figure 1.2 UEE is regarded as a teaching and learning model (represented by the 3P model in box 2) which targets to influence the students' entry-level factors (i.e. attitudes, perceptions and intentions in box 1 & 3). The model furthermore shows that both the UEE and students’ entrepreneurial profiles are subject to the contextual conditions, which present both the enablers and inhibitors for the effectiveness of the UEE, and the ultimate career progression of the UEE graduates (i.e. contextual embeddedness in box 4).
1.6 RESEARCH METHODS

1.6.1 Research setting and participants

An empirical investigation for this study was set up at four Institutions of Higher Education in Tanzania namely: Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Mzumbe University (MU) in Morogoro; College of Business Education (CBE) and the Institute of Financial Management (IFM) both in Dar es Salaam. Entrepreneurship in these universities is taught at different levels (undergraduate, master and PhD levels) and in different modes (as a single subject, elective, compulsory, or specialized bachelor/master degree). However, for the sake of uniformity and due to limited time, only courses that are taught to undergraduate students as a single semester-long compulsory subject were considered for this research.

Most of the fieldwork took place during the second semester (February to July) of the academic year 2008/09. It involved students from different fields of specializations including: Business
administration, Accounting, Taxation, Agri-business, Rural development, IT, and Economics. Using attendance registers, it was established that about 1124 students were expected to take the subject in this semester. The specific attendance and participation rates are given in each of the empirical chapters.

### 1.6.2 Data collection and analysis

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) explain that research methods should follow research questions in a way that offer the best chance to obtain useful answers. In this study therefore, each research question was individually considered in terms of orientation i.e. *what, how, and to what extent* (cf. Shields & Tajalli, 2006; Smith, 1983; Wellington, 2000), hence a choice of a mixed methods approach to include both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods.

A mixed methods approach includes the use of induction (or discovery of patterns), deduction (testing of hypotheses), and abduction (uncovering of and relying on best set of explanations for understanding one’s results) (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). This design allowed the study to make use of a variety of sources of information, hence increasing reliability. This also happens to be in line with the current best practice in educational and entrepreneurship research where qualitative and quantitative methods are said to complement each other (Hytti & Kuopusjärvi, 2004; Wellington, 2000). The next sections give a summary of methods used in each of the research questions.

- **Research question 1:** *What are the generic objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators in entrepreneurship education across different contexts?* This was designed to establish the state-of-the-art of global entrepreneurship education. The lack of a common conceptual framework of entrepreneurship and the noted variations on educational programs (Fayolle et al., 2006; Matlay, 2005) necessitated the need to take stock of the said state-of-fragmentations. Therefore, a semi-systematic review of existing literature on entrepreneurship education was conducted. To facilitate such a review, a thematic framework was designed such that it groups articles in terms of objectives, types of courses, teaching methods, and impact indicators. These themes become keywords in data collection, which was mainly through a search of literature in electronic databases like ABI/INFORM Fulltext and Emerald Fulltext. The search was limited to fulltext and scholarly peer-reviewed journals. Using excel
spreadsheets, the articles were thematically sorted in accordance to the above mentioned main themes. This helped to obtain some kind of quantitative weights for each of the themes, which facilitated not only in forming of the conclusions but also in limiting the reviewer’s bias (Petticrew, 2001).

- **Research question 2:** *What does the process of becoming a graduate entrepreneur entail in the Tanzanian context and how is this reflected in the UEE in Tanzania?*. This question sought to contextualize graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania. It was thought that to understand what it takes to become a graduate entrepreneur in Tanzania, it is best to approach this from the graduate entrepreneurs’ point of view, by giving them an opportunity to reflect on their career decision and procession in facing the Tanzanian entrepreneurial environment. Story-telling interviews were used (cf. Hytti, 2005; Johansson, 2004) in which the respondent entrepreneurs gave an in-depth account of the progression process from university to entrepreneurship, and at the same time reflect on their experiences without the confines of a pre-set or restrictive interview guide. The lack of a graduates’ database led to the use of a snowball sampling approach (Heckathorn, 1997). The stories were digitally recorded, transcribed, and uploaded on NVivo software pending the analysis process. In NVivo, the analysis was mainly by identifying and ranking the commonly occurring themes, which were categorized in groups of enablers and inhibitors and within or outside the control of entrepreneurs. The advantage of using NVivo was the generation of percentages which somehow gave sense of weights of each factor from the others.

- **Research question 3:** *What is the UEE attempting to achieve in Tanzania, and in what ways is this objective implemented?*. As it can be noted, the question aimed both at describing the Tanzanian UEE and measuring its outcome, hence calling for a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative methods. On one hand, a qualitative approach is argued to be suitable in understanding in detail all of what goes on in a particular activity or situation (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). For the qualitative part of the study, semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurship lecturers and documentary analysis of government policies and university course-outlines and other document relating entrepreneurship education were employed (Bazerman, 2006; Wellington, 2000). A quantitative approach, on the other hand, was mainly for measuring the extent and significance of change in students’ profiles. A
survey instrument was administered to students, both at the start and end of the courses, hence capturing students’ entry profiles, learning expectations, and career interest at start of the course. During the analysis, the qualitative data was mainly content-analyzed, with a specific intention of establishing the main components of the UEE and perceptions of the respondents. As it will be seen later, specific quotes were used to back-up the findings in each theme. The analysis of the quantitative data was first based on the observation of the mean scores among variables, from these correlations analysis was done to see how the variables in students’ profiles related to each other. To obtain a change in students-based variables, paired samples t-tests were run so that to establish the significance and direction of changes in students’ profile after the UEE.

- Research question 4: [to what extent and in which ways does UEE in Tanzania influence students’ attitudes, perceptions and intentions towards entrepreneurship as a possible career?]. This question was set to establish two issues: First, the validity of the Ajzen (1991) TpB in the Tanzanian context, including the individual significance of each of its independent variables in predicting intentions. And second the relationship between attending a UEE with a change in intentions (as observed in the independent variables). The question basically called for a quantitative approach, and specifically for a longitudinal survey (before and after the UEE) of the students taking the courses. An already validated Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (EIQ) was used in collecting the data (cf. (Fayolle et al., 2006; Liñán, 2008; Liñán & Chen, 2009). The analysis of these data was mainly quantitative. Multiple regression analysis was used to establish the predictive significance of the variables in the TpB, and later paired samples t-test was done to establish the significant and direction of changes among the TpB variables after the UEE.

Detailed discussions and justifications for the methods are presented in the individual chapters.

1.7 OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

This book has six chapters. The following sections will give a brief overview of each of the preceding chapters:
Chapter 2 was based on research question 1. As presented in the method section, the chapter gives a comprehensive review of literature which was aimed at establishing the state-of-the-art of global entrepreneurship education in terms of its generic objectives, teaching methods, indicators and other definitional issues within the field of entrepreneurship education. The review used a semi-systematic review of published articles in entrepreneurship education (n = 108). The results were first presented at the 18th IntEnt Global Conference (17th to 19th July, 2008) at the Miami University, and later published as Mwasalwiba, E (2010) Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objective, methods and impact indicators, Education + Training, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 20-47.

Chapter 3 answers research question 2. The question sought to identify the contextual factors that shape graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania. The empirical qualitative investigation used graduate entrepreneurs’ personal stories, narrating their career progressions from university into full-time entrepreneurship, and on their reflections of contextual enablers and inhibitors in the Tanzanian environment. This chapter is also written as an empirical paper titled “Graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania: contextual enablers and hindrances” The paper was co-authored with Professor Heidi Dahles and Doctor Ingrid Wakkee, and it has been submitted for publication to the European Journal of Scientific Research.

Chapter 4 was addressing research question 3. The question was both exploratory and evaluative, seeking to identify and assess the state-of-alignment among the components of the Tanzanian UEE. It therefore involved identifying its drivers, objectives, students’ profile and their learning expectations, the applied teaching methods, and how the UEE had met both its teaching objectives and learners’ expectations. This chapter resulted into a mixed method empirical paper which was presented at the IntEnt, 2010 Global Conference on Entrepreneurship education, held from 5th to 8th July, 2010 in Arnhem, The Netherlands. An alternative version of this paper was co-authored with Professor Peter Groenewegen and Dr. Ingrid Wakkee and is submitted for publication in the Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education, – Entrepreneurial University Handbook Vol. 4 (eds. Fsyolle, A. and Redford, D.)
Chapter 5 is based on research question 4. This question was set to establish three issues: (1) the validity of the (Ajzen, 1991) TpB-base model of Entrepreneurial Intentions to the Tanzanian sample of students; (2) the predictive significance of each of the said antecedents of intentions; (3) the significance and direction of changes of both the antecedents and intentions after students had attended the UEE. The results were presented at a conference titled “Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development in Tanzania: Insights from New Research” held in 15th December, 2010 at the VU University, The Netherlands. The paper is co-authored with Professor Enno Masurel, and will be submitted for publication to Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice.

The book ends with chapter 6 which summarizes the results from all the other chapters and gives an in-depth discussion of their implications to theory and practice. The chapter also serves as a conclusion chapter to the thesis and therefore gives an overall picture of what has been achieved in answering the main research question, highlight the limitations faced in this study and gives direction for future areas of further research.
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CHAPTER TWO

2 ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION: A Review of Its Objectives, Teaching Methods, and Impact Indicators

2.1 INTRODUCTION

For decades, since the first class of 1945 by the Harvard Business School, scholars have been interested in the explosive growth of entrepreneurship education. A number of good studies have traced developments and the state of entrepreneurship education (Pittway and Cope, 2007; Kuratko, 2005; Solomon et al., 2002; Vesper and Gartner, 1997; Garavan and O’Cinneide, 1994a, b; Hills, 1988) and all have unearthed a remarkable progress made in this field.

However, in 2002, the audience was reminded of the inherent lack of consensus (Pittway and Cope, 2007; Klapper, 2005; Singh, 1990) within this field when Solomon et al. (2002) made observations on the maturity of entrepreneurship as a field of study. Many scholars share the same opinion that there is remarkable progress made (Johnson, 2006; Matley, 2005a, b; Kuratko, 2005; Vesper and Gartner, 1997) and, as a field of study, it has achieved itself a place in the world of academics.

This level of progress is attributed to the growing support received from many stakeholders, including policymakers, academician, and students. Among these stakeholders there is a common belief that entrepreneurship education would help to influence culture and build enterprising economies (McKeown et al., 2006; Matley, 2005a, b; Kirby, 2004; McMullan and Long, 1987). But, if looked at closely and within their individual groups of interest, these stakeholders are interested in entrepreneurship education due to the perceived socio-economic benefits, at both an individual and societal level. This perception has contributed in fast-tracking most of its developmental stages. Stakeholders’ interest may somehow be explained by the use of the demand and supply relationship. For instance, policy makers, on the demand side, are charged with the economic development responsibilities and have a belief that enterprise culture is a key to more new ventures and job

---

creation. Students, also on the demand side, are faced with changing job markets, which renders more graduates to either compete for few but challenging vacancies or opt for self-employment. On the supply side, the academicians, plus their usual interest in academic advancement, are to provide entrepreneurship education as an interventional tool to building enterprising societies (to satisfy the policy makers), and further to have more innovative training programs to satisfy the students. Therefore, it is these combined shared interests that have contributed to the explosive growth within this field of study, plus a now tentative agreement that entrepreneurship or some of its aspects can be taught (Henry et al., 2005a, b).

However, despite the general consensus on the teachability and the progress so far made, Sexton and Bowman (1984) explained their concern on the persistent lack of consensus on some of the very basic issues in this field of study. There is still a strong disagreement in some of the crucial definitional issues, especially on the most pivotal terms like entrepreneurship itself, enterprise, and who is an entrepreneur (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991; Gartner, 1990; Hebert and Link, 1989). Also, there is a confusing application of terms like “entrepreneurship education” and “enterprise education” (Pittway and Cope, 2007; Garavan and O’Cinneide, 1994a, b; Gartner, 1990).

The unresolved definitional terms make the purported progress seem fragmented. It is here viewed that different interpretations of entrepreneurship, enterprise, and an entrepreneur have far-reaching effects on the understanding of the objectives of entrepreneurship as field of study, the setting of specific course objectives, the choice of target audiences, the design of course content, the teaching methods applied, and ultimately on evaluating progress and on the design of impact assessment frameworks.

It is acknowledged that entrepreneurship education ought to vary somehow, mainly due to contextual issues. However, in this work, it is argued that the current state of variations (Fayolle et al., 2006; Matley, 2005a, b) is mainly due to the lack of consensus on the definitive issues and the field’s conceptual fragmented state. As a body of knowledge, entrepreneurship education should be built on a foundation of a common theoretical framework. Departing from this view, this work is embarked to take stock of the alignment (or the lack of) existing on the main components of entrepreneurship education. It asks: “what are the generic objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators in entrepreneurship education?” The following five sub-questions are used to arrive at the major objective:
1. What are the perceived meaning, definition and objectives of entrepreneurship education?
2. What are the types, contents and target audiences of entrepreneurship education?
3. What are the most advocated teaching methods? What are the applied teaching methods?
4. What role does entrepreneurship education play to local entrepreneurs, local communities and society at large? What are the strategies used to achieve this?
5. How do trainers and researchers assess the impact? What indicators do they use?

It is hoped that answers to these questions will draw a clearer picture of the common features that exist in what seems to be a fragmented field of study. By compiling the main features and the advocated delivery methods, this work will concisely bring at view a guide to entrepreneurship educators, scholars and other stakeholders, who are at the moment divided by scholarly debates. Further, the discussion on success and impact indicators and assessment methods will be another input into revealing the outcomes and legitimacy of entrepreneurship education in the society.

This is a literature review, arranged into five sections. An overview of the review conceptual framework and methodology will be presented, leading to a presentation of the review findings. These findings will be critically discussed by correlating them with the given conceptual framework and recommended practice on entrepreneurial learning. Finally, the work will be concluded by bringing to light some research and practical implications.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 The review framework

This review is conceptually arranged in the framework depicted in Figure 2.1; which was formulated to guide the grouping of articles in their respective categories numbered 1 to 5. It is pictured in this framework that, to be able to have a smooth conceptual flow, entrepreneurship education should be traced from its essence and objectives ([1] in Figure 2.1), the specific objectives (i.e. to train individuals for, about or in entrepreneurship) and, to support local communities ([2i-iv] in Figure 2.1), its forms, type of courses, target groups and outreach projects ([3i-iv] in Figure 2.1), the applied teaching methods and community outreach activities ([4] in Figure 2.1), and; finally the success indicators and methods for evaluation and impact measurement ([5] in Figure 2.1). The concept behind this framework suggests that training efforts in entrepreneurship education have to
be in conformity with its definitional essence and general objectives (Box 1 in Figure 2.1). These definitional meanings and objectives of entrepreneurship education will form a basis for obtaining the specific entrepreneurship program or course objectives i.e. to train individuals either for, about or in entrepreneurship, and level of involvement with local community (Box 2 in Figure 2.1), and will influence the forms, course contents and target audience and community outreach projects (Box 3 in Figure 2.1).

It is viewed that, if Box 1 is taken as an original idea, then Boxes 2 and 3 in Figure 2.1 are components that need to be considered simultaneously. This means, the design of entrepreneurship courses should be done with a clear view of the type of graduates the trainer intends to produce, likewise, outreach projects to conform with the level of a desired role to the local entrepreneurial environment.

Further, the arrangement of course contents and specific course objectives have to be supported with appropriate teaching methods (Box 4 in Figure 2.1). Here, it is believed that, though no clear demarcation exists, those who need to be trained for entrepreneurship will require a different set of teaching approaches to those who learn about and in entrepreneurship. And, community outreach project goals have to be strategically aligned with implementation activities. At some points there
can also be interactions between teaching methods and activities for community outreach. Implying that, while an institution is implementing its entrepreneurship training plans, it may for example, link its students with local entrepreneurs for both exposing the students to the real-world and assisting entrepreneurs to acquire best practice.

Finally, in Box 5, as for any training or intervention effort there is a need for an evaluation and impact assessment. It is argued that evaluation and impact assessment are two separate processes each with its own end results. At this juncture trainers, policy makers and other stakeholders need to specifically outline the desired quality standards, measures of progress, impact indicators, and applicable assessment frameworks. And, both success/impact indicators and quality/progress benchmarks have to be consistent with the original intents and specific program objectives.

### 2.2.2 The review procedure

As explained above, this review was guided by the summative framework in Figure 2.1, from which six data excel extractions sheets were prepared for the purpose of drawing the authors’ names, common features and indicators. The main databases used were ABI/INFORM Fulltext and Emerald Fulltext; the search in these databases was limited to only full text and scholarly peer-reviewed journals. To extend the search, working papers from conference CD-ROMs for IntEnt 2004 and 2007, and references in downloaded articles were also checked.

This review did not specifically target studies that gave an exact thematic match or conclusion on any given feature in Figure 1; this means articles that are included in the data extraction sheets must have some points that are related to the topic under investigation (e.g. in Matley, 2005a, b). But, grouping of authors and quantification of the items were used to minimize reviewer’s bias; a limitation observed in Matley’s review. These inputs were grouped in common columns and later counted to obtain a total, which was given a percentage weight in relation to the number of articles it has appeared in. This information was ultimately used as a basis for the findings, discussions and conclusions.

A decision of whether to include or exclude a publication in the full review was based on the article’s title and abstract, which led to a quick perusal for deciding whether or not the article provides sufficient information for the category under review. The search and review was done in stages; meaning that the categories in Figure 2.1 were treated separately in the following groups:
(1) 1 and 2: definition and objectives – 20 articles were reviewed;

(2) 3: target groups – 19 articles were reviewed; course contents 21 articles reviewed;
    community role ten articles reviewed;

(3) 4: teaching methods – 21 articles reviewed; and

(4) 5: evaluation and impact indicators – 17 articles were reviewed.

Therefore, the total number of articles reviewed (n) was 108 articles. There are instances where
some articles addressed more than one category.

At this juncture, it is prudent to highlight two methodological challenges within this review: a
review of studies that originate from different geographical contexts; and the treatment of both
qualitative and quantitative studies within a single review. On contextual diversity of the reviewed
articles: the majority of articles come from the UK and Ireland, the USA, and others from European
countries; also a few from Asia, Australia and South Africa. And, in some instances there were some
papers that were co-authored by scholars from different countries. The diversity of these studies
may raise doubts on their comparability due to contextual differences. However, as it has been
observed in this review, a major challenge in comparing or combining studies in entrepreneurship
(education) originates more from authors’ differences in defining some of the pivotal issues, than on
their contextual embeddedness; an observation that was also made in Coviello and Jones (2004).
From this knowledge, it is argued that while entrepreneurship program programs may be affected by
issues that are unique in a given country, the essence and goal for these programs are universal.
Therefore, to avoid this whirlpool of definitional debates, this review did not differentiate studies on
the basis of author’s context; rather it took advantage of their diversity and summarized them into a
single generic work (Harden and Thomas, 2005; Coviello and Jones, 2004). On the research designs
of the reviewed articles, here there was no effort to categorize them based on their methodology as
done in a purely systematic literature review (see Pittway and Cope, 2007; Gorman et al., 1997). This
led to the inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative studies, and others that employed a mixed
methods approach. Apparently, it is a common myth that for results of such reviews to be reliable
they should only consider quantitative or randomized studies (Petticrew, 2001); which would lead to
a “meta-analysis”. Petticrew (2001) justifies that a proper review should aim mainly at limiting the
bias of the reviewer, and the choice of which study design to include is not a restriction of the
review methodology but a choice that is made by the reviewer. For this matter, in this work, data
extraction sheets were used in order to arrive at somehow quantified results and hence limit the
reviewer’s own bias.

2.3 THE REVIEW FINDINGS

2.3.1 Meaning and definition

Hytti (2002) is of the opinion that it is impossible to examine a field of study without visiting its
definition. A definition, in this case, is a starting point to a full understanding of the phenomena
under discussion. It is in a definition where one may be able to discover the essence, concerns and
objectives of entrepreneurship as a field of study (Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004; Jones and English,
2004; Henry et al., 2005a, b; Gartner, 1990). These basic issues, emanating from a definition, are
later taken to be the basis for conceptually aligning entrepreneurship education with the appropriate
target audience, course contents and teaching methodologies.

In this study, a total of 20 articles were reviewed for the purpose of establishing what
entrepreneurship education is. In reviewing these literatures, it shows that very few authors have
attempted to directly define entrepreneurship education. And for those who did, most of the times,
they have been caught in conflicting sides of entrepreneurship schools of thoughts, and an inherent
lack of a common definition of entrepreneurship (Sexton and Bowman, 1984). For instance, a
debate was noticed in the application of terms like entrepreneurship education versus enterprise
education (see Hynes, 1996; Garavan and O’Cinneide, 1994a, b) also a substitution of
entrepreneurship education with entrepreneurial education (see Jones and English, 2004). Garavan
and O’Cinneide (1994a, b) argue that there is a conceptual difference between entrepreneurship
education and enterprise education: the former has to do with creating an attitude of self-reliance
and the later is for creating opportunity-seeking individuals. But to others, like Gibb (1993), as
echoed in Garavan and O’Cinneide (1994a, b), the two terms are conceptually the same, but
contextually different. According to Gibb (1993) entrepreneurship education is a term mainly used
in America and Canada, and enterprise education in the UK and Ireland. Another interesting
observation is in the work of Jones and English (2004) who have constantly substituted
entrepreneurship education with entrepreneurial education; and defining it as “a process of
providing individuals with the ability to recognize commercial opportunities and the insight, self-
estem, knowledge and skills to act on them” (Jones and English, 2004).
Apart from the above readily visible contrasting views, it is learned in this review that in most of the other articles these terms (entrepreneurship education, enterprise education or even entrepreneurial education) are used interchangeably; or the term entrepreneurship education stands as a generic nomenclature to other similar educational processes (see Gorman et al., 1997; Wai and Man, 2007; Hynes, 1996). And, the definitions that are given are structured in a way that they reflect the major aims and objectives to be achieved among various target audiences. As it can be seen in Figure 2.2, 32 per cent of the reviewed articles related entrepreneurship education to some kind of educational (or training) process that is aimed at influencing individuals’ attitudes, behavior, values or intentions towards entrepreneurship either as a possible career or to enhance among them an appreciation of its role in the community (i.e. creating an entrepreneurial society). This educational view is an exhibition of scholars’ partial convergence towards a behavioral view of an entrepreneur, but at the same time being skeptical to strictly associate it with new venture creation as a sole educational objective (Kuratko, 2005; Kirby, 2004). Similarly, in Figure 2.2, an equally strong observation (at 32 per cent) related entrepreneurship education with the acquisition of personal skills in entrepreneurship, whereas others related it to new business formation (18 per cent), opportunity recognition (9 per cent) and, managing of existing small firms (9 per cent).

### 2.3.2 Objectives of entrepreneurship education

As mentioned in the previous section, most authors who have attempted to define entrepreneurship education have done so by relating it to its supposed outcomes. In this case, the 20 articles reviewed under the definition section were also found to be relevant in the review of...
objectives. Figure 3 gives this summary, and shows a close relationship between what has been earlier found as to what comprises entrepreneurship education with the generic objectives that it attempts to achieve. As presented in figure 2.3, it is learned that most scholars (at 34 per cent) argue that entrepreneurship education is generally aimed at creating or increasing entrepreneurial attitudes, spirit and culture among individuals and in the general community (Co and Mitchell, 2006; Henry et al., 2005a, b; Galloway et al., 2005; Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004; Kirby, 2004; Bechard and Toulouse, 1998; Gibb, 1993; Hills, 1988). Others (27 per cent) associate it with new venture creation and job creation; also 24 per cent associate it with contribution to the community by helping local entrepreneurs to form and grow (Matley, 2005a, b; Henry et al., 2005a, b; Kirby, 2004; Vesper and Gartner, 1997; McMullan and Long, 1987) and lastly 15 per cent relate it to the imparting of entrepreneurial skills among individuals (Henry et al., 2005a, b; Galloway et al., 2005).

![Figure 2-3 General objectives of entrepreneurship education](image)

However, some authors have given a more concise categorization of these objectives into what they termed as educating for, about, in or through entrepreneurship (see Co and Mitchell, 2006; Kirby, 2004; Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004). Here, it is argued that objectives are narrowed in terms of what educators (or/and students) intend to achieve and hence a determinant for the choice of pedagogical approaches. To educate for entrepreneurship means to create an entrepreneur; that is, an individual who is destined to starting a new venture. Co and Mitchell (2006) explain that educating for entrepreneurship addresses both the present and potential entrepreneurs with the aim of stimulating
the entrepreneurial process, providing them with the tools to starting a business. In actual fact, this is the most desired outcome and yet highly debated – hence the question in Henry et al. (2005a, b): “Can entrepreneurship be taught?” Also, to learn about entrepreneurship is to obtain a general understanding about entrepreneurship as a phenomenon (Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004). This objective may also include sensitization activities to different stakeholders including policy-makers, financers and the general public on the role of entrepreneurs in the community. Lastly, some scholars have added as an objective, that we can also train individuals in entrepreneurship. Educating in entrepreneurship is said to aim at making individuals become more entrepreneurial (innovative) in their existing firms or place of work (Henry et al., 2005a, b; Kirby, 2004; Dreisler et al., 2003). Hytti and O’Gorman (2004) clarify that this objective aims at making individuals to take more responsibility of their learning and career life. Kirby (2004) gives another term: educating through enterprise which, according to him (Kirby, 2004) is when educators use new venture creation to help students acquire a range of both business understanding and skills or competences. It seems that educating through entrepreneurship is more of a teaching approach in educating for entrepreneurship than an objective in itself.

However, taking all the three objectives in consideration, Dreisler et al. (2003) could not see if there is any visible demarcation between for and about. Educating for, if taken in perspective, it is an objective that also encompasses all the other two aims (about and in). This is due to the fact that at start participants are expected to be given a general understanding on entrepreneurship which means they will have learnt about, whereas as the training progresses students are exposed to more advanced learning activities that are aimed at sharpening their innovativeness and equip them with opportunity discovery skills, which is also expected of those who are educated in entrepreneurship. Despite this blurred demarcation among these objectives, however, it is still of value for educators to have a pre-conception of aims on their specific educational programs. This may assist them to understand well in advance the expected impact of their programs, and give them an advantage in the selection of the appropriate teaching methods and in the fine-tuning of other determining factors.

2.3.3 Types of programs and target groups

A total of 19 articles were reviewed for the purpose of identifying the different types of entrepreneurship programs. It came to be understood that it is possible to group entrepreneurship
programs in terms of their focus, level of education, and target audience (see Honig, 2004; Kirby, 2004; Finkle and Deeds, 2001; Charney and Libecap, 2000; Laukkanen, 2000). For instance, Kirby (2004) reviewed about 205 entrepreneurship programs and found that they have three main focuses:

1. Programs that are for giving an orientation and awareness about entrepreneurship;
2. Programs that develop competences for new enterprise formation, self-employment, or economic self-sufficiency; and
3. Programs that focus on small business survival and growth. It can be recalled that Kirby’s grouping is actually consisted with the earlier section on educational objectives (*educating for, about, and in*).

Again, basing on target audience (and level of education), Figure 2.4 gives a summary of the popularity of different target groups identified in this review.

![Figure 2-4 Forms and target audiences](image)

It is evident that university business students are the most favored group (30 per cent). This group is an important target group because, according to Pretorius et al. (2005), it includes students who learn to become entrepreneurs (especially undergraduate students), and those who seek advanced theoretical knowledge about entrepreneurship (at postgraduate levels). The next group of audience, at 23 per cent, is that of owners, managers and employees of existing small businesses. As pointed out by Kirby (2004), this is the group that is trained with the focus on how to manage
existing firms and to work for growth. Also, entrepreneurship education is offered to minority or disadvantaged groups in society, for example, women, ethnic groups, and people with disabilities (Gorman et al., 1997; Kourilsky and Esfandiari, 1997). Mescon (1987) argues that minorities, especially immigrants, have become an important economic force in most cities because they form a larger proportion of small business owners, but still are faced with a high rate of business failure. Typically, the training focus to such a group would be on how to start and manage growth of a small business (Kirby, 2004). Further, entrepreneurship education is increasingly being directed at non-business students and other vocational disciplines like engineering (Keogh and Galloway, 2004; Katz, 2003; Hynes, 1996). There are also efforts to introduce such courses in pre-university education levels (Lee and Wong, 2006; Henry et al., 2005a, b; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003). The major aim for such a group is to cultivate entrepreneurial attitudes at an early age when their career options are still open (Lee and Wong, 2006; Henry et al., 2005a, b). The unemployed also form another target group (Linan, 2004; Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004; Monroy, 1993), of which the main focus is to give them awareness and the necessary skills on self-employment. The last group, though not very popular, includes policy-makers, bankers, tax authorities and the general public (Lee and Wong, 2006; Kent, 1990). This group, according to Verheul et al. (2002) and the World Bank (2002), forms an important part of the local institutions that may have an effect on entrepreneurial activities.

2.3.4 Course content

One of the challenges faced in this review is to ascertain course content in a typical entrepreneurship program. It seems that every training institution has its own approach in building an entrepreneurship curriculum. This has resulted in wide variations of modules making up an entrepreneurship program (Hills, 1988). A similar observation was also made by Fiet (2000a, b), who in his collection of just 18 different entrepreneurship courses found a total of 116 different topics. Although Hynes (1996) is of the opinion that both the course focus and content ought to vary in accordance with the specific requirements and needs of students, Matley (2005a, b) observed that the current variation is so wide as to make the general appropriateness and effectiveness of entrepreneurship courses questionable. This is also reflected in Fiet’s (2000a, b) remarks: “the contents of our courses vary so much that it is difficult to detect if they [courses] even have a common purpose”. Bennett (2006) attributed these variations, again, to the lack of a common
definition of entrepreneurship and to the absence of a cohesive theoretical framework in entrepreneurship education.

In this section, 21 articles were reviewed. Given the understanding that there is a wide variation in program contents, this study resorted into ascertaining only the most common subjects or course contents in a typical entrepreneurship program. Owing to the variety of subjects and an inconsistent naming of subjects, this part was likely to be prone to some shortcomings. However, it was decided to group the subjects in what seemed to be similar fields of study. At start a total of 18 most popular subjects were identified, which later and for the sake of space were shortened to the nine most popular subjects (see Figure 2.5).

![Figure 2-5 Most common subjects taught in entrepreneurship programs](image)

According to this summary the most taught subjects are:

1. resources marshalling and finance (16 per cent);
2. marketing and salesmanship (14 per cent);
3. idea generation and opportunity discovery (13 per cent);
4. business planning (12 per cent);
5. managing growth (12 per cent);
6. organization and team building (10 per cent);
7. new venture creation (9 per cent);
(8) SME management (8 per cent); and
(9) Risk and rationality (6 per cent).

Other subjects that ranked the lowest are not included in Figure 5. These were: legal issues; management of innovations and technology; franchising; family business; negotiation skills; communication skills; and Problem solving.

2.3.5 Teaching methods

A number of scholars purport that the question of whether entrepreneurship can or cannot be taught is now irrelevant, since it has been proved that it can (Henry et al., 2005a, b; Kuratko, 2005), and therefore educators should move ahead. While it is not a difficult decision for universities to run entrepreneurial courses, it is, however, a challenge to academicians to choose teaching methods that align to their course objectives, environments and even the type of students in the program. If scholars are able to dodge the question “Can entrepreneurship be taught?” they still will have to face the next question, i.e. “How should it be taught?”

This review has come across an overwhelming number of articles addressing teaching methods. Most of these articles report on experiments on teaching methods (cf. Izquierdo et al., 2007; Lourenc¸o and Jones, 2006; Heinonen and Poikkijoki, 2006; Robertson and Collins, 2003; McMullan and Boberg, 1991). Many also propose what they consider to work best (see Verduyn et al., 2009; Hannon, 2006; van Auken et al. 2006), and others give a reflection of present teaching approaches (see Smith, 2006). And, like the previous sections, teaching methods is another area over which there are many disagreements. For example, Bennett (2006), in his study involving 141 entrepreneurship lecturers, found that the lecturers had no consensus on how the course should be taught.

Twenty-six methods were identified from a total of 21 articles, and these were summarized to the 13 most important (see Figure 2.6). It seems that most authors categorize teaching methods into two groups, which are termed “traditional methods” (comprising normal lectures) and “innovative methods” (which are more action-based), also known as “passive methods” and “active methods”, respectively. Compared with passive methods, active methods according to Bennett (2006) are those that require the instructor to facilitate learning, not to control and apply methods that enable students’ self-discovery.
As can be seen in Figure 2.6, in order of importance, the three most used methods are:

(1) lectures;
(2) case studies; and
(3) Group discussions.

These are actually the same methods used in other business-related courses, which according to Bennett (2006) are passive and less effective in influencing entrepreneurial attributes. Fiet (2000a, b) explains that instructors rely on lecture-based methods because they can be easily accomplished, and also because they require less investment. Other methods used, but not as common as the previous group, include:

- business/computer or game simulations (Hindle, 2002);
- video and filming (Verduyn et al., 2009);
- role models or guest speakers (Hegarty, 2006; Fiet, 2000a, b);
- business plan creation; and
- Project works.
Also used were games and competitions, setting of real small business ventures, workshops, presentations and study visits (Keogh and Galloway, 2004). This latter category of methods is termed “active” and is said to be more appropriate for nurturing entrepreneurial attributes among participants (Bennett, 2006), but as the low rankings in Figure 2.6 reveal, they are used less than traditional methods.

2.3.6 Community outreach activities

Entrepreneurship programs and faculties are expected to be a part of the social support system that assists indigenous enterprises to form and grow (Gorman et al., 1997; McMullan and Long, 1987). De Faoite et al. (2003) point out that outreach activities to the community are those specific services that are of benefit to the community, for example knowledge/technology transfer, consulting, teaching and research.

It was found in this review that very few studies have been dedicated to the investigation of the role of entrepreneurship education in community improvement. This scarcity of studies in this area is in line with a comment by McCarthy et al. (1997) that community outreach activities by most entrepreneurial programs are still in their introductory phase. This review came across 11 activities that were linked to outreach activities by training institutions, as summarized in Figure 2.7. The following is a summary of the activities grouped according to number of articles cited:

- business centers and entrepreneurship clubs with local entrepreneurs and technical and management assistance to entrepreneurs (Co and Mitchell, 2006; Fukugawa, 2005; Edwards and Muir, 2005; Robertson and Collins, 2003);
- link with local entrepreneurs through internship opportunities for students (Co and Mitchell, 2006; De Faoite et al., 2003; Hytti, 2002; Gibb, 1993);
- public symposia and awareness campaigns (Edwards and Muir, 2005; Hytti, 2002; Vesper and Gartner, 1997);
- dissemination of research results to the community (Mok, 2005; Kuratko, 2005; Edwards and Muir, 2005; Vesper and Gartner, 1997); and
- Students’ consulting projects with local entrepreneurs (Kuratko, 2005; Edwards and Muir, 2005; Vesper and Gartner, 1997).
Other activities include technology transfer, incubation services, and annual summer schools for potential entrepreneurs in the community.

Figure 2-7 Role to community and outreach activities

However, the above review was limited to articles that were searched collectively without regard to a specific outreach activity. This implies that the review did not go into detailed analysis of, for example, incubation services as a specific type of outreach strategy by universities (for an overview on university incubators, see Kirby (2004), or Mian (1996)). It is acknowledged that if this had been done some of the rankings would probably be different. However, in this instance, a collective review was intended to draw a general picture of how a specific type of outreach activity is ranked among others.
2.3.7 Evaluation and impact indicators

It has been observed that impact assessment in entrepreneurship education is currently receiving increasing attention from various stakeholders. Donors, policy-makers, students and scholars in entrepreneurship are keen to find out if it is truly worth investing more efforts and money in entrepreneurship education (Matley, 2005a, b; Charney and Libecap, 2000). Now and then, scholarly doubts on the teachability of entrepreneurship keep on resurfacing, mainly due to the absence of coherent proof of its impact. Charney and Libecap (2000) point out that many still wonder if students from these courses will have the ability to compete in the job market as well as in the business arena.

One of the challenges in impact assessment is the choice of generally accepted success indicators. This is because at the moment entrepreneurship [education], as a developing field of study, is characterized with debates from stakeholders that have differing interests and theoretical orientations with regard to entrepreneurship. Henry et al. (2005a, b) observe that each of the contributors to this field of study does so from its own perspective, hence making the field more fragmented. For example, while on the one hand entrepreneurship theoreticians are still debating whether entrepreneurship is an acquired behavior or an inborn trait (Herron and Sapienza, 1992) and questioning its teachability, on the other hand politicians and policy-makers continue to advocate entrepreneurship education because they think of it in terms of its perceived economic role (e.g. more new ventures and more jobs). Also, employers would probably think that hiring a graduate from an entrepreneurial course will lead to more innovative ways of doing business, and the discovery of new competitive products/services and new ways of marketing. Students, meanwhile, would like to see favorable examination scores, satisfaction with course delivery, competence in the job market, and the realization of their career and financial aspirations. Therefore, the diversity of these views presents a challenge in choosing impact indicators, and even methodological arguments.

In this regard, this review came across two types of studies:

(1) Studies that have attempted to measure the general progress in entrepreneurship education as a field of study (see Matley, 2006; McKeown et al., 2006; Dana, 2001; Vesper and Gartner, 1997); and
(2) Studies that attempted to measure a change in some pre-determined variables among students as a result of attending a course in entrepreneurship (see Fayolle et al., 2006; Henry, 2004; Charney and Libecap, 2000).

Due to the nature of the fifth research question it was decided to only concentrate on the second group of studies, i.e. studies that measure the impact on students as a result of attending a course in entrepreneurship. And therefore, a total of 17 articles were reviewed, in which 27 indicators were noted and grouped.

![Figure 2-8 Indicators for impact assessment](image)

According to the scores in Figure 2.8, graduate start-ups were the highest ranked success indicator. This means that in order to measure the success of an entrepreneurship course, one need to establish the number of graduates who have started their own ventures as a result of attending a course in entrepreneurship. This finding is in line with the views of scholars who associate entrepreneurship with the creation of new ventures, but contrary to Kuratko's (2005) remarks that entrepreneurship is more than the mere creation of business. Despite the three different educational objectives in entrepreneurship (i.e. to educate for, about, or in entrepreneurship), many stakeholders do generally associate entrepreneurial courses with the creation of individuals who are destined to start businesses (Henry, 2004; Rosa, 2003; Charney and Libecap, 2000). Also, students’ academic standards (including examination scores and GPAs) were ranked the second most immediate impact indicator (Charney and Libecap, 2000; Vesper and Gartner, 1997; Hynes, 1996). Hynes (1996) argues
that the use of formal examinations is mainly aimed at testing students’ knowledge and aptitude (towards entrepreneurship). The third group of indicators originates from psychological constructs, for example change in students’ attitudes, perceptions, interest, self-efficacy, confidence, abilities and skills towards entrepreneurship (see Souitaris et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2006; Fayolle et al., 2006; Veciana et al., 2005; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003; Rosa, 2003). What is interesting in this third group, however, is the formulation of attitudinal measuring questions. Most of the questions, if read closely, seem to focus on ascertaining students’ attitudes/intentions towards starting their own business; this gives the impression that venture creation is still the main preferred impact indicator, although addressed in a different way (the attitudinal way).

Further, some scholars measure impact in terms of how much entrepreneurship programs contribute to the community, for example in terms of technology transfer, new jobs created, or assistance to local entrepreneurs (Henry, 2004; Vesper and Gartner, 1997). Others have used indicators like students’ satisfaction with the course, resulting innovations and graduates’ business performance (Henry, 2004; Charney and Libecap, 2000). Lastly, some scholars measured impact using a change on students’ need of achievement and locus of control (see Hansemark, 1998).

Methodologically, it is argued that there is still an inherent design problem in impact assessment studies and that most of the studies apply methods that bias the results in favor of entrepreneurship education (Matley, 2006). In this review, it was observed that most impact assessment studies ranged from simple surveys of participants or and trainers to longitudinal survey of participants (i.e. a questionnaire administered at the start and at the end of the course), while others made use of control groups plus some qualitative interviews or focus group discussions. Although most studies vary in terms of approach and theoretical orientations (which also consequently influence the choice of indicators), their results seem to conclude that entrepreneurship education has some positive impact on students. For example, Fayolle et al. (2006) concluded that there was a strong measurable impact on entrepreneurial intentions, but less on perceived behavioral control. Lee et al. (2005) found that there was an increased level of confidence, knowledge and ability of venture creation among students. Souitaris et al. (2007) concluded that entrepreneurship education did raise students’ attitudes and the overall intention towards entrepreneurship. Also, Henry (2004) found that there was a significant impact on the level of business skills and knowledge, and confidence in enterprising capabilities. Peterman and Kennedy (2003) also reported that there was an increase in participants’ perception of desirability and feasibility of starting a venture. Hansemark (1998) proved that an
entrepreneurship program had an impact on students’ need for achievement and locus of control. However, as will be discussed later, most of these conclusions are based on constructs/indicators that predict the probability (as opposed to giving actual confirmation) that graduates may in the future act entrepreneurially.

2.4 DISCUSSION

The goal of this review was to establish the essence, objectives, applied teaching methods and impact indicators for entrepreneurship education. To some extent the above section on findings has succeeded in giving a more descriptive view of entrepreneurship education along the lines drawn by the research questions. This section attempts to bring forth a collective understanding of the above findings and to highlight some possible implications. Mainly, there are three issues that arise:

(1) The alignment among the major educational components in entrepreneurship programs (i.e. objectives, target groups, course content, methods, and impact indicators);
(2) The time lag between the moment that impact is assessed and that at which an individual is expected to manifest entrepreneurial actions as predicted by the theory (or indicators) used in impact assessment; and
(3) A brief highlight on the need to separate progress evaluations from impact assessment studies, and presentation of a few criteria on the choice of success indicators and quality benchmarks.

2.4.1 The alignment concept

Biggs’s (1996, 1999) concept termed “constructive alignment” is used to examine the alignment of major educational components in teaching entrepreneurship. In this concept, Biggs (1999) perceives teaching as a complex system comprising teachers, students, the teaching context, student learning activities, and the outcome. Biggs (1999) challenges educators to seek a proper alignment between course objectives, the teaching/learning activities and the assessment tasks. According to this concept the course objectives define what should be taught, how it should be taught, and how impact should assessed. Learning is a complete system in which the achievement of learning objectives needs maximum consistency throughout the system (Biggs, 1996, 1999).
In this case, taking Figure 2.3 versus Figure 2.6, the two major educational objectives are:

(1) increasing entrepreneurial attitudes or culture; and
(2) More tangibly, new venture creation.

The major teaching methods are lectures, case studies, and discussions. In Figure 2.3, the two major objectives confirm the concept by Kuratko (2005) that although new venture creation is an important feature of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship has more to do with an individual’s perspective. To understand Kuratko (2005) in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, the word “perspective” means “a particular way of regarding something”, which is also consistent with a definition of attitudes: “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (Ajzen, 2005). It is evident here that many scholars are now converging towards this behavioral mindset and cultural view of entrepreneurship (see Fayolle et al., 2006; Kuratko, 2005; Krueger et al., 2000), and are somehow discarding a once strict emphasis on venture creation as sole feature of entrepreneurship. However, using Biggs’s (1999) concept, a major issues may be seen between this behavioral view in the teaching objectives of entrepreneurship and the dominant teaching methods (i.e. lectures, case studies and discussion groups). Although it is still debatable as to what educational methods have an impact on changing behavioral attributes, it is however also generally agreed that traditional methods are less effective in encouraging entrepreneurial attributes. It is said that such methods actually make students become dormant participants. These methods prepare a student to work for an entrepreneur, but not to become one (Aronsson, 2004; Kirby, 2004). The existing shortfall in teaching methods confirms Kirby’s (2004) comments that most entrepreneurship educators though relate their courses with new ventures creation (educate for), they actually end up teaching about entrepreneurship. If entrepreneurship is to be learned as a career, it is best done using some kind of apprenticeship (Aronsson, 2004). In Aronsson (2004), Birch suggests that traditional methods should only be used to give students the commercial underpinnings of their entrepreneurial actions. But, doing something practical and having an opportunity to question, investigate, converse, and discuss with real-world entrepreneurs gives both knowledge and skills and also stimulates attitudes. However, in a practical sense most of the advocated active/action-based teaching methods are costly and somehow may not align to the conventional university system of teaching and awarding.
Also, another examination would be to check the fit between program objectives, methods, and selection of students to the program, and even the subjects that make up the program. Talking about types of students versus program objectives, Biggs (1996) argues that learners bring in the classroom an accumulation of motives, intentions, and previous knowledge that affect the learning process and determines the course and quality of learning that may take place. Although in this review no specific findings have pointed out on the quality and attributes of the participants, the participants’ prior intentions should be among the inputs that determines the level of effort in teaching. For example, an increasing number of training institutions are making it compulsory for students to take entrepreneurship courses. In this case, therefore, most programs end up taking onboard a mixed group of students, i.e. those who have favorable attitudes, some level of skills or experience and intentions towards entrepreneurship, and those who do not. Also, for voluntary entrepreneurial courses (e.g. an elective single module or a complete Bachelor’s or Master’s degree), students will enroll on a course for a number of different reasons that are the result of many factors. Some students intend to become entrepreneurs and the course to them is one a means towards this end. Some may be aspiring to work in innovative organizations. Some simply join the course in order to learn about the phenomenon or to obtain further knowledge. Some students may join the course because they consider it as an easy one to pass and hence improve their grades. Or in cases like in least developed countries (LDCs), students may join an entrepreneurship Bachelor’s program just for the convenience of obtaining a university degree after failing to secure other more competitive courses. From a similar view, to achieve better results, Fayolle et al. (2006) wondered whether such students’ attributes could be used as a criterion in the admission process, or whether educators may see the need to fine-tune their programs so that they align with some specific types of participant.

Also, a tricky question will still be the course structure or the selection of subjects to be taught. Staying with Biggs’s (1999) alignment concept, the choice of subjects should again be based on the course objectives; this should dictate the necessary skills to be developed among the participants. It is understood that most entrepreneurship courses have combined objectives – i.e. they educate for, about, and in entrepreneurship; this is contradictory, since the selection of subjects and teaching methods will also be in a haphazard manner. For effective results, course objectives should be focused on specific skills that are required for a particular type of graduate. For example, this review has revealed that one of the most desired outcomes is to create graduates who will start new ventures (see Figure 2.3). In this regard, the course content could be structured in such a way that it
comprises subjects that match the skills and abilities that are said to be exhibited by real-world entrepreneurs, for example as given by Kuratko (2005) and Birch (Aronsson, 2004), the ability to recognize opportunities, the ability to create new products/services, business planning skills, skills to marshal resources, selling skills, and the ability to form and manage teams. Interestingly, this list of skills is also in agreement with the most common subjects cited in Figure 2.5. However, what is still tricky is whether the choice of subjects is also sufficient for imparting behavior-related attributes to students. It is here viewed that most of the subjects in entrepreneurial programs focus mainly on the activities that a would-be-entrepreneur should be able to perform “functionally”, as opposed to “behaviorally”. The question is: in order to stimulate entrepreneurial behaviors, is it a matter of proper choice of subjects (i.e. what to teach) or of teaching methods (i.e. how and who to teach it), or both?

2.4.2 Time and other situational influences on impact indicators

As shown in Figure 2.8, the three most common impact indicators are:

(1) Start-ups by graduates;
(2) The academic standards of students (or examination scores); and
(3) A change in students’ attitudes and intentions towards entrepreneurship.

In this review it has been found out that most impact assessment studies are carried out shortly after students have completed a course in entrepreneurship. For the purpose of academic grading, examinations are appropriate to be done immediately after the course. Hynes (1996) explained that examinations are aimed at testing students’ knowledge and aptitude. But what remains unexplained is the linkage between students’ grades and their future behaviors as a subject of time and other situational influences. Although in their study DeVolder and Lens (1982) concluded that students with high grades seemed to value future goals more highly than students with low grades, this conclusion was still limited on students’ future intentions, and not the actual achievement or actions towards the goals. Similarly, it is currently argued that intention-based models have proved to be good predictors of future entrepreneurial events. And, specifically it is mentioned that since intentions are made of constructs like attitudes, subjective norms, and self-efficacy (Fayolle, 2007; Krueger et al., 2000; Ajzen, 1991; Bird, 1988), these constructs can also be used as a measure of impact of an intervention like entrepreneurship education (see Fayolle, 2007, Fayolle et al., 2006;
Charney and Libecap, 2000). Of interest at this point is the time lag between the point of measuring these indicators (i.e. student examination grades, attitudes, perception and intentions) and the time of action (i.e. starting a new venture or behaving entrepreneurially). Souitaris et al. (2007) argue that the link between an individual’s future goals and intentions is affected by the time-lag between the moment the goal/intention was set and the time of action. Now, if entrepreneurship education is related to the most important target group (university students) it may be seen that it is here where the time-lag effect comes to be of most influence. University students are a group of young people, of which the majority have high but unstable career aspirations that decline with age/time (Jacobs et al., 1991). The study of Galloway and Brown (2002) and many other studies indicate that most graduates usually plan to start their own businesses after five to ten years of work experience. Over a period of five to ten years a graduate’s attitudes and intentions may change several times. This is justified by Audet’s (2004) study, in which he measured the stability of entrepreneurial perception and intentions over a period of just 18 months and concluded that the temporal stability of these constructs is questionable. Linan (2008) argues that situational factors (e.g. time constraints, task difficulty and social pressures) have an influence on attitudes towards entrepreneurship. As time and other situational influences continue to act on the students even after graduation, they make most impact assessment conclusions (especially those taken immediately after the completion of the course) tentative at best.

2.4.3 Evaluations versus impact assessment and choice of indicators

The use of students’ grades and other academic quality indicators make scholars commit a common mistake of mixing evaluations studies with impact assessment studies (Hulme, 2000). According to Hulme (2000), impact assessment is associated with the outcomes of an intervention rather than with input and output. The goal in impact assessment is to “prove the effects” and later improve the intervention. On the other hand, an evaluation entails a review of both students and the program to measure either quality or progress (Solomon et al., 2002). Measuring effect (impact) means looking for causality, which is quite a separate process to that of measuring progress and quality (evaluation). For instance, evaluations are based on a set of standards as a benchmark, whereas impact assessment draws its basis from the predetermined objectives of an intervention (Hulme, 2000). A common problem in both exercises, as observed in this work, is the choice of
quality standards for evaluations and effect indicators for impact measurement. For example, in an impact assessment exercise the major questions would be:

(1) What will indicate success/effect to individuals, institutions, communities, etc.?
(2) How will these be measured?
(3) How are the simultaneous effects of other influencing agents in the environment (Descy and Tessaring, 2005) to be separated?

Most of the indicators that will be adopted for impact assessment will, as McMullan and Long (1987) pointed out, relate to socio-economic issues. However, measuring these variables is a formidable task, and it is probably the major cause for the current absence of a common impact assessment framework in entrepreneurship education. From an educational point of view, Preston and Green (2003) explain that the best probable method to measure the impact of any educational intervention is the use of cross-country comparisons. This is done, according to Preston and Green (2003), through the identification of differences and similarities between countries and their systems, and one may make macro-causal comparisons. Later this should be supported by comparative studies of micro-indicators from a longitudinal study (see Lee et al., 2005, 2006). This approach, however, requires more time, and the cost implications are enormous.

Similarly, in evaluation studies, the absence of common quality standards or benchmarks in entrepreneurship education leaves most evaluations open to subjectivity and criticisms. Quantifications and comparisons based on the number of courses offered, the number of students enrolled/graduated, or academic standards are themselves arbitrary. If any attempt is made to develop a set of quality or progress indicators for entrepreneurship education such indicators should be, as suggested by Hudson and Anderson (2005), relevant to policy makers, valid and able to measure the condition accurately, reliable and consistently used, easy to interpret and understand, and able provide timely information. Each indicator should be logically connected to other indicators.

2.5 CONCLUSION

In this review entrepreneurship education has been traced from its essence to impact assessment. The main concern was to investigate the inherent disagreement and the fragmented nature of this field of study, and its resultant variations in the educational process. The main
question was to ascertain the meaning of and general objectives in entrepreneurship education, and to identify various types of programs, subjects taught (course content), the teaching methods applied and impact indicators.

It has been learned that, although there is no consensus in the basic definitional issues, there is a common understanding of what entrepreneurship education is generally attempting to achieve. Again, there is a diversity of types of educational programs that can be grouped into three in respect of their focus and objectives – i.e. educating for, about or in – entrepreneurship, but still there is a substantial variation in teaching methods. Entrepreneurship is taught to various target groups ranging from students to the unemployed and minority groups in the community. However, not only do the educators differ in the choice of subjects to be taught, they also have failed to substantiate the impact of most entrepreneurship programs mainly due to the absence of a generally accepted framework for evaluating and assessing the outcomes of the training process.

Specifically, it has been found that there is a relative agreement that the major rationale for entrepreneurship education is more economical than social. Following a belief that entrepreneurship is a panacea to some economical problems, especially employment, entrepreneurship education is to promote entrepreneurship by influencing attitudes, values and the general community culture. This aim is the driving force behind all other objectives, namely start-ups, self-employment, job creation, knowledge advancement and skill development. It has also been found that most scholars are of the opinion that there is a need to be more innovative on designing modules that will enable learners to achieve their predetermined outcomes in learning either for, about or in entrepreneurship. The objectives and type of audience have to be matched with the course contents and teaching methods. With more focus being on increasing the number of start-ups, the majority of articles reviewed have questioned the use of traditional teaching methods. There is an almost common understanding that students destined for self-employment need a more action-based approach rather than traditional methods. However, on the other hand, some have also recommended that it is not wise to abandon theory-based teachings completely. The main focus for each of the contributors has been on how to enable students to acquire the attributes, behaviors and skills that are exhibited by successful entrepreneurs.

By looking at the approaches, theories and indicators used in impact assessment studies, it seems that the current focus of most scholars is directed towards the behavioral or cognitive type of
entrepreneurship. This is evidenced by the convergence of recent scholars towards the use of constructs relating to intention-based models, and less emphasis on new venture creation and personal qualities as there was in the 1980s. Recent scholars seem to agree that entrepreneurship can be taught. However, this agreement is still problematic due to the fact that there are still different versions of what entrepreneurship means, which means teaching, will still be in a variety of forms with respect to one’s definition of entrepreneurship.

In a more general picture, there are research opportunities on the practical implications of all of the five categories on the framework in Figure 2.1. This means that the framework used in this literature review could also be empirically replicated to assessing a given educational program. Some questions that arise with this review are, for example, why Institutions of Higher Education decide to establish entrepreneurship centers and programs. What are the driving forces? How do they strategically link these programs to the societal needs, policy agendas, and the limited resources? Further, relating to the program implementations, there is a need to investigate how these institutions set their specific program objectives (for, about, and in entrepreneurship), and how they match them with subject contents, target audience, delivery methods, and even local environments in which learning is taking place. But, more specific, it has been observed that there is very limited research and publications on the role of entrepreneurship education with regard to local entrepreneurs, communities, policy-makers, financiers and other related institutional players that affect regional entrepreneurial efforts. Many studies have indicated how policy-makers have been a major force in promoting entrepreneurship education (e.g. Pittway and Cope, 2007; Lourencéo and Jones, 2006; Matley, 2005a, b). But it is also observed that there is a two-way relationship of influence, especially at lower levels of societies where academicians can also influence policy, or faculties can act as a source of innovations and a catalyst entrepreneurial revolution. This observation does not lead to a quicksand of finding the cause-effect of entrepreneurship education. But this could be approached as case studies on specific strategies, activities, success-stories and improvements made by a particular entrepreneurship faculty to a local community and its components. Similarly, it is thought that too much educational effort has been directed to producing entrepreneurs and less has been directed towards the study of the institutional environments in which these graduates are going to operate. The World Bank (2002) argues that institutions (e.g. political, judicial, financial, society, media, etc.) influence both entrepreneurial opportunities and entrepreneurs’ ability to use their skills and resources. It would be interesting to study the role of
entrepreneurship education towards these institutions, or how these environmental institutions shape the curricula and approaches in entrepreneurial programs. Also, there is an opportunity for educators to conduct entrepreneurship teachings, as a mainstream faculty activity, alongside sensitization activities to people who build up these institutions. This would lead to educating another important target group that comprises the facilitators of entrepreneurship in society.

Also, relating to evaluation and impact assessment, educators’ attention has been directed to start-ups and self-employment as an objective and as a success indicator. This has reduced the focus towards the fate of other types of learners. It is a fact that not all students joining entrepreneurship programs intend to start businesses of their own, hence the categorization for, about, and in. Therefore, if there are attempts to establish progress made within this field of study, there is also a need for further research on the performance of entrepreneurship graduates in workplaces, which happen to form a bigger proportion among entrepreneurship graduates. This is more relevant in least developed countries (LDCs) for both the public and private sector, where massive investment is committed to modernizing working styles in the public sector and to improve the competitiveness of the graduates needed by an expanding private sector.

Lastly, it has been argued that attitudinal variables are the best predictors of future entrepreneurial behaviors, and that attitude and intentions are hard to change. But, what remains uncertain is when and how these attitudes and intentions start to build and become actions, given the time lag between the two. Therefore, there is a need for scholarly efforts to find proof of the link between measures of impact and graduates’ performance in the field. This could probably be done using extended longitudinal studies, which will require faculties to keep track of their graduates for over a period of ten years or so. Most entrepreneurship research at the moment fails to conduct such studies, mainly due to a lack of comprehensive alumni databases and their huge cost implications.

A general opinion from this review is that there has been remarkable progress in entrepreneurship education. Although the current debates and variations signify that entrepreneurship education is a developing field of study (Singh, 1990), this review has shown that the field is moving towards a common conceptual approach in terms of agreement on educational objectives, advocated (as opposed to the most applied) teaching methods, and convergence towards behavioral impact indicators.
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CHAPTER THREE

3 DEVELOPING GRADUATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN TANZANIA: Contextual Enablers and Hindrances

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is a result of both the individual’s entrepreneurial zest and a societal context conducive to entrepreneurial activities (Bull and Willard, 1993; Jack and Anderson, 2002; Shane, 2003). Some authors capture this relationship in a seed-soil metaphor, implying that the emergence and growth of entrepreneurs (seed) is said to be dependent on the conduciveness of the breeding context (soil) (Martinelli, 2004; Tillmar, 2006). Current scholarly debates on how entrepreneurship is generated seem to be settling for the idea that entrepreneurial behavior can be developed through educational interventions (Kuratko, 2005). However, it is also observed that graduates from such educational interventions cannot succeed unless they are positioned in contexts that are conducive to entrepreneurship (Cuervo, 2005; Karimi et al, 2010). Martinelli (2004) argues that the social and institutional contexts in which entrepreneurs are embedded help to shape the individual’s attitudes and motives, determine the availability of resources, present both the constraints and opportunities, and set the level of legitimacy of entrepreneurship in society. The entrepreneur-context relationship, therefore, sets the tone for the currently advocated approach in which governmental efforts in creating entrepreneurial graduates should coincide with reforms in institutions that affect entrepreneurship (cf. Kshetri, 2011; Ronstadt, 1990; World Bank Report, 2002). As indicated by Ronstadt (1990), graduate entrepreneurs enhance a country’s competitiveness, economic growth and development. Despite massive policy and educational efforts in boosting graduate entrepreneurship, there are world-wide concerns that the rates of graduates entering into entrepreneurial ventures do not reflect the level of investment endowed (Al-Samarrai and Bennell, 2003; Mukyanuzi, 2003; Nabi and Holden, 2008).

---

2 This chapter was also a journal article co-authored with Professor Heidi Dahles and Doctor Ingrid Wakkee. The paper was accepted for publication in the European Journal of Scientific Research.
Turning to developing countries, Cuervo (2005) argues that in order to understand the emergence of entrepreneurial activities, one has to conduct an analysis of both the characteristics of individual entrepreneurs and environmental characteristics in terms of the availability of resources and competition, as well as the conditions of the institutions that govern economic activity. From this three-tiered angle – the individual, the contextual and the institutional – the current paper explores entrepreneurship education in Tanzania, where boosting graduate entrepreneurship is a national development agenda (cf. URT, 1999a). Entrepreneurial courses have been increasingly integrated and taught in almost all fields of specializations both at university and other levels of education. However, tracer studies, especially those of Al-Samarrai and Bennell (2003) and Mukyanuzi (2003) indicate that self-employment among recent cohorts of university graduates have been falling. The aim of this article is to explore the experiences of Tanzanian graduate entrepreneurs and the ways in which they make sense of the developing environment in which they operate. Their perspectives may shed light on why the rate of graduate entrepreneurs has declined in recent years. In particular, this article raises the question of which opportunities and obstacles graduate entrepreneurs in Tanzania experience when aspiring to a career in business, particularly in terms of the social and institutional environment in which they are embedded (cf. Karimi et al, 2010). In order to address this issue, this study assesses the contextual variables that shape graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania from the graduates’ point of view. This study adopts a contextual approach that is defined by a society in transition, i.e. a post-colonial and post-socialist country.

This paper is structured as follows. The next section addresses conceptual issues regarding the embeddedness of entrepreneurship in economic and social contexts. Before this conceptual discussion is applied to the Tanzanian context, the methodology applied to generate the empirical data underlying this article is described, followed by a brief outline of the Tanzanian economic and social context. Next, the empirical findings are first presented and then discussed and interpreted against the background of the conceptual framework. The paper ends with a number of policy implications.

3.2 CONCEPTUAL ISSUES: ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND EMBEDDEDNESS

Drawing on the seminal work by Schumpeter (1934), entrepreneurship is widely viewed as a crucial mechanism for economic development offering employment, innovation and welfare by means of hard work, creativity and risk taking (Acs, Desai and Hessels, 2008; Kirchhoff, 1997;
Wennekers and Thurik, 1999). For Shane (2003) risk-taking behavior, driven by the expectation of making profit and the perception of good business opportunities, is one of the important attributes of entrepreneurs in overcoming the uncertainty of the market (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). In addition, Shane (2003) shows that, for recognizing entrepreneurial opportunities, entrepreneurs require entrepreneurial skills. These skills encompass the competence and knowledge to act upon business opportunities, to be able to evaluate an opportunity and to turn it into enduring value (Shane, 2003). While some authors maintain that these skills are innate behavior that some individuals possess “naturally” (Rauch and Frese, 2007), others maintain that entrepreneurial skills can be obtained through education and training (Kuratko, 2005; Ronstadt, 1990). The impact of education, in particular higher education, on entrepreneurial motivation and skills is of particular importance. As Shane et al. (2003: 258) argue entrepreneurial behavior is based on both motivational and cognitive factors on the one hand, and on external factors on the other. External factors include entrepreneurial opportunities and environmental conditions (such as the status of the economy or socio-cultural and political conditions both conducive and constraining to entrepreneurship) and the availability of venture capital.

Although economists acknowledge the role of “external factors” affecting entrepreneurial activity, Granovetter (1985) points out that the conventional (economic) approach to entrepreneurship used to be rather under-socialized. In economic analysis, entrepreneurial activities are viewed solely in terms of profit making and entrepreneurs are defined as “persons who are ingenious and creative in finding ways that add to their own wealth, power and prestige” (Baumol, 1990: 987). Following the definition by Baumol, entrepreneurship may be channeled into activities that are not necessarily productive, as rent-seeking or crime can also add to personal wealth but affect society negatively (Baumol 1990: 894-5; Naudé, 2007: 3-4). In such cases one may question whether entrepreneurship is an appropriate instrument for development beyond individual wealth accumulation. However, elaborating on the seminar work by Granovetter (1985), a number of authors argue that individual entrepreneurs as well as the opportunity structures within which they operate are social phenomena embedded in a wider social context (Kloosterman, 2010; Kloosterman and Rath, 2001). The significance of this argument for the developmental potential of entrepreneurship will be discussed in the next section.

Institutional scholars (cf. Zukin and DiMaggio, 1990) argue that embedded economic activities such as in business communities or business networks are useful institutional means for
implementing co-operative strategies in any business system. However, entrepreneurs and their businesses are embedded in manifold ways. Acknowledging that changes in the economy creating or destroying opportunities for business start-ups or expansion are as relevant as the social embeddedness, Kloosterman and Rath (2001) developed a framework that addresses the “mixed embeddedness” of entrepreneurs and their enterprises. This framework pays equal attention to the entrepreneur or business owner who is embedded in social relations which provide access to capital, labour and opportunities as well as to economic and institutional embeddedness, including surrounding rules and regulations, and economic and political climates (Kloosterman, 2003, 2010).

In the context of local business communities, “mixed embeddedness” appears at two separate but intertwined levels: first, at the level of “informal” institutions that are more or less within the control radius of the individual, such as family ties, personalized non-family connections, and patronage relationships. Second, at the level of “formal” institutions that operate beyond the control of individual entrepreneurs encompassing dominant economic, social, and political forces at work in the larger society. These forces are defined by market dynamics, demographic developments, technological innovation, government policies, geopolitical relations and institutional legacies from the past (Scott, 1998; Storper, 1997).

At the level of embeddedness in “informal” institutions, membership in a number of partly overlapping networks enables entrepreneurs to accumulate social capital that may strategically be invested to advance business interests. Overall, such overlapping networks constitute a multilayered business community that comprises of both strong and weak ties (Granovetter, 1973; 1983). The strong ties of community constituted by family, neighborhood and church affiliation traditionally play an important role in many transitional economies, reflecting the economic and political insecurity and the lack of public services available to local people under post-socialist and post-conflict conditions. Strong ties, however, may come with particular constraints for local entrepreneurs. As Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993: 9) point out, strong ties may imply a “bounded solidarity” that exerts leveling pressures on successful individuals to redistribute wealth (within their immediate community) instead of reinvesting it in economic ventures. In that case, social capital diminishes the incentive for entrepreneurial behavior. Conversely, weak ties – single-stranded relationships with acquaintances (Granovetter, 1983) such as (former) classmates, college friends, co-workers and business relations – may figure as a significant support system among local entrepreneurs. For our purposes, the role of educational institutions is of particular importance in
establishing such weak ties that may prove valuable network relations for graduates in their subsequent career as entrepreneur and business owner. Both strong and weak ties are vehicles for establishing and maintaining trust within the overlapping networks. As the increasing body of knowledge on the role of trust in business networks illustrates, trust facilitates cooperative exchange, especially under conditions of uncertainty and information asymmetry in weak institutional settings (Venkataraman, 1997: 127-128).

At the level of embeddedness in “formal” institutions, a number of dimensions have to be distinguished such as social-demographic (e.g. age-cohorts, life-course change), economic-technological (access to innovative technologies, connectedness to internet, social media, etc.), political (level of state intervention in the private sector) and cultural (value systems impacting upon the acceptance and prestige of entrepreneurship) dimensions which are an integral part of the entrepreneurs’ life but which are beyond the individual’s power to actively influence their course and impacts. These dimensions represent the parameters within which entrepreneurs exploit and create opportunities and deal with setbacks and threats; in other words, these dimensions define the opportunity structure within which entrepreneurs operate. Currently, entrepreneurs all over the world, whether operating large corporate divisions or small local businesses, have to deal with the complexities of the global market of which they form an integral part (Dicken, 2007).

3.3 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This article is based on empirical research conducted among graduate entrepreneurs in Tanzania in 2009. Story-telling interviews were used as a strategy of data collection. As Atkinson (1998) explains, the story-telling approach is defined by an individual’s narrative account of important events, experiences, and feelings which may either focus on specific aspects of life or on a chronological account of life as a whole. Story-telling and narrative interviews have proven to be useful in enabling participants to easily express how they make sense of their environment, how they relate to others, and how all this affects their endeavors towards a goal (Atkinson, 1998; Johansson, 2004). During the interviews, entrepreneurs were given a specific starting point (cf. Rae and Carswell, 2000) by asking them to describe the type(s) of business (es) they run, and to provide a detailed historical account of and reflection on their career progression from university to full-time entrepreneurship, their perceptions of the developing Tanzanian entrepreneurial environment, and the ways in which they have adapted to this environment by creating and exploiting business
opportunities. These stories were taped and transcribed. A conventional content analysis approach was adopted, where all transcripts were read and re-read so that to get an immersion and a sense of whole (cf. Burnard, 1991; Hsien and Shannon, 2005). In addition, the software program of NVivo™ 7 was used for the analysis of the transcripts.

Since experiences in entrepreneurial ventures rather than success rates of the educational programs form the unit of analysis in this investigation, the current analysis includes solely those informants who are currently practicing entrepreneurship, as these individuals are able to inform us both about facilitating and inhibiting factors and their strategies to cope with challenges. Ten (n = 10) graduate entrepreneurs participated in the study. A graduate entrepreneur, in this study, is a person with at least a university degree (or its equivalents) who, as a full-time occupation, has started and is running his/her own business. A snowballing approach has been applied to identify participants. Heckathorn (1997) advises the use of snowballing in situations where the sample size is unknown, a scenario similar to this study due to the fact that universities in Tanzania do not maintain databases of graduates’ career destinations. Appendix 1 provides a summary profile of the interviewed graduate entrepreneurs.

The presentation of empirical data below revolves around the themes that the NVivo-based analysis identified as the most prominent ones in the stories told by the ten informants. The data presentation offers a summary at an aggregate level of the most important experiences of the informants and adds literal quotes from the interview transcripts which were significant and illustrative.

3.4 ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF EMBEDDEDNESS IN TANZANIA

Tanzania, with an average growth of above seven per cent in the past five years, is one of the best performing countries in East Africa. Yet, Tanzania remains one of the poorest countries in the world (Colijn, 2009) ranking number 151 out of 182 on the human development index (Loman, 2010). The estimated population is around 42.5 million inhabitants (51 percent female and 49 percent male) reaching a population density of 45 people per square kilometer. The distribution of the population shows that 74.5 percent of the people live in rural areas, equivalent to 25.5 percent in urban areas. The population growth rate is 2.9 percent per annum (resulting in a growth of 10
million people in the last 10 years) with an under 15 years old population of 44 percent. Family structures in Tanzania, like in most African countries, are based on strong family ties. Strong family ties are dependent on a member of the family (typically the wife) to stay at home to run the family organization. Strong family ties also imply geographical proximity of adult children: young adults stay home longer and when they exit the parental household they tend to stay close to enjoy the benefits of the family, both emotionally and practically (Alesina and Giuliano, 2010). Tanzanians, when thinking of their family, include a wide range of extended family members such as aunts, uncles and cousins (Ksoll, 2007; Urassa et al., 1997).

The Gross National Income of Tanzania is just below 500 US$ with a highly skewed salary distribution as is common in developing countries. Out of the total population, 36 percent lives below the poverty line of one dollar a day and is unable to meet their basic daily needs. For women this percentage is even worse: 60 percent of all female Tanzanian has to survive on less than one dollar. Poverty is most common amongst the illiterate part of the population which is estimated at 24 percent of the adult population. The employment rate shows 18.3 million people have a paid job and 2.3 million are unemployed. A large, yet shrinking majority of 76.5 percent of the population works in agriculture, with informal and other sectors growing rapidly by following far behind with respectively 9.3 percent and 8 percent of the population (URT, 2007).

The history of Tanzania has a major impact on the current entrepreneurial climate in the country, affecting both the supply and demand of entrepreneurs. Tanzania is a former German colony that came under British mandate in 1919, which became independent in 1961. In 1964, the formerly called “Tanganyika” (mainland Tanzania) and the Sultanate of Zanzibar became united to form a country called Tanzania under the leadership of the late President Julius Nyerere. The socialist Nyerere envisioned economic development for his country through what is called Ujamaa. The Swahili Ujamaa stands for extended family or family-hood and reflects the idea that “a person becomes a person through the people or community”. Here, the concept of family is used to reflect reciprocity, collective effort, and an open version of community, tapping into tribal heritage and connections (Nyerere, 1987). According to Pratt (1999), Nyerere translated the Ujamaa concept into a political-economic management model, within which local private entrepreneurship was actively discouraged in favor of government-owned, community-based ventures and cooperatives. Also it was discouraged to have any secondary source of income besides the official salary received (Hyden and Karlstrom, 1993). In this top down, anti-market philosophy prices were kept low and, in
contrast to many other African nations, Tanzania witnessed relatively little social unrest and political instability. In the 1970s, however, the Tanzanian economy started to decline with receding per capita income, stagnating agricultural production and low productivity industry (URT, 2003b). This decline was caused by a combination of factors including the oil crisis in the 1970s, the drop in value of coffee and sisal exports, the 1977 break-up of the East African Community which resulted in a border closure with Kenya, and the war with Uganda, and a prolonged drought in the early 1980s. The years of socialism left Tanzania as one of the poorest, least developed and most aid-dependent countries in the world. By the end of the 1980s there was compelling pressure towards the introduction of a multiparty democracy and economic transformation programs (UDEC, 2002). After the first ever multi-party elections in 1995, the new government established the Local Government Reform Program with the objectives to involve people in decision making on their own development plans, economic empowerment, good governance and poverty reduction (URT, 2007). Nationalized businesses were privatized again. In the 1990s the government started to invest heavily in entrepreneurship education and currently seeks to raise awareness among all Tanzanians that entrepreneurship is the way forward. So far, these efforts have led to the rapid proliferation of mainly petty trading and small businesses within Tanzania’s urban centers (Mfaume and Leonard, 2004). Entrepreneurship in Tanzania therefore is characterized by small scale necessity-driven initiatives and micro businesses.

Entrepreneurship, as a new policy priority, is reflected in documents like the “Vision 2025” (URT, 1999a), “National Trade Policy” (URT, 2003a), and the “SMEs Development Policy” (URT, 2002), all having an effect on Higher Education policy, which had to include entrepreneurship as one of the major areas of education. While such an alignment in policy formulation is of crucial importance in the promotion of (graduate) entrepreneurship, the present findings indicate that there are still gaps between policies at ministerial level and their implementation at institutional and functional levels. For example, both the “Vision 2025” (URT, 1999a) and the “National Higher Education Policy” (URT, 1999b), cite the need for entrepreneurship education at university. The “SME Development Policy” (URT, 2002) stipulates that academic entrepreneurship education should be implemented by creating an enabling environment and developing financial support and other infrastructure. While the current policy emphasizes graduate entrepreneurship, one may wonder whether these efforts sort effect at lower levels of implementation. In the next section, the experiences of graduate entrepreneurs will be described in order to shed some light on this issue.
3.5 GRADUATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN TANZANIA

In this section, the diverging response of Tanzanian graduate entrepreneurs to the specific socio-economic and cultural challenges emerging from their local and national environment is established, based on the interview findings. First, the factors enabling or hampering graduate entrepreneurship are presented at an aggregate level in Table 3.1. Second, these findings are backed up with selected statements of our informants, hence allowing the participant’s points of view to prevail (Sandelowski, 1998).

**Table 3-1: Summary of factors affecting graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling Factors</th>
<th>NVivo (% coverage)</th>
<th>Inhibiting Factors</th>
<th>NVivo (% coverage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within the control of entrepreneurs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Partnering with and assistance from other entrepreneurs.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1. Lack of start-up capital.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support from strong ties (family, friends and relatives).</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2. Lack of trusted business partners/employees.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emerging links with China, Asia and Middle-East etc (globalization).</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3. Poor technology and low quality of product and services.</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning from entrepreneurs of Asian origin (entrance of foreign role models)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside the control of entrepreneurs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political and policy change.</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1. Limited access to credit and inhibitive banking/financial services.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved business registration and taxation procedures.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2. Negative attitudes towards graduate entrepreneurship.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving general awareness of entrepreneurship.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3. Corruption, collusion and theft.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good publicity of entrepreneurs in media. Fostering legitimacy and reputation.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4. Poor taxation procedures.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Growing banking and micro-finance sector.</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5. Poor implementation of government policies by officials.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase in multinational companies.</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>6. Threat from cheap imports.</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 3.1 the NVivo percentages are added to the enabling and hampering factors in order to establish the level of significance of these factors as experienced by our informants. These coverage percentages indicate that a higher relative percentage in a given node reflects a higher concern with the factor that it represents (Schilling, 2006). The use of percentages not only helps to avoid conclusions that are based on a single overweighed comment, but also give an indication of how representative the comments are for a whole sample and minimize the number of exemplars (or quotes) needed to support the findings (cf. Sandelowski, 2001; Schilling, 2006). These percentages one would argue should have the sum of 100 percent, but one should notice that the table presents only a summary of themes that are relevant for this paper. The complete transcripts of stories have shown a vast array of themes which are beyond the scope of this particular study.

The findings are presented in such a way that the factors are grouped into two categories: (1) enabling (i.e. factor that facilitate graduate entrepreneurship) and (2) inhibiting (i.e. factors that hinder or delay graduate entrepreneurship), and within each of these categories there is a separation of these factors in terms of their controllability, which may either be at the informal institutional level and more or less within the control/influence of entrepreneurs, and those at the formal institutional level which are outside the control by an individual entrepreneur. It is, however, acknowledged that some of the factors may tend to fit in both categories.

3.5.1 Enabling factors

One of the major institutional changes that occurred since the 1990s involves the improvements in the areas of business registration and taxation. The extent of improvement in these areas is noticeable by those entrepreneurs who were already involved in some form of business activity prior to the reforms. The entrepreneurs indicated that these improvements had done away with excessive bureaucracy and corruption in this domain: “…registration and licensing procedures are fine, very facilitative. But in the past, when we started our first company, it was too bureaucratic to do so. And the TRA (Tanzania Revenue Authority) they nowadays understand … their system is not bad. But in the past, you may just find a person from TRA invading you in the office and taking files and saying all sorts of things. Others were threatening you so that you may sit down with them and “talk” …, said interviewee 5. Other entrepreneurs, although recognizing the improvements in these areas, stated that there is still corruption and other inefficiencies in business taxation and that generally the formal institutions are not yet completely untied from the legacies of poor public management.
In response to changes in government policies and public institutions, the banking and micro-finance sector has also been transformed. For example, in rural areas, there has been a growth of savings and credit unions that offers micro-financial facilities to farmers and small business owners. The increase in the number of banks and other financial institutions, both local and foreign, presents entrepreneurs with opportunities for start-ups as well as the ability to undertake large-scale investments by experienced entrepreneurs. Another effect of the political changes observed by the entrepreneurs is the increased presence of multinational companies. Multinational companies, besides their role in providing jobs to the local population, also create business opportunities for local entrepreneurs, particularly as a result of their need for locally sourced services such as security, catering, transport, stationeries, and other support services. While some entrepreneurs suggested that these foreign companies are considered as a threat because they have competitive advantage over local companies, overall the increase in the number of foreign investments should also be seen as an indicator of the improved entrepreneurial environment in Tanzania.

Despite these formal institutional changes, the ten stories in our sample show that many entrepreneurs still depend on some type of informal assistance from other entrepreneurs, their friends and relatives in the local environment in order to start their business. Social network relations provide access to business ideas and resources such as business advice and financial facilities to exploit the opportunities emerging from these ideas. While professional and business networks and friendship in addition seem to provide access to social capital which is necessary for starters, existing entrepreneurs also benefit from such assistance. The extent to which entrepreneurs can benefit from business network relationships is largely dependent on their own networking skills and abilities. The narratives in our sample indicate that entrepreneurs in Tanzania tap into both immediate and extended family ties as alternative sources of finance both in starting and expanding a business. As interviewee 1 explains: “… I had to come back to my father. I told him that I got this issue here, and I am requesting if you could help me with the money to register a company. …be helped with the money; I went and registered my company …” Moreover, the inherent feature of African extended families and strong ties with relatives also provide entrepreneurs with opportunities to hire a trusted labor force. Family becomes a valuable source of employees especially in an early stage of venture creation where, in most cases, an entrepreneur will not have a stable flow of sales to guarantee salary payment and, at the same time, has to curtail possibilities for employees to swindle some of the revenues. “… [At the start] I used to hire my nieces, my sister’s daughters. I was paying them, of course... You know, if you decide to hire
other people, they come to work, but not trustful. … But they get tempted to steal. I wanted someone I can trust…” interviewee 7 explained. Though the question of trust is far beyond family bonds, it is a common scenario in most small enterprises in Tanzania to find family members among employees. It is believed that family members treat the business as their own. However, family ties work both ways, where an entrepreneur uses family members as a source of cheap and trusted labor, and family members view an entrepreneur as a source of employment. For the entrepreneur this poses the risk of being obliged to hire family members regardless of their level of skills and training to perform the tasks they are entrusted with.

Network relationships in Tanzania are not limited to family or local business ties. The number of foreign entrants from the Middle East, China and other Asian countries has increased rapidly over the past years. In the ten stories with graduate entrepreneurs, trade ties with China and other Asian countries offer many business opportunities. Most of the entrepreneurs have sought to import Chinese goods and technology which are cheaper than those from Europe and America. Furthermore, entrants from the Middle East and China have set up business ventures in Tanzania. “Weak” ties with such traders have in some cases provided trade opportunities among Tanzanian entrepreneurs and, therefore, have shown their “strength” in a Granovetterian sense. While the number of Chinese investors increased in recent years, some sectors of the Tanzanian economy have been dominated by Tanzanians of Asian origin. These Asians (mainly Indians) control large corporations, and from the African entrepreneurs’ point of view, their business competition has often been a serious obstacle to their own progress (Marris, 1968). Yet, the current cohort of emerging local entrepreneurs often perceives these Asian businessmen as role models. For example, interviewee 5 holds this view: “…our fellows [of Asian origin] are very far. They own these big companies mainly because from the very start they decided to take risks. So if you look, that is why they achieve more than us, it is because they have taken the risks and decided to stay fully in their businesses…” As few indigenous role models have yet emerged, the entry of entrepreneurs from other regions may actually enable Tanzanian entrepreneurs to upgrade their own ambition levels. In recent years, Tanzanians of Asian origin have been actively involving themselves in local issues including political activities and in sectors other than retail. This, in some cases, has brought closer links with the indigenous entrepreneurs and provided opportunities for the locals to learn the skills of the trade.

In Tanzania a graduate’s decision to become self-employed has been a battle with the existing norms that envision graduates as salaried employees. Although the current government
strives for graduate entrepreneurship and self-employment, it has not been able to erase the institutional legacy of *Ujamaa* completely. Usually, graduates who identify themselves as entrepreneurs are still equaled to those who are unemployable, necessity-based traders or who make a living through unreliable or illegal means. However, public attitudes towards entrepreneurship seem to have changed. Currently, there is a growing understanding and appreciation of entrepreneurship and its role in the Tanzanian society. Interviewee 10 explains: “… entrepreneurship has become like a trendy thing to be. When you call a person an entrepreneur, it is like praising him, like giving him a title or some sort of a respect, you know? Even petty-traders want to identify themselves that way…” The improved reputation of entrepreneurs and the attractiveness of an entrepreneurial career among Tanzanians is a reflection of both the more conducive environment and the shift away from salaried employment among graduates.

### 3.5.2 Inhibiting factors

Despite the above observed expansion in both the banking and micro-finance sector, the banking sector is still incapable to cover the current needs of entrepreneurs. Almost all of the ten interviewed entrepreneurs gave an account of how getting start-up capital was a major hurdle in their efforts to start their first business ventures both in the formal and informal institutional context. In the formal institutional sectors, if loans are granted at all, they are often below the requested amounts. One of the most serious features of the banking system is the lack of trust that bankers have in start-ups. While some of the banks do not offer loans to business start-ups, there are others that do, but these set their borrowing conditions in such a way that a person with a newly started business will not be able to meet them. This would be in the form of restrictions such as submitting audited financial statements of three consecutive years, or having operated with the bank for a given period of time. Under such restrictive conditions, an entrepreneur with a business idea will spend a long time in moving from bank to bank in search for less restrictive conditions. The lack of financial resources and the perceived difficulties in obtaining a loan have a negative effect not only on the aspirations of future entrepreneurs, but also on experienced entrepreneurs’ choice of types and size of business investment. Almost all graduates who intended to start a business using a bank loan had experienced long procedures and restrictions that are not feasible for a starter. Most of the graduates are from poor families and come directly from secondary school. In the eyes of the banks, this type of customer lacks both the experience and security in terms of assets and
guarantors. In order to be able to start a company in Tanzania, entrepreneurs have to develop a strategy that enables them to deal with the lack of startup capital. Typically, their strategies involve starting small or having a number of alternative product ranges and gradually growing their businesses to the level where they can initiate the activities they had originally envisioned. As interviewee 6 indicated: “…our country does not have a system that can enable a person to borrow large amounts of money. That is why you see entrepreneurs like me divide our businesses into several small businesses.” Under these circumstances, entrepreneurs tend not to pursue business opportunities that would require a large outlay of money upfront (e.g. in real estate and large scale engineering projects) which are also key to the country’s competitiveness. This means that the development of opportunity-driven entrepreneurship by graduate entrepreneurs continues to suffer from the limited financial services and the financial sector’s tendency to focus either on micro and informal businesses via micro-credit schemes or on large established companies with regular business credit schemes.

Conversely, credit restrictions also occur in the informal institutional sector due to limited family resources. In a number of instances entrepreneurs have faced options of whether to work with friends and family or other entrepreneurs, suppliers, customers and employees. In all instances, it seems that the question of trust was of a determining importance in choosing who to employ or trade with. For example, one of our interviewees (no. 5), facing lack of start-up capital, had to decide whether or not to enter into a partnership with other entrepreneurs. This strategic decision enabled him to embark on the construction of a beach hotel, a project that would otherwise be impossible to be undertaken by a single entrepreneur with limited financial resources: “…we were so lucky, one of my business partners, my elder brother, got into another business partnership with his friend. We were now to build a beach hotel. This guy had a plot at the beach, but did not have the money to build….. Also there was another guy that my brother went to high school with, this guy said ‘let’s start the hotel project by first contributing money that is equivalent to the value of the beach plot’... “, stated interviewee 5.

As pointed out earlier, the perception of trust (or lack of it) affects the choice of suppliers, agents and employees. For instance, interviewee 2 felt that he should not turn to a friend as an import agent; instead he opted for a Chinese trader: “… I decided not to use my friend as an agent. I did not trust him, you see? He might disappear with my money! You know there is this common problem among Tanzanians, what they talk about is not what they worship….. So I kept talking the deal with Mr. Lee [a Chinese trader], he speaks good English too…” In many cases, entrepreneurs have faced suppliers who do not meet their contractual obligations, or employees who attempt to swindle money or products from the business.
Despite the different approaches to identifying trustworthy business partners, trust is a recurring element in business decisions among Tanzanian entrepreneurs. Trust works both as a facilitative and inhibitive factor in all stages of an entrepreneurial activity, affecting the startup as much as the financing, staffing and trading.

Free trade has resulted in an increase of imports in Tanzania. There has been an influx of cheap products from countries like China and India, which have tended to cripple local production. The relaxation of import conditions like import duties in some of the products seemed to be justified by the argument that local production has failed to meet local demand, especially for food products. But this has been at the expense of local producers and sellers of locally made items. Interviewee 2, who runs a sunflower oil refinery plant, had the following comment: “…in the market, we compete with too much imported [edible] oils, which do not pay tax. This automatically disadvantages us…” In most cases, imported products come from countries that enjoy both advanced technologies and low costs of production hence having mass production. When these products are exempt from taxation or benefit from tax reduction, the imported products are sold at cheaper prices than locally produced goods. As a consequence, these foreigners have a competitive advantage over the domestic entrepreneurs. Several respondents have indicated their concerns that foreigners, in particular Chinese traders, are currently dominating the streets that used to be the domain of the local street vendors.

While currently technological developments in IT, telecommunications and transport are better than in the past decade, there are still significant complications with the quality of internally developed products and the level of after-sale services from suppliers of machines and other technological equipment that entrepreneurs acquire for their business operations. Interviewee 1 explains his experience with his street lamp project: “…I started the process of making the [street lamp] poles, I went to VETA; they made such horrible poles. They kept on falling after being installed in the streets. I entered into a loss of about Tshs. 12 million….frankly speaking, there is a big percentage of Tanzanians who cannot deliver results…” This respondent lost money in the very early stages of his business and resorted to importing the street lamps from outside the country. While imported goods offer some assurance on quality, imports come with a number of other problems, including less assurance of the after-sale services due to the distance between the supplier and customer. It limits the growth of the local manufacturing firms and, in most cases, goods from outside have proven to be very expensive due to taxation and cumbersome import clearing processes.
Adding to such outlays is the widely accepted practice of paying bribes. Tanzanian entrepreneurs are most likely to face corruption when tendering for business contracts and when dealing with institutions like the police, local government authorities and other regulatory bodies. Interviewee 6 explained this situation: “...it is not about delivery; it is not about the quality, or otherwise. There are a lot of strange things out there! ...I may need a business contract, I say: “listen here, you have your Tshs. 200,000 and I have my contract ...” While corruption is against the law, the evidence from the ten interviews indicates that corruption has been justified to be a way of “how business is done here”. Corruption is taken to be a way of building networks, gaining access to and acceptability among different formal and informal institutions. Corruption presents an ethical challenge, meaning that it is hard to maintain a strong ethical standard and at the same time be able to make progress in business life.

While taxation is among the domains where entrepreneurs come into contact with corruption, procedures in paying tax and other levies may also present an obstacle to business growth. The tax authority shows a number of procedural inefficiencies: “…you see that bus? It is now three weeks since I imported it. I have paid all the taxes everything, registration costs …everything. But to date I have not been given the number plate. Imagine, you paid all the taxes, but just a simple tin plate takes ages to come. …this is a third week my bus is standing there. I have incurred all the costs, but it is standing there unproductive” complained interviewee 6. While such delays lead to a loss of valuable time, entrepreneurs also face the possibility of being overcharged on their business income. The fear of paying high amounts of taxes has led many entrepreneurs to avoid growth and decide to remain in the informal sector or to operate micro businesses.

3.6 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The research reveals that Tanzanian graduate entrepreneurs take advantage of factors such as the changed political orientation, partnership among entrepreneurs, strong family ties, emerging links with countries like China, the presence of entrepreneurs of Asian origin, the growing awareness of entrepreneurship, the improved banking and taxation sector and the increase in foreign companies. However, the research also shows that graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania is still in its infancy and is facing a number of inhibitors, including the difficulties in raising start-up capital, inhibitive banking and taxation systems, problems of trust, poor technology, negative attitudes, corruption, poor policy implementation at lower levels of government, and the increasing threat from cheap
imports from countries like China. The findings in this study align with earlier conducted studies on Tanzanian entrepreneurship and youth entrepreneurship in Africa (cf. Kristiansen, 2001; Tillmar, 2006; World Bank, 2004). However, where the existing literature generally emphasizes a singular external factor in terms as facilitator or impediment of Tanzanian entrepreneurship, the current research shows that, among the graduate entrepreneurs, the embeddedness in the social environmental is not singular but mixed. This mixed embeddedness does not simply strengthen or weaken entrepreneurship in Tanzania. Instead, mixed embeddedness implies that there are complex, partly converging and partly conflicting institutional forces at work which at the same time advance and impede entrepreneurial activities. Frustration with the slow pace of change and lingering institutional barriers are among the factors causing graduates to be less attracted to entrepreneurship in recent years. Still, most Tanzanians who engage in entrepreneurship do so because they cannot find adequate employment in larger firms or government bodies because of low levels of education which restrict their chances on the labor market. This, however, is not the case for graduates in Tanzania. Highly educated individuals in Tanzania engage in entrepreneurship as they recognize opportunities and are driven by a strong motivation. At the same time, their attempts at entrepreneurship are hampered by what Schmitz (1982) termed as “internal problems”, including a mismatch of education and the business environment and a lack of entrepreneurial skills and managerial capabilities, and “external problems”, comprising of lack of access to resources, inhibitive formal institutions and exploitation by larger enterprises. These problems, as it is the case in many other developing countries, largely explain why most businesses created by graduates remain of a small-scale, informal and survivalist nature (Kristiansen, 2001; Schmitz, 1982). Since many businesses are generated as a survival strategy and micro-businesses are most abundant and visible in Tanzanian society, it is hardly surprising that entrepreneurship holds a low status and is not a desirable career choice for most middle class Tanzanians. Most Tanzanian parents invest in their children’s education in order to secure their future employment in a stable and well-paid job (Al-Samarrai and Peasgood, 1998; Bergmann, 1996). Therefore, when a graduate becomes interested in entrepreneurship, parents and other family members respond with skepticism. With few successful entrepreneurial role models present in Tanzanian society (Nkirina, 2010), it is not surprising that the older generation who still carry the institutional legacy of the Ujamaa principle, continue to be cautious of private enterprise, and do not see this as a suitable career choice for their educated children. However, the politico-institutional situation in Tanzania is changing towards conditions that are more conducive to entrepreneurship. The changed tone in government policies, the current
advocacy of entrepreneurship and its education, and the growing awareness and interest towards entrepreneurship are some of the indicators of the current entrepreneurial awakening in Tanzania. Although the government is in support of private enterprises, the implementers of policies, i.e. the civil servants, are still slow to adopt the change which enforces the antagonistic and suspicious relationship between the state and the private sector (cf. Temu and Due, 2000).

Opportunity-driven entrepreneurship is suffering from a persistent scarcity of resources in Tanzania. Lacking support structures and credit facilities reflect the widely held assumption that entrepreneurship in Tanzania mainly concerns small scale initiatives aimed at survival and livelihood provision. Hence micro-credit being widely available through banks and governmental initiatives. While there is a significant growth in the banking and financial credit sector (Lwiza and Nwanko, 2002; Temu and Due, 2000), banks in Tanzania hardly provide larger credits to opportunity-driven graduate entrepreneurs. In general, the services of the financial sector are accessible exclusively to large, established corporations. Consequently, when starting a business, graduate entrepreneurs in Tanzania largely rely on family members for both the startup capital and unpaid labor (Marsden, 1992). The strong ties between them and relatives and other entrepreneurs (both local and foreign) provide the graduate entrepreneurs in our sample with business ideas as much as start-up capital, partnership opportunities, trusted human resources, and even weak-tied network relations. Yet, as studies in other parts of the world have shown, family ties might also undermine entrepreneurship, in particular if these ties forge obligations of bounded solidarity (cf. Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1973) that may drain business resources for private consumption and burden the business with family members as salaried but redundant personnel. This is true in Tanzania, as family members expect jobs for which they are not qualified and may drain the entrepreneur of resources by demanding financial support (Egbert, 2009). However, embeddedness in strong-tied networks is not based on ethnic or family ties alone. Many Tanzanian entrepreneurs forge ties beyond their immediate social circle and establish trust-based relations with actors with whom they maintain weak ties in order to sustain their entrepreneurial endeavors.

Trust, in general is a major issue. Whether it concerns relationships with family members, friends, local business people or international business connections, all graduate entrepreneurs in our sample continued to bring up the issue of trust. Graduate entrepreneurs in Tanzania have rather limited control over the outcomes of their business interactions, as they seldom have alternative relationships to turn to for resources if a particular relation does not deliver, nor do they have the
necessary financial means to hire a lawyer and go to court to settle disputes. Under such circumstances, personal trust gains importance. By relying on trusted relations, they reduce transaction costs through obtaining information and a means to enforce contracts (Welter and Smallbone, 2005). Overall, their sense of control in complex situations is enhanced (Höhmann and Malieva, 2005). Yet, the interviews also reveal that trust is broken frequently due to conflicts of interests and opportunistic behavior.

In recent years, the number of foreign companies entering the Tanzanian market has increased rapidly (Mkenda, 2005; Rutihinda, 2007). Tanzania is experiencing a surge of Chinese influence in all sectors of the economy, and there also has been an increase in trade between Tanzania and countries in Middle East, and Asia in general. The positive effects of such foreign direct investments on the economic development of developing countries are widely recognized, as they increase tax revenues, fill part of the gap between desired investment and domestically mobilized savings, bring superior management, technology and human capital, and lead to the formation of jobs and consequently help the country reduce poverty (Borenzstein, De Gregorio and Lee, 1998). While acknowledging these advantages for the Tanzanian economy, local entrepreneurs do not necessarily benefit from foreign entrants as suggested by Szogs (2008), as relatively few local entrepreneurs possess the necessary absorptive capacity to benefit from knowledge spillovers from foreign entrepreneurs. In developing countries, foreign entrants have competitive advantage over local entrepreneurs in terms of access to financial capital and superior technology and knowledge. Using such competitive advantage, foreign entrants outperform and sometimes even replace local entrepreneurs, causing damage to existing local economic arrangements. This may result in disembeddedness of Tanzanian entrepreneurs from their local economy. This has been a concern to many Tanzanian entrepreneurs. The government, enforcing its strategy to increase foreign investment, has eased the way for foreign investors. However, not all foreigners starting a business in Tanzania qualify as investors in terms of the type and size of their business. Some operate at the level of street vendors competing with the local micro businesses. However, while this may seem to be to the disadvantage of many local entrepreneurs, for some perceptive graduate entrepreneurs the presence of foreign competitors has provided an opportunity to forge access to new products, markets, technologies and partnerships.

Although the current research does not have the ambition to identify and explain individual differences between the interviewed graduate entrepreneurs, it should be noted that the listed
contextual enablers and inhibitors exert different effects on each individual entrepreneur. The differences in perceptions of the opportunities and restrictions may indeed be related to individual divergence in entrepreneurial capabilities. The same contextual factor may be viewed as being within their control – hence an opportunity - by one entrepreneur and out of their control – hence a restriction - by another. Therefore, it seems that while the general entrepreneurial climate in Tanzania remains rather adverse, resourceful entrepreneurs manage to find a way of dealing with the identified hurdles and drive their business from a mere idea to a full-grown enterprise. The question that remains to be answered is to what extent academic entrepreneurship education enhances the graduates’ ability to identify business opportunities and to thrive under complex market conditions.

3.7 REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Reflecting on policy and educational implications of the findings, probably the first concern that policy-makers need to ponder is the evident gap that exists between the national drive towards creating entrepreneurial graduates and the lower levels of government and implementing institutions that are key to the realization of this policy objective (e.g. training institutions, financial institutions, tax authorities, local government authorities, civil servants, and the community at large). The problem is rooted in difficulties of translating policy goals formulated at a ministerial level into specific measures to be taken at lower government levels. This calls for policy-makers to think of a proper framework that will guarantee the realization of different policy goals at lower levels. For example, there could be specific tax reliefs granted to graduates’ start-ups, or improvements in the legal framework that would establish trust in contractual agreements beyond the common reliance on informal ties.

At the level of educational institutions, the challenge is to enhance the relevance of entrepreneurship courses and programs taught in universities for addressing practical issues in the Tanzanian context. It is a common cry, also among the interviewed graduates, that university courses do not prepare them to face the challenges in business practice. While a course lists banks and micro-finances as sources of capital, bankers in the real world say they do not offer loans to start-ups. Teaching entrepreneurship has to move beyond listing strategies for raising capital. Students need also to be equipped with skills enabling them to deal with negative attitudes, competition from cheap imports, choice of appropriate technologies, and to take advantage of other factors that are unique to the Tanzanian context. Therefore, while there is an eminent need to
improve training programs in Tanzania, there is also a need to develop entrepreneurs who would be able to navigate in local troubled waters. This could be done by working with a “triple helix” approach (cf. Etzkowitz, 2003), which advocates the engagement of (higher) education with both the industries and government. In terms of entrepreneurship education in Tanzania a triple helix approach would imply the involvement of financial institutions, local entrepreneurs and policy-makers in the design, teaching and evaluation of entrepreneurship programs offered at the university.
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### APPENDICES

**Appendix 3-1 Profile of interviewed graduate entrepreneurs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Business Sector(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Business Administration (Marketing)</td>
<td>Advertising and Marketing Solutions</td>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Diploma in Locomotive Technician</td>
<td>Agri-business, sunflower oil refinery</td>
<td>Morogoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Business Accounting &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Butchery, Rice farming, Transport</td>
<td>Morogoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• MBA in Corporate Management, Advanced Diploma in Taxation</td>
<td>Import of Car Accessories and Electrical appliances</td>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• MBA in International Business, Certified Public Accountant (CPA-T), Postgraduate Diploma in Financial Management, Advanced Diploma in Accountancy</td>
<td>Pharmaceuticals; Hospitality/Beach Hotels; Tour and Transport operators; Real Estate</td>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Advance Diploma in Economic Planning</td>
<td>Transportation, Micro-credit; Rice and Crop Milling</td>
<td>Morogoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Science in Forestry</td>
<td>Civil Engineering Contractor; Hotels; Crop Milling and Wholesaling</td>
<td>Morogoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>• Master of Laws (LLM); Bachelor of Laws (LLB); Diploma in Beauty Therapy; Certificate in Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Bridal Care and Beauty Therapy; Cosmetology Training Center</td>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Science in Agribusiness</td>
<td>Milking processing</td>
<td>Morogoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Science in Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Poultry, Horticulture</td>
<td>Kibaha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

4 UNIVERSITY ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION IN TANZANIA:  
Aligning Teaching Context, Students’ Profile, Expectations and Outcome

“...non-alignment is signified by inconsistencies, unmet expectations, and practices that contradict what we preach...”  
(Biggs, 2003)

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In Africa, the education of entrepreneurial graduates is equated with the future prosperity of the nation (Kenway et al, 2004 in Morley et al, 2009). This purported economic role of entrepreneurs in Africa (Bigsten and Soberbon, 2006; Marsden, 1992) and the apparent link between an entrepreneur’s level of education to the quality of business innovations, growth and success (Kuzilwa, 2005; Robinson and Sexton, 1994) increased the demand for entrepreneurship education. In Tanzania, the increase in the number of enterprising graduates thus has been a major policy priority (Wedgwood, 2007; Kaijage, 2001; Kristiansen, 2001). Yet, surprisingly, self-employment among graduates has recently been reported to be falling (Al-Samarrai and Bennell, 2003; Mukyanuzi, 2003). Therefore the conundrum of the effectiveness of teaching entrepreneurship in this specific context provides an interesting focus.

Making use of an instructional design model, this chapter seeks to explain the simultaneous and paradoxical growth in attention to entrepreneurship in university education and declining graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzanian university entrepreneurship education (UEE). Specifically, the study sets out to find what the Tanzanian UEE is attempting to achieve and the ways in which this objective is being implemented. This was done by answering the following set of questions:

1. What are the objectives, methods and general teaching context of the Tanzanian UEE?

---

3 This chapter was co-authored with Dr. Wakkee, I. and Prof. Groenewegen, P. The paper was presented at the IntEnt 2010 Global Conference at HAN University in Holland. An alternative version which takes a broader perspective on the entrepreneurial nature of the universities has been accepted for publication in Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education, – Entrepreneurial University Handbook Vol. 4 (eds. Fayolle, A. and Redford, D.)
2. What are the general entry-level profile, career interests and learning expectations of UEE students in Tanzania?
3. To what extent does UEE in Tanzania meet students’ expectations? And to what degree does it influence students’ interest towards a career in entrepreneurship?
4. What is the state-of-alignment between the teaching contexts, methods, and students’ profile? Does this explain the current level of achievement?

The paper has two aims. First, it aims at understanding the steps in the process of entrepreneurship education that might lead to an increase in high-value entrepreneurial activities in developing countries. Second, it extends instructional design theories to the domain of entrepreneurship educations. Thus answering the call to exploit already developed and empirically established educational theories to the field of entrepreneurship education (Bechard and Gregoire, 2005 in Hannon, 2006). Biggs (2003) 3P model of teaching and learning is used to guide the study.

4.2 ESSENCE OF UEE IN TANZANIA

Tanzania, in East Africa, is emerging from its own type of Socialism the ujamaa Na kujitegemea (socialism and self-reliance). During the ujamaa era, entrepreneurship was actively discouraged. Major political changes started to take place in the late 1980s, when the government embarked on trade liberalization in which entrepreneurship, as observed by Wedgewood (2007), became a key to the country’s development, and was now to be inculcated in the society’s cultures (URT, 1999a).

In Tanzania, the role of education as a culture-influencing tool was and is well recognized both in the socialist era, and the current times. In the socialist era, education was used as major tool for building a socialist society. Students, at all levels of education, were instructed in subjects that had sufficient elements of political education. This has changed and entrepreneurship education has almost completely replaced the former socialist-based topics (Kristiansen, 2001). Nevertheless, as reflected in a number of policy statements, they seem to be unsatisfied by the ability of universities in developing entrepreneurial graduates. In the Trade Policy of 2002, for example, higher education institutions were categorically blamed for their tendency to create employment seekers rather than job creators (URT, 2002). This, among other issues, prompted the need to review the traditional subjects and to incorporate training in entrepreneurship (URT, 1999a; URT, 1999b; URT, 2003).
It was however not only politics that led to the creation of UEE in Tanzania. Kaijage (2000) and UDSM (2001), show that individual universities also turned to the teaching of entrepreneurship based on their own internal initiatives. There were a number of factors that played a role within these initiatives. For example, in almost all institutions, academicians searched for new knowledge and needed to respond to the changing external demands, where entrepreneurship was now considered to be in vogue and in demand in student and labor markets. This led to the starting of entrepreneurship centers in almost every university. Furthermore, universities felt the need to improve the general competitiveness of their graduates in the labor market. This was after an outcry by employers about the poor quality and lack of innovativeness among Tanzanian graduates, especially when compared to their counterparts in the region (e.g. Kenya and Uganda). Furthermore, in some universities (or faculties) specializing in non-business studies like engineering and agriculture, entrepreneurship education was a response to the difficulties that their graduates faced in the labor market. The fall in demand for these specializations in the labor market, especially after the government had stopped its direct employment policy, proved the inability of these graduates to seek alternative means of employment. So self-employment and entrepreneurship were seen as key options hence the need to teach the subject. This provides the context in which we apply Biggs (2003) 3P Model of Teaching and Learning.

4.3 CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Biggs (2003) 3P model, in figure 4.1 below, has been previously employed by course developers and evaluators in their efforts to assure a “proper alignment” within their educational systems (Reeves, 2006; Freeth and Reeves, 2004; Barrie in Santhanam, 2001). The 3P model of teaching and learning, the teaching/learning program is made up by three main components called presage, process and product. In an aligned instructional system, the presage and process interact to produce the product, in service to a common goal (Biggs, 1999). In the remaining part of the conceptual framework, each of these components is given a wider consideration on how it relates to an entrepreneurship program.
4.3.1 The presage: the teaching context

As visualized in figure 4.1, the teaching context is made up of four components teaching objectives, teachers’ profiles and their perceptions of the subject and students, assessment methods, and the overall climate. In particular the first two are important in the Tanzanian case.

4.3.1.1 Objectives in teaching entrepreneurship

In a given teaching context or institutional-setting, the design of an entrepreneurship course should be dependent on the type of graduates educators intend to produce. These objectives should simultaneously be derived from current social needs and the demands for specific skills and knowledge by the students, employers, the government, and the institution itself (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008). Hytti and O’Gorman (2004) inspired by Gibb (1999) identified three categories of objectives for teaching/learning entrepreneurship i.e. to learn to understand entrepreneurship, to learn to become entrepreneurial, and to learn to become an entrepreneur. In chapter 2, the three objectives are termed as to learn about entrepreneurship, to learn in, and to learn for entrepreneurship respectively (also see Kirby, 2004). Despite the current scholarly insights that entrepreneurship education should be concerned with more than new venture creation, key stakeholders, especially politicians and various policy-makers, continue to believe that entrepreneurship education should
(only) be concerned with stimulating students to start towards self-employment (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008), hence paying less attention to the other possible outcomes of this type of education.

4.3.1.2 Teachers’ profile and perceptions

Entrepreneurship is clearly a relatively new research and teaching domain at universities around the world (Hindle, 2007), and this poses a challenge to the profile of existing lecturers (Kuratko, 2005; Low, 2001). As a consequence very few (senior) lecturers have had an opportunity to be educated in entrepreneurship as a student or junior faculty member. In many instances, especially in Africa, universities had to follow new government policy directives, and hence had to hastily adopt entrepreneurial subjects, with little regard to the availability of appropriately educated faculty members. Consequently, entrepreneurship is often taught by lecturers who have sometimes forcibly switched from their original (more or less related) specializations to entrepreneurship. The limited availability of educators has furthermore led to large, overcrowded class-sizes and limited opportunities for small scale more intensive types of education.

Added to the shortage of educators is the current discussion of the qualities of the educators. Many educators who have had to move into entrepreneurship education lack sufficient theoretical understanding of the nature and diversity of entrepreneurship. Furthermore, it seems that few of them have actual hands on entrepreneurial experience either through running their own business or by being responsible for entrepreneurial activities in their employer’s name. Yet it is argued that since entrepreneurship is a subject defined by action (Jack and Anderson, 1999), it is best taught using action-based methods, and that preferably people who have experienced the act of starting and running a business should teach it (cf. Birch in Aronsson, 2004; Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004). This is what Hindle (2007) termed as a practitioner-view of teaching entrepreneurship. McMullan (2003) as echoed in Hindle (2007) pointed out that entrepreneurship is a field with missing educators, in which most teaching is conducted by what he termed as “ad-hoc adjunct-practitioners” and “re-tread” academicians. To remedy this, Hindle (2007) argues for a well-balanced, well-mixed team of committed good teachers or a multiple presenters approach (academicians and practitioners) within one subject, but depending on the topic under discussion.

One last consideration, from the teachers’ point of view, is the different perspectives existing on what entrepreneurship is and on who can learn the subject. In entrepreneurship, there are two issues
that have to do with perceptions: (1) teachers’ perception on the teachability of entrepreneurship; and (2) teachers’ perception/characterization of the students. First with respect to the teachability of entrepreneurship, although at the moment there seems to be a consensus amongst entrepreneurship scholars that entrepreneurship can be taught (Kuratko, 2005) still many scholars from outside this specific domain continue to doubt this stand (Hindle, 2007). Given the earlier observation that in Tanzania few lecturers have a background in entrepreneurship, we do not know if these lecturers actually endorse the teachability of entrepreneurship. If they have doubts and if such doubts are being voiced by an educator, especially in the presence of students, the legitimacy of the field is damaged, thereby affecting the impact of entrepreneurship courses on students. Second, when it comes to teachers’ perception of the students, there is a probability of a miss-match between what the teacher perceives to be the type of students he/she is teaching vs. the actual students’ profile. This miss-match, according to Ferguson (2003) may cause a major hurdle in achieving learning goals. In practice, teachers have tended to adjust their teaching approaches in accordance to the perceived level of students’ ability, attitudes, and aptitude towards the subject (Sparks and Ganschow, 2001). These perceptions, as argued in Ferguson (2003), interact with the actual students’ beliefs, behaviors, and work habits during the learning process. The result is that a misplaced perception on the teacher’s side, will lead to a miss-directed teaching approach.

4.3.2 The presage: students’ factors

In course design, educators have also to deal with a question of: “Who should learn?” Answers to this question have a significant impact on the achievement of teaching/learning objectives (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008; Hindle, 2007; Fayolle et al, 2006). The students’ profile is generally explained by their entry level abilities, skills, past experiences, beliefs, values, and career goals. Students are packed with a number of entry level abilities and expectations which provides the baseline for their reactions to the course (Gigliotti, 1987). University students in particular are highly diverse with respect to levels and stage of education, disciplinary backgrounds (business, science, arts, humanities, medical) and personal backgrounds, attitudes, learning expectations, and career interests (Brand, Wakkee and Van der Veen, 2008). These aspects also shape students’ expectations about the course, in terms of what benefits will be achieved by attending the course (Gigliotti, 1987). Expectations, if considered by the teacher, open up opportunities to make the learning process as responsive as possible to learners’ differing goals and starting points (Appleton-Knapp and Krentler, 2006; Freeth and
Reeves, 2004). This is supported by a study that demonstrated that students’ learning expectations were highly related to (and driven by) their career interests (Byrne and Robertson, 2005). These effects may be reinforced by the changing employers’ preferences (Henderson and Robertson, 1999). Thus career interests may translate to students’ demand for learning a particular course, which in entrepreneurship education, align with the three possible needs for learning the subject i.e. learn to understand entrepreneurship (about), learn to become an entrepreneurs (for) or learn to be more entrepreneurial (in) at work places (Jack and Anderson, 1999).

4.3.3 The process: methods of teaching entrepreneurship

The question of how entrepreneurship should be taught was highly debatable in the nineties (cf. McMullan and Long, 1987). And it remains so today, Hindle (2007) echoes McMullan and Long by his remarks that teaching methods in entrepreneurship education are considered inadequate simply because they are still based on traditional approaches used by business schools. The choice of what should take place in a learning process should be done in recognition of the important distinction and relationship between teaching for (vocational) or teaching about (theory and impact) entrepreneurship (Hindle, 2007; Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004). The choice of methods and learning activities, as discussed earlier, is also inherently dependent on the educators’ conception of entrepreneurial learning in view of objectives of teaching.

Biggs (1999) argues that learning is a result of students’ learning-focused activities which are engaged by students as a result of both their own perception and inputs and of total teaching context. Within this school of thought, it is argued that what matters is not what the teacher does; rather what the student does to learn. Biggs (1999) distinguishes teaching/learning activities into teacher-focused and student-focused. Teacher-focused strategies are a mere transmission of information from the teacher (an expert) to students (inexpert). This focuses on what the teacher does i.e. getting it across. In student-focused approach, the main feature is what the student does, which aims at bringing about a conceptual change in students’ understanding of the world (Biggs, 1999).

The teaching methods need be based on the curriculum objectives (Biggs, 1996). For instance, it would seem appropriate to use a teacher-focused teaching strategy in a course about entrepreneurship. This is where the subject is taught mainly as theoretical phenomena and its related
impact on other phenomena (Hindle, 2007). In this scenario, the teacher (as an expert) will be concerned with transmitting the concepts and theories about entrepreneurship to the recipient students. A combination of methods (i.e. teacher-centered and student-centered) would be needed where the objective is to teach for entrepreneurship. In this latter scenario, the students need to first understand the theoretical side of entrepreneurship, and later using student-centered approach, need to gain the mastery of entrepreneurial competencies by being exposed to practical issues of entrepreneurship. In a student-centered approach, an important question to a teacher is not what am I going to teach today? But what am I going to have my students do today? Fiet (2001)

4.3.4 The product: outcome of an entrepreneurship course

At this juncture, we need to pay attention to the outcome of entrepreneurship courses where we follow Hytti and Kuopusjarvi (2004) arguing that impact of an entrepreneurship course should be measured against the planned teaching/learning objectives; and hence be consistent to the essence and need of entrepreneurship education as discussed in chapter 2 (i.e. to educate about, in and for entrepreneurship). Evaluating the achievement of these objectives has been among the most challenging issues in this field. This is due to the difficulty in establishing a direct cause-and-effect link between students’ attendance in a course with their future actions. It is especially difficult when measuring the impact of education for entrepreneurship as evidence suggests that on average graduates start their first business between 10 and 15 years after graduation (Galloway and Brown, 2002) while those who start within 5 years have a much higher chance of failing. This suggests that entrepreneurship education may only have an indirect impact and needs to be combined with other types of experiences. Therefore it seems sensible to build on Pittway and Cope (2007) and measure impact in terms of: students’ change of perception towards entrepreneurship, or a change of some behavioral attributes rather than in acting entrepreneurially. To this regard, Vesper and Gartner (1997) argue that high quality entrepreneurship program would not only try to understand and meet the needs and expectations of current and future students (and other important stakeholders) but also try to measure how best they meet these expectations. Fitting with this approach also indicators like a change in students’ attitudes, career interests, aspiration or intentions towards becoming entrepreneurs may be used (see chapter 2). Additionally questions that identify students’ learning expectations, and to assess how the courses had met them (Hytti and Kuopusjarvi, 2004; Vesper and Gartner, 1997) may be employed.
4.3.5 The alignment in an entrepreneurship course

Biggs (2003) concept of constructive alignment calls instructional designers to seek a proper level of alignment among the components of a teaching system (i.e. alignment among the 3P), imbalance in the system will lead to poor teaching and surface learning. Non-alignment is noticeable by inconsistencies, unmet expectations, and practices that contradict what we preach. According to Biggs (1996) efforts to seek alignment usually focuses on three crucial areas: (1) objective setting, (2) learning activities and situations, and (3) assessment of the outcome.

A discussion on alignment is likely to lead to the re-discussion of a number of issues covered in discussion of the composing elements of the 3P model. However, once again the setting of teaching objectives, at the presage stage, should reflect what the teachers want the student to learn in terms of performances of understanding or exhibition of specific attributes (Treleaven and Voola, 2008; Biggs, 1996). Of course, in an entrepreneurship course these would be in accordance with the teaching for, in and about entrepreneurship. But, the main challenge would be not only be on choosing of teaching methods, but also on devising assessment methods that would give evidence that students have actually acquired the intended attribute. The main focus in the constructive alignment concept is that learning outcomes have to be consistent with the course objectives. The outcomes are in terms of different levels of understanding (Biggs, 1996), or set of attributes, skills (Treleaven and Voola, 2008). The evidence of the highest level of understanding is the students’ performance of that understanding when faced with different situations. A challenge that educators, face is to achieve a reasonable alignment among the 3P of the teaching system. According to Kirby (2004) educators must be able to measure the product or outcome of learning/teaching both qualitatively and quantitatively (i.e. the acquired entrepreneurial skills, attributes and behaviors, and probably in terms of new start-ups).

4.4 METHODS

As summarized in appendix 4.1 this section presents data collection methods, sources and types of data, in relation to each of the research issues.
4.4.1 Semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis

Research question 1 seeks to characterize the UEE in Tanzania, hence it was more exploratory and best approached using qualitative interviews and documentary analysis (Shields and Tajalli, 2006). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 entrepreneurship lecturers. The choice of the lecturers was restricted to those allocated to teach the subject in the semester under this study. As done in Kember and Kwan (2000), interview questions were pre-conceived so as to have a framework of themes that fell in the categories that addressed the variables in the presage of a teaching context. And, to complement the interviews, as recommended by Wellington (2000), a number of documents were collected and reviewed, including course-outlines and government policies relating to entrepreneurship and higher education (see appendix 4.1).

The analysis of the qualitative data was aimed at a systematic recording of themes and issues from the 10 interviews, and to link them together (Burnard, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1994) such that it would be convenient to identify: the teaching objectives, methods, policy-drivers, lecturers’ perception of students, and lecturers’ profile. These common themes were captured from specific quotations in the interview transcripts and were then used to support the findings (cf. Kember and Kwan, 2000; Corcoran and Stewart, 1998; Burnard, 1996).

4.4.2 Questionnaire

A survey instrument, as part of a larger EIQ (entrepreneurial intention questionnaire), was used to collect students’ related data both before teaching commenced (t=0) and at the end (t=1) of a course. The target participants were undergraduate students taking an entrepreneurship course in the four universities. It was established that in all the four universities 1124 students were expected to take entrepreneurship courses in that semester. Of these 932 students (82.9%) participated in the first round of the survey and 706 students (62.8%) in the second round. Matching of the two datasets (round 1 and 2) was done using students’ registration numbers. This showed that a total of 433 students (38.5%) participated in both rounds of the survey and hence qualified for analysis of educational outcomes (CBE n=85 (19.6%); IFM, n=122 (28.2%); Mzumbe n=20 (4.6%); and SUA n=206 (47.6%)). The reasons for non-participation of the other students were mainly non-attendance on the day that the questionnaires were administered. Following the method by which the questionnaire was administered, it is assumed that there was no selectivity problem for the non-
response. This is due to the fact that students had no prior knowledge of the exact date and time at which the questionnaire was to be administered; hence non-response was purely by chance rather than intentional.

Questions in the questionnaire were formulated following the earlier discussed generic teaching/learning objectives/expectations: i.e. to teach/learn about, in, or for (Kirby, 2004; or see chapter 2). The answer categories were in a 7 point Likert-type scale, in which students were asked to indicate the level at which they place their learning expectations in questions like: “to what extent do you expect that this course will develop you in each of the following areas: (1) to obtain a general understanding about entrepreneurship; (2) to obtain necessary abilities to work as an entrepreneurial employee, (3) to obtain the necessary abilities and skills in starting your own business venture.” Two additional questions were also included asking students to indicate the level at which they are attracted to both salary employment and entrepreneurship. The second round questionnaire included the same questions, but now asked the students to indicate the level at which each of the above expectations have been achieved by the course. The career interest question remained the same for the purpose of observing how students will change their responses after the course.

The survey data were analyzed in three steps, the first was to run a descriptive analysis to ascertain: (1) students’ general entry-level profile (i.e. age, gender, percentage of those who attempted starting own business, and those who had parents who started/run a business); (2) students’ overall levels of learning expectation and interest towards either salary employment or entrepreneurship. Then, the second stage, a correlation analysis was done to establish how students’ learning expectations related to: (a) students’ entry profile (i.e. age, gender, entrepreneurial experience, and parents’ entrepreneurial attempts); (b) students’ levels of career attraction (i.e. salary employment and self-employment). The third stage of analysis, used both datasets for round 1 and 2, to run paired samples t-tests (cf. Appleton-Knapp and Krentler, 2006; Smith and Wertlieb, 2005) for the purpose of comparing the mean scores of: (a) Students’ learning expectations at start of the course with their ratings on how the courses had met these expectations; (b) change in students’ attractions towards both entrepreneurship and salary employment. Paired samples t-test was repeated but this time for students’ sub-groups (i.e. male/female, with/without experience in starting own business, and if parents had/had not started a business). ANOVA analyses were run at both instances of testing (i.e. t = 0 and t = 1) so that to observe the differences among the four universities.
4.5 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This part has two sections: The first, presents the qualitative findings in relations to the Tanzanian UEE teacher’s profiles, their perceptions on students and appropriate teaching methods followed by an overview of the aspired teaching objectives. The second section presents survey results relating to students’ entry profile, career interests, learning expectations, correlations among these components, paired samples t-test results which show the extent and significance of how the UEE had met students’ learning expectations, and influenced students’ career interests.

4.5.1 Lecturers’ profiles and perceptions

Building from the conceptual framework, three issues were addressed in this section: (1) lecturers’ education background in relation to entrepreneurship (2) lecturers’ perceptions on how entrepreneurship should be taught vs. applied methods of teaching; and (3) lecturers’ perception of students’ entry profile in relation to the subject.

Table 4.1 provides a summary of lecturers’ explanations in relation to their education background and experiences in teaching the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee No.</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Educational qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
<td>College of Business Education</td>
<td>MSc. Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>Mzumbe University</td>
<td>MSc. Management Studies - Strategy and Innovation; BBA. Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>PhD. MBA. Business Administration; BCom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>College of Business Education</td>
<td>MBA. Corporate management; BSc. Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>Tumaini University College</td>
<td>BBA-Accounting; Diploma in Education- Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
<td>Sokoine University</td>
<td>MSc. Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
<td>Mzumbe University</td>
<td>MA. Marketing management; BA Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 8</td>
<td>Institute of Finance</td>
<td>MBA Marketing; Advanced Diploma in Materials Administration; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 9</td>
<td>Sokoine University</td>
<td>PhD Agriculture, MSc. Agriculture. Econ; BSc. Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 10</td>
<td>Sokoine University</td>
<td>MBA-Agribusiness; BSc. Agronomy; Diploma in Banking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In almost all universities, entrepreneurship was hastily adopted as a subject. There were no proper review of the teaching capacity and expertise among the member of faculties. One of the respondent lecturers recalled the situation:

“No specific person was prepared for the subject… [there was] no lecturer with appropriate education…” 
[...] the subject had to be thrown to somebody to teach it” (Source: interviewee 7).

At most universities faculty members were of the view that subject related to business studies or marketing. And therefore took for granted that anybody from the department of business studies could teach it.

Generally, there are a limited number of lecturers with specialized training or background in entrepreneurship. But evidence also shows that, in recent years, Tanzanian universities have increasingly invested in building teaching capacities in the field of entrepreneurship through both new recruitment and sending more members of faculty for further studies: “… There was an offer to lecturers to apply for two PhD scholarships in entrepreneurship. So me and my other colleague are specifically trained to promote entrepreneurship at this university…” (Source: Interviewee 6). In contrast, many that are educated are of a younger generation of graduates which means they will still need to obtain teaching experiences.

Moving on to the teaching objective, a review of official course outlines (summarized in appendix 4.1) indicates that the objectives in teaching of entrepreneurship may be generally grouped into two categories: (1) to give student an understanding of theories, roles, process, and of entrepreneurship so as to create a general appreciation and positive attitudes among the students; (2) to impart in students the skills and ability: on idea generation, opportunity identification, business planning, venture creation, managing growth. Further, from the analysis of the interviews with the 10 lecturers, almost similar teaching objectives are given, but this time with a somehow rhetoric tone, and a strong emphasis on “creating students who are destined for self-employment” (i.e. to teach for entrepreneurship). The following quotations from interviewee 4 and 7 support this observation:

“…to develop entrepreneurial spirit and culture… a positive attitude towards entrepreneurship. Our students to become innovative even when employed (Source: Interviewee 4).
“The objective is to give them ability to start own business…and be innovative and creative even when employed. But our main focus is to develop a graduate who will go into self-employment” (Source: Interviewee 7).

Despite the strong need to teach for entrepreneurship, there is also a common agreement among all lecturers that there is first a need to create awareness (i.e. to teach about it) and, that entrepreneurial skills obtained through the course can also be applied at workplaces (i.e. to teach in entrepreneurship).

In consideration of both the official course-outlines and responses by the 10 lecturers, it may be concluded that UEE in Tanzania, has three major objectives: (1) to create a general understanding about entrepreneurship among students; (2) to produce graduates with the skill, ability and intention to become entrepreneurs/self-employed; and (3) to create an enterprising work-force of graduates.

Table 4.2 presents a summary of the teaching methods that were originally prescribed by the school administration in the official course outlines/brochures, the methods of teaching which were actually applied, and the lecturers’ own views on the situation. The table shows the main teaching methods as follows: lectures, group discussions, and other traditional methods. These methods, also used in other subjects, are said to be convenient and cost effective for the currently over-crowded classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Prescribed methods</th>
<th>Applied methods</th>
<th>Envisaged methods by lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mzumbe University</td>
<td>Lectures and seminars</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>To involve practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokoine University</td>
<td>Practical and seminars on selected topics</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Practical-based methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Education</td>
<td>Not prescribed in course outline</td>
<td>Lectures and group discussions</td>
<td>The way carpenters are trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Finance Management</td>
<td>Not prescribed in course outline</td>
<td>Handouts and lectures</td>
<td>To involve local entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As supported in Table 4.2, lecturers think that to achieve the objectives, teaching should adopt a mixture of traditional teaching, and a form of apprenticeship, or other forms of interaction between faculties with local entrepreneurs. However, consistent with their view of the objectives of teaching
entrepreneurship, lecturers’ choice of what should be the teaching methods seems to be biased towards educate for entrepreneurship of the three objectives of teaching entrepreneurship).

In order to determine whether their students had actually learned something during their course, lecturers at all four universities used written exams based on multiple choice and or open ended questions. Unfortunately, lecturers were unwilling or unable to provide us with a list of the examination results per student but they are willing to show us the distribution of the results. As can be seen in Table 4.3, the marks suggest relatively good performance with the large majority of the students passing the courses. These findings are an indication that learning objectives have at least in the short term been met. In discussion section this findings will be further interpreted.

Table 4-3: Overall student performance on the end of semester entrepreneurship exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to what do lecturers think of their students’ entry attitudes and aptitude towards the subject and its related career, the general view is that the students come into the class with a negative attitude towards entrepreneurship and self-employment. And that their career aspirations are towards salaried jobs. This is evidenced from the quotes below:

“... The problem with our students is with their attitudes and mindsets towards entrepreneurship…”
(Source: interviewee 6);

“... Our students’ attitudes are copied from the older generation…” (Source: Interviewee 4).

The overall view of this section is suggesting that students enter in the class with neither awareness nor practical experience on the subject matter. It further indicates that lecturers have a clear judgment that students have limited exposure to entrepreneurial role models (e.g. parents, friends, and important others), who most of them had worked in during the socialist era, hence the negative influence on their children entrepreneurial mindsets. To achieve effectiveness, according to
the lecturers’ perceptions, would therefore mean to adopt training strategies that focus on changing students’ attitudes and at the same time impart the necessary skills for self-employment.

4.5.2 Students profile before the UEE

The 433 surveyed students had an average age of 25.2 years (standard deviation = 7.5), 58.2% of the respondents are males (n=252) and 35.8% are females (n=155), and 6% of the students (n=26) did not respond the gender question. A large number of respondents (i.e. 65.1%, n = 259) had parent(s) who had started or run own businesses. And 23% of the students (n=99) had started and operated businesses of their own. As indicated in Figure 4.2, the surveyed students have diverse specializations. The highest numbers of the students are from accounting and rural development courses followed by agriculture economics and agribusiness, which is explained by the share of respondents from Sokoine University of Agriculture. In order to check for differences across the different programs and institutions we conducted ANOVA analyses. The analyses indicated that no significant differences could be observed between students from the different study programs, in terms of age, entrepreneurial experience or parents running a firm.

![Figure 4-2: Students’ specialization and their percentages](image-url)
Looking at the demographic information in Table 4.4, while gender had no relationship to any of the variables, having a parent who had started/run own business had a significant link with students’ past attempts to start or run own business ($r = .157$, $p< 0.05$). This somehow confirms a conventional wisdom that parents can act as role models to their children where a child from an entrepreneurial family is likely to follow parent’s footsteps (Crant, 1996; Scherer, Adams, Carley, & Wiebe, 1989; Van Auken, Stephens, Fry, & Silva, 2006). But again, the correlational results in table 4.4 do not seem to fully support the role model assumption because there is no significant relationship between parents’ entrepreneurial status and students’ attraction to entrepreneurship as a future career. This may imply that while a student may attempt to start own business (to follow a parent’s example) this may not necessarily be a response to the attractiveness of entrepreneurship as a career, especially when the student exposed to other career possibilities.

Students’ attraction to salary-employment had no relationship with students’ expectation to learn about or for entrepreneurship. However, the results indicate that attraction to salary employment had positive and significant relationship with expectations to learn the necessary abilities to work as an innovative salaried employee, i.e. to learn in entrepreneurship ($r = .279$, $p< 0.01$) Also students’ attraction to a career in entrepreneurship correlated significantly with all the learning expectations. Specifically, attraction to entrepreneurship was positively related to learning about ($r = .218$, $p< 0.01$), learning in ($r = .125$, $p< 0.05$), and learning for ($r = .364$, $p< 0.01$). Attractions to salaried employment and to entrepreneurship were not significantly related, which can be explained by the limited spread in attraction to entrepreneurship which was very high for most respondents.

### Table 4-4: Correlations between entry profiles, career interest and learning expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ever started a business</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parents ever started own firm</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.164*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attracted to salaried job</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.106*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attracted to entrep.</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expect to learn about</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.134*</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expect to learn in</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>0.125*</td>
<td>0.297**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expect to learn for</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.135*</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.364**</td>
<td>0.418**</td>
<td>0.198**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
a. Listwise N=384
It is shown that students who are highly attracted to salary-employment seem to have associated their learning expectations with learning in. Moreover, the pattern of relationship between expectations to learn for may indicate that students who seek to learn to become entrepreneurs also view that it is necessary to learn all the facets of the subject i.e. to learning about its theoretical underpinning, its importance, and to acquire the skills of doing it. Combined these outcomes may suggest that entering a course students expectations are at least partially dependent on what they want to learn in light of their current career ambitions.

Finally, looking at the negative but significant correlations between students’ past entrepreneurial attempts and learning expectations (i.e. to learn about and to learn for), it may be concluded that past entrepreneurial experiences have negative effects on students’ learning expectations. It is observed that students with prior experiences in running their own business tend to have somewhat lower learning expectations compared to those without previous entrepreneurial experience. This might either suggest that they believe they already have developed some knowledge and skills in this area or that they are less convinced than other students, that you can learn entrepreneurship at university.

4.5.3 Students’ profile after the UEE

Table 4.5 presents paired samples t-test results, comparing the before and after the course mean scores of students’ learning expectations (i.e. about, in, for), and changes in their career attractions. Regarding the extent to which the UEE had met students’ learning expectations, pair 1 and 2 in table 4.5, indicate that, respectively in terms of expectations to learn about and in entrepreneurship, there were no significant differences between what students’ expected to learn before the course and what they reported to have learnt after the course. However, in pair 3 relating to expectations to for entrepreneurship, the results indicate that there were significant but negative differences between what the students’ had expected to learn with what they reported to have learnt from the course \[ t(394) = -0.322, p < 0.001. \]

Again, in relation to how students’ career attraction had changed over the UEE period, pair 4 and 5 in table 4.4, indicate that after the UEE students’ attraction towards salary-employment had significantly been lowered \[ t(394) = -0.269, p < 0.05 \]. Also after the UEE students’ attraction to entrepreneurship had significantly increased \[ t(394) = 0.440, p < 0.05 \].
Overall, this part of the results means that the UEE, in terms of learning *about* and *in*, has more or less met the students’ expectations with scores just slightly under the very high expectation scores that students reported prior to the course. But, in terms of the most preferred learning expectation i.e. to learn *for* entrepreneurship, despite of reported high learning achievements, the UEE significantly fell short of students’ very high learning expectations in this area. It is also true that despite the fact that the course did not meet some of the expectations, after following the courses, students became less attracted to salary-employment and more attracted towards a career in entrepreneurship. This suggests that either the knowledge or skills they developed during the course gave the students more confidence about entrepreneurship as a potential career or it simply raised their awareness of the possibilities.

We furthermore conducted several ANOVA analyses in order to explore potential differences across universities in terms of learning expectations and attractions towards entrepreneurship and salary employment. Results in table 4.6 indicated that, prior to entering the courses (at t = 0); there were no significant differences in attraction to entrepreneurship and expectations to learn *for* entrepreneurship between students from the four participating universities. Significant differences could be observed between these groups when it came to attraction to salaried employment (p<.001) and expectations to learn *about* and *in* entrepreneurship (p <.000). After participating in the course (at t = 1) no significant differences regarding attraction to either salaried employment or entrepreneurship could be established between students from the four different universities. Yet, significant differences were found to exist between respondents from different universities in terms of the extent to which they indicated they had actually learned *about*, *for* and *in* entrepreneurship. In particularly it seems that students participating in entrepreneurship courses at Sokoine University indicated they learned the most *about*, *in* and *for* entrepreneurship of all the four groups. When looking at the difference between the average learning expectations and learning achievements the findings show that particularly lecturers at IFM and Mzumbe struggled with meeting the students
high learning expectations about entrepreneurship, while Mzumbe and CBE lecturers yielded relatively high learning achievements in the area of learning in entrepreneurship compared to the students original expectations.

Table 4-6 ANOVA results to observe differences across Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>$t = 0$</th>
<th></th>
<th>$t = 1$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect to learn about entrepreneurship</td>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFM</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mzumbe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokoine</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>6.046</td>
<td>4.944</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect to learn in entrepreneurship</td>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFM</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mzumbe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokoine</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>5.237</td>
<td>7.224</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect to learn for entrepreneurship</td>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFM</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mzumbe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokoine</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6.284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to salary employment</td>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFM</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mzumbe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokoine</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>4.560</td>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to entrepreneurship</td>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFM</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mzumbe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokoine</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>5.980</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at these differences across universities, especially after the courses (i.e. at $t = 1$), the results give an indication that while universities may achieve a relatively equal influence on how students views of the world of employments (in terms of choosing between salary vs. entrepreneurship), there are however significant differences on how each university meets (or satisfy) its students’ learning expectations. In the following paragraphs we will discuss several potential explanations.
DISCUSSION

This part of the study gives detailed inferences of the findings. This is done in line with 3P model of teaching and learning, and by examining the findings in view of the state-of-alignment existing among components of the Tanzanian UEE. Specifically, the discussion has categorized the findings in accordance with key issues in Biggs (2003) 3P Model of teaching and learning i.e. the presage [teaching context and students profile], the process [applied teaching methods] and the product [learning outcome].

4.5.4 The presage: from policy pressures to teaching objectives

From the results it is clear that there are two main drivers behind the current state of UEE in Tanzania – pressures from the government [policy] and universities’ own initiatives matching student demands. These drivers explain not only the level of UEE development, but also variations existing in teaching objectives and implementation. At a policy-level, for example, although the main policies (i.e. The Vision 2025, The SME Development Policy, the Trade Policy and Higher Education Policy) address the need for entrepreneurship education, they lack a unified concept of entrepreneurship and its related education. The policies therefore are not reflected in a coherent way in the National Higher Education Policy. To a large extent, this has resulted in the absence of a single model of a Tanzanian UEE and leads to inconsistent interventions that are aimed at promoting graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania.

At the university level, policy directives are translated differently. Teaching institutions seem also to fail to translate these conflicting and poorly developed policy directives into their curriculum. Clearly, institutions struggle with how to descend from these macro-aims of entrepreneurship development, towards their own feasible course objectives. These struggles are complicated by factors such as the diversity of students’ specializations, course duration, limited financial and human resources, poor teaching facilities, crowded classes, the search for feasible teaching and assessment methods, and a less than optimal external entrepreneurial climate. What seems to be the common denominator of the Tanzanian model of UEE is that everyone seeks to combine all possible teaching objectives [i.e. to educate about, in, and for] into a single, one-semester-long module. Another common feature is that these modules are implemented almost entirely using lectures and
group discussions rather than with more advanced and activating teaching methods that would fit such objectives better.

While trying to combine these three types of learning outcomes, and following ideas voiced by policymakers, most lectures indicate that future venture creation is the most desired outcome of their teachings. However, from the survey it is clear that differences exist in the tone in which these objectives are emphasized by different lecturers: while some only modestly address this outcome in their official course-outlines, Others express more rhetoric views of the same objectives, privately lecturers do not necessarily endorse the official viewpoints that teaching for entrepreneurship should be the desirable or achievable objective. Diverging ideas amongst lecturers signify that, even within the same faculty, entrepreneurship is still a debatable subject. The conflict could either be a rebellion or an unintentional misunderstanding of the official aims. The latter is eminent where a university lacks a policy that would set the goals, strategy and protocols for entrepreneurship development. Regardless of the origin of the apparent conflict, resolution of this conflict is crucial in order to bring entrepreneurship education to a higher level. Both institutions and lecturers have to realize that doing so may involve investment in staff (e.g. through additional training of by bringing new capable staff members) as well as in teaching facilities. Especially in the light of the limited resources available for this, parties also have to be more realistic about what is attainable in the short and medium time. Finally and based on the outcomes of these processes, teaching objectives and learning goals need to be presented in a consistent and true-to-nature manner via course materials that are presented to students prior to them entering the courses. This will help to avoid disappointments in terms of attainable learning achievements. When courses are offered as electives rather than a mandatory part of the curriculum managing expectations in this way will also help to create a match between students’ expectations and actual entry profiles.

4.5.5 The presage to process: misperceived students’ entry-profile

Results show that prior to entering entrepreneurship courses, students seem to have a very entrepreneurship friendly entry profile: they indicate they are very much attracted to the idea of becoming self-employed in the future and also they have very high learning expectations. Given the rather difficult or even hostile entrepreneurship climate (see chapter 3) and the fact that the surveyed entrepreneurship courses form a mandatory part of the student’s curriculum this finding is rather surprising. In fact, the results might be an indication of a response bias. Potentially students have
answered in the way they believed they were expected to answer, in light of the government’s campaign to foster entrepreneurship or in order to show respect to their lecturers. In order to check for such response biases the principal investigator however also talked to a number of students in a more informal setting about these issues and these conversations yielded similar positive mindsets with regards to a future entrepreneurial career and high learning expectations based on their enthusiasm for the topic. The fact that many students have actually started a business in the past (22%), and almost all of them have entrepreneurs amongst their parents, relatives and or close friends (83%) might be further evidence of the student’s sincere thoughts and enthusiasm for the topic.

When we match these findings with the outcomes of our qualitative survey of the lecturers we observe a disturbing gap between what lecturers know about students’ entry profile and the actual background of these students. Lecturers have the opinion that students join their classes without entrepreneurial backgrounds, hence lecturers expect their students to hold negative attitudes towards entrepreneurship. These misconceptions of their students’ entry-profiles have resulted in a mismatch between the teaching approaches that were being adopted and the ones that were needed or expected by the students. Whereas lecturers spend considerable time on building awareness and motivations through lectures and classroom discussions, students were waiting for skill-building though more activating forms of teaching.

The consequences of this mismatch are easily observable from the changes in attitudes and learning outcomes reported by the students. The students’ levels of attraction to salaried employment dropped in favor of their attraction to self-employment and entrepreneurship as the lecturer’s set out to do. Yet, when it comes to the learning achievements students reported that they had learned less than they had expected to learn when entering the course. It should be noted however, that the reported learning achievements are still very high especially when considering the lack of appropriate teaching methods used in the classroom.

4.5.6 The product: effect of state-of-alignment on the outcome

The learning outcome, as measured by examinations results that were shown in table 4.3, indicated a relatively good performance. However, as the examination in each of the four institutions was based on a written exam consisting of either multiple choice or open ended
questions rather than an assessment of skills, and actual insights these marks may, at best, provide an indication of the extent to which students learned about entrepreneurship (Charney & Libecap, 2000; Hynes, 1996; Vesper & Gartner, 1997). When it comes to testing students learning achievements with respect to learning in and for entrepreneurship such written examinations can only assess the extent to which students have the ability to recall issues discussed in classes, as opposed to the specific indicators of entrepreneurial potential. Furthermore, as we did not obtain the examination results of the individual students we were unable to match these against their self reported learning achievements. While the examination results thus provide limited insights in the actual learning achievements in these fields, the exam scores may be viewed, at least partially, as an indicator of student’s interest in the topic (Schiefele, Krapp, & Winteler, 1992) which may in turn be a first step towards a future career in entrepreneurship. When linking these findings to the self-reported achievements however, the examination marks may also be interpreted as a sign that the courses were too easy for the students as their entry profile exceeded the lecturers’ expectations. Examining the quality of the exams was beyond the scope of this study, yet in order to gain a better understanding of the meaningfulness of examination marks, future research should incorporate evaluations of exams in order to determine their usefulness for measuring learning outcomes.

A second way to measure learning outcomes is to look at the change in students’ career intentions (Fayolle, Gailly, & Lassas-Clerc, 2006; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Al-Laham, 2007). Here, our outcomes show that Tanzanian UEE significantly influences students’ interests in entrepreneurship, and respectively lowering their interest towards salary-employment. Given that the share of students that were attracted to entrepreneurship prior to entering the courses was already large, this result is pleasing and may be better expected. The increased attraction is very much in line with the lecturer’s original intentions to achieve these results. These results also show that education provides an important tool in stimulating people to consider entrepreneurship on top of raising the awareness via other policy measures and campaigns such as implemented by the Tanzanian government. Yet, at the same time, the results should not lead to overoptimistic expectations. The increase in attraction to entrepreneurship was reached without meeting the students’ learning expectations. This might be a warning signal that the awareness and attraction effects might be only temporarily or that they will not be translated into actions: i.e. starting a business in the future unless students know where and how to develop additional knowledge and skills. Indeed, recent studies have shown that in some cases participating in a single entrepreneurship course can actually lower students’ intentions and
behavior towards starting their own firm as they become more awareness of their own short comings and lack of skills in this area (Oosterbeek, van Praag, & IJsselstein, 2010). If students become frustrated by not having learned what they expected to learn the same might happen here as well.

Finally, when contemplating why learning achievements fell short of learning expectations one only has to consider the state-of-alignment among the main components of the Tanzanian UEE. Importantly, educating for entrepreneurship was close to a mission impossible due to a miss-match between the teaching objective and the applied methods. The methods, being more theoretical, failed to engage the students in learning activities that build the skills and capacities for new venture creation. This was reaffirmed by the lecturers’ doubts on achievements. In contrast, the courses motivated students in terms of understanding the possibility of an entrepreneurial career, hence explaining the proper alignment between the less demanding objectives of the subject (to educate about), with the more theoretical teaching methods (lecturers and group discussions). In addition other factors with the UEE also contributed to the current effects such as the lecturers’ profiles, teaching facilities, the link with local industry etc, which all have an influence on the actual UEE product.

Overall, the current model of the Tanzanian UEE may be said to appropriate for the following two goals. The first is to educate future public or private sector officials about entrepreneurship and its economic roles, hence resulting in entrepreneur-friendly decision makers who will facilitate entrepreneurial activities. Whether graduates will indeed occupy such positions in the future remains yet to be seen but should be a focus of future research. The second goal is to raise students’ entrepreneurial intentions by inspiring them to look into career alternatives. A drawback is that achieving such aims still would leave students without appropriate skills for pursuing their entrepreneurial intentions. Thus there remains a need for efforts directed at designing well aligned courses for entrepreneurship.

4.6 CONCLUSION

The main research question sought to characterize the Tanzanian UEE, in terms of what it is attempting to achieve and ways in which this objectives is being implemented. This research was informed by the observation of the apparent paradox that increased attention for entrepreneurship
education at universities was matched by lower rather than higher levels of graduates starting their own ventures.

The results indicate that the Tanzanian UEE has a multiple aims and objectives, ranging from the more general objectives (i.e. awareness creation, changing the general attitudes) to new venture creation. The objectives are a result of both policy pressures and universities' internal initiatives. However, it was also noted that, these objectives are somehow bundled within a single teaching program, and implemented in a teaching context that is characterized with students who enter into the courses with a satisfactory level of entrepreneurial mindsets and learning expectations. The achievement [or none-achievement] of each of the three objectives of entrepreneurship is dependent on the state-of-alignment among the components of the UEE. The results show that the Tanzanian UEE achieves a significant level of success, but mainly in teaching about entrepreneurship, but somehow fails to teach for it. The later is the most desired objective to both policy-makers and lecturers, and will therefore remain to be a source of criticisms on the UEE effectiveness. The most appropriate explanation for missing this target is that the objectives are implemented in a non-aligned teaching model that lacks a connection to the student’s entry profiles. Especially in combination with other unsupportive factors, like shortages of lecturers with entrepreneurship specialization, limited financial and teaching resources, crowded classes and a very limited link with local entrepreneurs this misalignment results in a higher motivated students population that are lacking the skills to start new ventures.

This study has implications to both policy-makers and educators. Our findings call for formulation of a clear definition of what UEE is for Tanzania, from which clear teaching objectives could then be drawn. As discussed above, the parties involved need to work on resolving their differences, be committed to invest in skills and facilities and become more realistic in terms of intended outcomes. The selection and consecutive development of other building blocks of UEE should be based on their fit with the achievement of these objectives. At the functional level, for faculties, course developers and lecturers alike, a change in perspectives is needed to foster alignment between the major components of their entrepreneurship courses. Most importantly, for educators, is the need to understand students’ entry profiles that shape their learning expectations and future career aspirations.
Further, as acknowledged previously, there is more to graduate entrepreneurship than the effectiveness of the UEE. This also suggests that it may prove fruitful, at least for Tanzania, to direct research efforts to the assessment of contextual factors that shape graduates’ decisions to enter into entrepreneurship. Such studies could benefit from extended qualitative analysis of graduates’ experiences and their perceptions. In this case, therefore, it is here suggested that the solution to the ultimate UEE effectiveness is not dependent only in offering more entrepreneurship training, but also on both re-aligning the current UEE model with the policy needs, teaching context, students’ profiles, teaching, assessment methods and other enabling/inhibiting factors outside the university. Until that time, it is unlikely that graduate entrepreneurship levels will rise significantly.
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### APPENDICES

#### Appendix 4-1: Summary of data collection methods, sources of data and research issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/Data Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Type of Data Collected</th>
<th>Research issue addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Semi-structured interviews *(Lecturers)* | 10   | 1. Teaching objectives  
2. Perception of students  
3. Perceptions on how entrepreneurship should be taught  
4. Applied teaching methods  
5. Ever run a business?  
6. Educated in entrepreneurship?  
7. Original area of specialization? | 1. Profile of entrepreneurship lecturers  
2. Teaching objectives as per the lecturers  
3. Their perceptions on the teachability of entrepreneurship  
4. Their perceptions on the type of students they teach |
| 2. Documentary reviews | 5    | Government policy documents:  
2. Policy drivers towards the adoption of UEE  
3. Objectives of UEE at the national-level  
4. State of entrepreneurial environment |
|                    |      | University Course Outlines:  
1. Sokoine University of Agriculture:  
   - AEA 210: Agri-business and Entrepreneurship Development  
2. Mzumbe University:  
   - BUS 270: Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship Development  
3. Institute of Finance Management:  
   - MG 361: Entrepreneurship and  
   - PENT 101: Entrepreneurship  
4. College of Business Education:  
   - HD 14: Entrepreneurship Development | 1. Course objectives and expected learning outcomes  
2. Prescribed teaching methods |
|                    |      | University final examination results:  
   - For the above courses *(i.e. AEA 210, BUS 270, MG 361, and HD 14)* | *To relate students’ performance with their general feedback on how the course has/not met their learning expectations.* |
| 3. Survey before/after the course *(Students)* | 437  | 1. Mean students age  
2. Gender  
3. Percentage of Students who ever run a business  
4. Percentage of student with one or two parents who ever run a business  
5. Students’ mean scores on level of attraction towards entrepreneurship/self-employment *(before and after)*  
6. Students’ mean scores on learning expectations before the course *(about, in, for)*  
7. Students’ mean scores on how course met learning expectations *(about, in, for)* after the course. | 1. General student profile, their learning expectations, and interest towards entrepreneurship  
2. Students’ view/feedback on how the course has met their learning expectations  
3. Change in students’ interest towards self-employment/entrepreneurship |
5 UNIVERSITY ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION AS AN INTERVENTION TO ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS: Empirical Evidence from Tanzania

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the mid 1980s Tanzanians beheld the fall of a socialist era – the *Ujamaa Na Kujitigemea* (socialism and self-reliance). From these times, Tanzania had undergone dramatic political and economic reforms. There was a shift from a once state-controlled economy to a market oriented economy (Treichel, 2005; Kuzilwa, 2005). At these times, politicians began to promote and engage themselves in what they once actively discouraged - private investment, self-employment and entrepreneurship. And like in other parts of the world, entrepreneurship is now believed to be a medium for economic growth, competitiveness and employment. With this in mind, there was a need to increase the levels of private investments, self-employment, and entrepreneurship in general, which also went along with the building of supportive institutions, culture, and related skills (URT, 1999a). As indicated in the Tanzania Development Vision 2025, the current mission is to create a society that cherishes hard-work, innovation, entrepreneurship and self-employment (URT, 1999a). This need has been echoed in many other sectoral policies like the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty of 2005 and the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Policy of 2002.

Working toward a more entrepreneurial Tanzania, the education system became the centre of policy-attention, as a major tool towards inculcating entrepreneurial values, skills and attitudes. It is acknowledged that the old education framework “has not been able to innovatively engage Tanzanians in entrepreneurship and self-employment” (URT, 1999a) and that it “tended to create employment seekers rather than job creators” (URT, 2002). A new strategy, for the higher education sector, was to review the traditional subjects and incorporate training in entrepreneurship (cf. URT, 2005; URT, 1999b).

---
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In Tanzania, entrepreneurship is synonymously taken to mean both self-employment and new venture creation. The country is facing increasing levels of unemployment (Kondylis and Manacorda, 2006), which makes entrepreneurship education to have objectives that aim both at developing graduates with attributes and skills in new venture creation or self-employment, and at changing the general culture in Tanzania. A review of entrepreneurship course-outlines, from five universities, confirmed that each university works towards these objectives. However, it was also noted that there was a stronger emphasis on new venture creation and self-employment than on other possible outcomes of teaching the subject. For example, an entrepreneurship module at the College of Business Education (CBE) in Dar es Salaam aims at imparting to students an “entrepreneurial culture”, and equip the students with the ability to develop entrepreneurial ventures and manage for growth (Source: course outline for Higher Diploma Entrepreneurship course: course code HD – 14). The Institute of Finance Management (IFM) in Dar es Salaam aims at making students to understand the entrepreneurial process, and develop in them the necessary skills required for new venture creation (Source: course outline for Postgraduate Entrepreneurship: course coded PENT 101). At Mzumbe University (in Morogoro) the course is aimed at imparting the knowledge and skills on how to establish and manage a new business (Source: course outline for entrepreneurship courses in Business Studies: coded BUS 270). The objective at the Iringa College of Tumaini University is towards imparting entrepreneurial skills and to make students think creatively about self-employment (Source: course outline for course named Entrepreneurship and Business Excellence: course code ENBE 601). The course objective at the Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) in Morogoro is to give students the ability to generate business ideas, screen and evaluate viable business plans, and implement own business plans (Source: course outline for entrepreneurship course for students in Agriculture Economics and Agribusiness: course code AEA 210).

Over a decade of teaching entrepreneurship in Tanzanian universities and recurring questions on its effectiveness, there has been a need to assess its impact. A few previous attempts for impact assessment had a limited focus by targeting vocational students or a gender orientation (cf. Nkirina, 2010; Olomi and Sinyamule, 2006; Sekwao, 1996). At the moment, in consideration of the investment in entrepreneurship education, it is high time for an impact assessment study that will not only have a wider coverage, but also that has a focus on a university level of education, a context that has long been overlooked despite its immediate influence on producing an educated workforce.
This sort of study that will shed light on how successful (or not) the universities are at creating entrepreneurial graduates in response to the changing environments and demands by the government, employers, students and other stakeholders. Moreover, it is the lessons from such a study that will help to understand the most critical issues towards improving the current framework of university entrepreneurship education in Tanzania.

This study attempts to address the above need under the following main problem statement: “To assess the extent at which university entrepreneurship courses influence students’ intentions towards entrepreneurship as a future career”. The study is based on change in entrepreneurial intentions as success indicator. As justified in the theoretical section, the Entrepreneurial Intention Model, based on the Theory of Planned Behavior (TpB) of Ajzen (1991), was used to inform this inquiry.

This study has both theoretical and practical relevancy within the wider field of entrepreneurship education and in the Tanzanian context, specifically. While theories on entrepreneurial intentions have been widely tested and applied in impact assessment studies, there is hardly any study that has tested these models in the Tanzanian context (if not in the Sub-Saharan Africa). Past application of the TpB in Tanzania has been only in the domain of health research where it was used to predict students’ intentions to use condoms (Lugoe and Rise, 1999) and to reduce sugar intake (Masalu and Astron, 2000). This study will therefore test and extend the application of the TpB in predicting the intentions of the Tanzanian university students, but this time in career related intentions towards entrepreneurship.

Practically, this study is timely in Tanzania because, as observed by Nkirina (2010), the current model of entrepreneurship education suffers shortfalls that have originated from the design phase which have affected both the implementation and assessment phases. It is here thought that the investigation of students’ attitudes, perceptions and intentions, would benefit course designers by giving them an understanding of behavioral issues that affect students’ learning approaches and motivations. This would also help in the design of entrepreneurship courses through setting feasible teaching objectives and properly aligning the objectives with students’ profiles, physical resources, teaching methods and local contexts.

The remaining parts of this paper are structured such that it presents a theoretical foundation, from which a number of hypotheses are formulated. Further, the methodology section presents the
research design, measures used, and the participants and data collection procedures. The results section follows next, giving participation rates, handling of missing data, reliability checks and findings that relate back to the hypotheses. The paper ends with the discussion section and the conclusions section, which summarizes the results and draws from them a number of inferences relating to theory, practice and future research.

5.2 THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

5.2.1 Students’ entrepreneurial intentions

In this field, as there are many definitions of entrepreneurship, there are also an overwhelming number of success indicators that have been used in assessing the impact of entrepreneurship courses. For example, a number of researchers have used indicators like academic performances or students’ satisfaction levels, resulting innovations, number of start-ups, business performance, contributions to society, and even graduates income at work places (Charney and Libecap, 2002; Vesper and Gartner, 1998). Astin (1991) has observed that educational output can be expressed in tangible outputs (e.g. physical ventures created by graduates) but due to a number of challenges, (e.g. time constraints and interaction with other behavior changing variables) most impact assessment studies have resorted to using intangible outputs (e.g. skills, values, attitudes, aspirations, interest etc.), or to look at the change in entrepreneurial attributes among the participants, or at their perceptions of or intentions towards entrepreneurship (Man and Yu, 2009). The choice of behavioral impact indicators is a way of dealing with questions on the time-lag involved from time of graduation to that of actual venture creation. Research evidence shows that most graduates start their first businesses between five to ten years after graduation (Galloway and Brown, 2002). This time-lag, therefore, renders most of the physical indicators (e.g. new venture creation, business performance, contribution to society etc.) to be irrelevant if one wants to measure the impact immediately after the course. In view of this time-lag, Fayolle and Gailly (2006) experimented with “a new impact assessment methodology”, and proposed that impact assessment, if conducted shortly after the course, should then be based on intentions to act and on the acquired knowledge and know how. The idea behind this choice of intentions follows the TpB of Ajzen (1991) which argued that intentions are the best predictors of individuals’ future behavioral acts.
The acknowledgment that venture creation is planned behavior, hence an intentional process (Krueger et al, 2000), has led to the development of the so called entrepreneurial intention models. These models, in most cases, are based on either the TpB of Ajzen (1991), or in some cases on the Model of Entrepreneurial Event of Shapero (see Krueger et al 2000). It is the TpB of Ajzen (1991) that has received much attention among scholars in this field of study. This is because of its said robustness in predicting intentions (and actual behavior), even when applied in different contexts (cf. Linan, 2008; Souitaris et al, 2007; Fayolle, 2005; Kristiansen and Indarti, 2004; Lee and Wong, 2002; Krueger et al, 2000; Autio et al, 2001).

According to Ajzen (2001, 1991), intentions precede peoples’ behavior, they capture the motivational factors that influence behavior; they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the intended behavior. The TpB postulates that an individual’s intention to perform a given behavior is a convergence of three major antecedents, namely: personal attitudes towards the behavior, perceptions on social norms, and perceived behavioral control.

**Personal attitude** represents a person’s evaluation of something as good/bad, harmful/beneficial, pleasant-unpleasant, and likable-dislikeable (Ajzen, 2001). Attitudes are related to an individual’s evaluative judgment on the desirability of the options faced; they can also be linked to career decisions (Fayolle, 2005). In entrepreneurship, this means being attracted or not into becoming an entrepreneur or to the idea of starting a business (Linan, 2008). Studies in entrepreneurship have, in most cases, found that attitudes have positive influences on intentions (Veciana et al, 2005). This is also true even among university students, who by nature, are characterized with volatile career interests (Souitaris et al, 2007; Tkachev and Kolvereid, 1999).

**Perception on social norms**, according to Beck and Ajzen (1991), refers to the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform a certain behavior. It is argued that an individual’s decision to enter into a particular type of occupation is based not only on e.g. monetary issues, but also on the way in which that type of occupation is regarded by close people and by the community at large (Giannetti and Simonov, 2004). This construct makes a broad consideration of two important issues that an individual may face prior to making a decision to behave in a certain way. First, the issue of facing important others, e.g. parents, spouse, close relatives etc., or simply facing people whose views matter before ones makes a decision (Veciana et al, 2005; Ajzen, 1991). Second is the general
acceptance of such behavior/actions in the society in which an individual entrepreneur is embedded. Society sets generally accepted norms, values and beliefs that may set the legitimacy of certain behavior. Recognizing the probable differences in social values and pressure from others, Linan (2008) divided the subjective norms construct into two value perceptions termed *closer valuations* (influence from links to family or close friends) and *social valuations* (i.e. values peculiar to a specific group or society). This approach will be used here as well, in which the role of social values as a component of culture is separately considered. This follows the long purported [inhibitive] influence of African culture on entrepreneurial behaviors amid the current changes that are taking place in Africa (cf. Takyi-Asiedu, 1993; Tshikuku, 2001; Tillmar, 2006).

Perceived behavioral control refers to the difficulty or ease of performing certain behavior in the mind of the actor himself/herself. It reflects past experiences as well as anticipated impediments and obstacles (Ajzen, 1991). This also relates with another entrepreneurial concept termed as “self-efficacy” which explains an individual’s confidence in his/her ability to successfully perform entrepreneurial roles and tasks (Zhao et al, 2005; Krueger et al, 2000; Ajzen, 1991). Bandura (2004) argues that, unless people believe that they can produce desired effects, they have little incentive to act. Research in self-efficacy has shown that peoples’ performance is strongly influenced by their confidence in their ability to perform (Ajzen, 1991). Zhao et al (2005) explain that self-efficacy is a motivational construct, which influences an individual’s choice of activities, goals, persistence and performance. In many studies, this variable has been found to be positively related to students’ intentions to start their own businesses (cf. Fayolle et al, 2006, Zhao et al, 2005) and to their choice of entrepreneurship as their future career (Kolvereid and Isaksen, 2005). Linan (2009, 2008) showed that entrepreneurial self-efficacy in turn is enhanced by the extent to which an individual actually possesses entrepreneurial knowledge, or a set of skills related to entrepreneurship.

From the research on the literature in the field of (entrepreneurial) intentions, the following four hypotheses are developed:

**H1:** The positive attitudes of students towards entrepreneurship have a positive influence on their entrepreneurial intentions.

**H2:** The positive perceptions of students on close peoples’ support towards entrepreneurship have positive influence on their entrepreneurial intentions.
H3: The positive perceptions of students on social values towards entrepreneurship have positive influence on their entrepreneurial intentions.

H4: The positive perceived entrepreneurial behavioral control of students has a positive influence on their entrepreneurial intentions.

5.2.2 Entrepreneurship education as an intervention

According to Fishbein and Ajzen (2005), intentions (and behaviors) can be shaped through educational interventions. While the TpB could be used as a framework to design intervention strategies (cf. Stead et al, 2005), in many places however, as noted by Hardeman et al (2002), the theory has been used mainly as a framework to either assess the outcome of interventions or in predicting behavioral intentions. In this field, with questions on the teachability of entrepreneurship (Kuratko, 2005; Sexton and Upton, 1987), there is still a search for a common definition of entrepreneurship and its related educational framework (Henry et al, 2005; Gartner, 2001; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000; Bull and Willard, 1993). In this search, a number of scholars like Souitaris et al (2007), Fayolle et al, (2006) and Audet (2000) have reported on experiments that have tested the validity of intentions-based interventions and impact assessments methods.

When TpB or any other intention model is used however, one needs to have in mind the objectives of such an educational intervention. Hytti and O’Gorman (2004) have summarized that, as an intervention, entrepreneurship education seeks to achieve three main objectives: First, to create awareness of entrepreneurship, this is argued to be a first ladder to preparing individuals to an entrepreneurial career. Hytti and O’Gorman (2004), argue that in order to choose entrepreneurship as a career, one needs to know that it exists and understand issues about it. The second objective is to equip students with an entrepreneurial approach in their daily work, like becoming more innovative at the currently demanding work environments. Third is to prepare individuals to act as entrepreneurs by starting new ventures and be able to manage them.

As argued earlier, most of these teaching objectives not only seek to equip students with appropriate knowledge about entrepreneurship and practical skills in entrepreneurship, but also a drive for behavioral change among students (Lobler, 2006; Gartner, 1988), hence influencing their perceptions, attitudes, confidence, and interests toward entrepreneurship. Now, when new venture creation is taken as a major objective of entrepreneurship education, one important consideration is
the time-gap involved from the end of an intervention exercise to that at which a student will actually start to behave entrepreneurially. While it has been proved that, at the end of the course students exhibit an attitudinal change (cf. Cooper and Lucas, 2006), the actual entrance into entrepreneurship may also be a subject of factors other than the educational intervention. This leads to the formulation of the following hypotheses:

**H5:** At the end of the entrepreneurship course, the level of students’ personal attitudes, perceptions on close people, perceptions on social values, perceived behavioral control, and intentions towards entrepreneurship are higher than the levels at the start of the course.

**H6:** The positive changes of students’ entrepreneurial intentions are the result of the changes in personal attitudes, perceptions on close people, perceptions on social values, and perceived behavioral control towards entrepreneurship.

5.2.3 Students’ entry profiles as control variables

Students enter a course of study with sets of prior attitudes, interests, and perceptions, abilities and expectations, which form their entry-level profile (Biggs, 1989). Students also differ in terms of their gender, ethnicity, parents’ occupation, past training and work experiences (Terenzini et al, 2001). These differing profiles shape their learning expectations and career aspirations (Terenzini et al, 2001; Biggs, 1989). In this study, it was also thought that these entry variables could have some influence on students’ perceptions and entrepreneurial intentions, which may affect the outcome of the courses (Terenzini et al., 201; Biggs, 1989), hence the need to control for their effect during the analysis of the TpB model of entrepreneurial intentions. Specifically, in a number of studies, it has been argued that: males are more entrepreneurial than females (Veciana et al, 2005; Cowling and Taylor, 2001); parents who run their own businesses influence their children’s become more entrepreneurial than children from employed parents (Van Auken et al, 2006; Scherer and Brodzinsk, 1991); having attended a prior course in entrepreneurship make an individual be more entrepreneurial than those who have not taken a course (Blackford et al. 2009); having work experience makes one more entrepreneurial than those without (Shane, 2000); and that having attempted to start or run own business make an individual to be more entrepreneurial than those who have not attempted to so (Birch, 2004; Stavrou and Swiercz, 1998).
5.3 METHODOLOGY

5.3.1 Design and measures

This study adopted a pre-test and post-test approach, as proposed by Fayolle et al (2006) and used by Souitaris et al (2007). An Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (EIQ) was used as a data collection tool, based on Linan (2008), who had developed and validated the instrument in different cultural contexts, except Africa (cf. Linan and Chen, 2009). The EIQ had multi-items in a 7 Likert types scale questions. The questions were designed to measure the variables according to the TpB: (1) personal attitudes towards entrepreneurship, (2) perceptions on subjective norms, this had two parts i.e. perceptions on close people and perceptions on social values, (3) perceived behavioral control, (4) entrepreneurial intentions. See appendix 5.1 for an extract of the EIQ.

As mentioned above there was a need to establish students’ entry-profiles, in this case additional questions were introduced for identifying students’ demographic information and entrepreneurial entry-level profiles. These questions were to form the following additional variables: (1) gender, (2) if parents ever started/run own business, (3) if taken prior entrepreneurship courses, (4) if any work experience, (5) if ever started or run own business. All the profile questions were dichotomous (i.e. yes or no type of responses).

5.3.2 Context

The fieldwork for this paper took place in Tanzania, in East Africa. According to year 2008/2009 estimates, the country has a population of 42.5 million people. The annual growth of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has averaged between 5 and 7 percent in the period of 2008 to 2009, making Tanzania one of the fastest-growing economies in Sub-Saharan Africa. Despite this attractive economic growth rate, Tanzania remains to be among the world’s poorest countries. Tanzania’s economy relies heavily on agriculture, which accounts for nearly half of the GDP and employs about 80% of the national workforce. Tanzania has one of the smallest industrials sector in Africa, which accounts for less than 10% of the GDP. Tourism is growing in importance and ranks as the second highest foreign exchange earner after agriculture. Mineral production (gold, diamonds, tanzanite) has grown significantly in the last decade, and represents Tanzania's biggest source of
economic growth, providing over 3% of the GDP and accounts for half of Tanzania's exports (The World Bank, 2011).

By the year 2007 Tanzania had a total of 33 institutions of higher learning, including 8 publicly funded universities, 13 publicly funded polytechnics/specialized colleges, and 12 privately funded universities or colleges. The higher learning institutions in Tanzania operate amid the same challenges facing most of the African higher learning institutions, including shortage of resources, poor infrastructure, inadequate number of staff, and decline in quality of teaching and research. In the Tanzanian case, there are increasing numbers of students which does not match with both funding and higher learning institutions’ capacities. Despite the increase in university intakes and crowded classes, the university gross participation rate in Tanzania is the lowest in the African region, standing at about 1% in 2007 (SARUA, 2009; Morley et al 2009).

This study targeted undergraduate students from four Tanzanian institutions of higher learning namely: Sokoine University of Agriculture in Morogoro, Mzumbe University in Morogoro, College of Business Education in Dar es Salaam, and the Institute of Financial Management in Dar es Salaam. These students come from different specializations (i.e. business administration, accounting, taxation, agri-business, rural development, IT, and economics). In Tanzanian universities, students take a semester-long course in entrepreneurship in their third year of studies. To most of these students the course is a compulsory requirement. Using attendance registers, it was established that about 1124 students were expected to take the subject in the semester running from February to July, 2008 in the four institutions. After obtaining official permissions to administer a questionnaire, round 1 of the questionnaire was administered on the first day of the classes (i.e. t = 0). This was done before anything of the subject was discussed or distributed by the lecturers. Round 2 of the questionnaire was administered on the last day of the course (i.e. t = 1). In all instances, students were informed that participation was voluntary, and that their responses were to be handled with confidentiality. Students were also asked to fill in their registration numbers which were needed to facilitate the matching of the two sets of responses.

5.3.3 Participation rates and handling of missing values

Of the 1124 students who were taking entrepreneurship courses in that semester, 932 students (i.e. 82.9%) participated in the first round of the research, and 706 students (i.e. 62.8%) in the
second round. The data were entered in SPSS in two separate datasets (i.e. for \( t = 0 \) and \( t = 1 \)), and later these datasets were combined and matched to obtain the number of students that had participated in both rounds of the survey. Students’ registration numbers were used in the matching process, after removing cases with missing data we ended up with a sample of 433 students (38.5%) who had completed the entire questionnaire both at the start of the course and at the end, and therefore qualifying for further data analysis. The reasons for non-participation of the other students were mainly due to non-attendance, especially in round two of the survey which was done at the end of the semester, where students have a tendency of skipping classes for their individual preparations for final examinations.

5.3.4 Reliability

Using the first round questionnaire, a principle component-factor analysis (results not included here) with Eigen values greater than 1, coefficient suppressed at 0.40 was conducted to verify the grouping of items in each of the TpB constructs. The items loaded in the expected groups, except for the items in subjective norms which, as pointed out in the theoretical part, happened to be split themselves into two groups, obviously in terms of Linan’s (2008) conceptualization of Social valuations and Close valuations, which in this study were translated in perceptions on Close people and on Social values. The resulting factor analysis groupings of the components were used to formulate the final EIQ to be used to collect students’ responses after the courses in entrepreneurship. Further, Cronbach’s alpha was used to check scale reliability. The data confirmed the reliability of scales with the Cronbach’s alpha > 0.7 for all the items in each of the TpB constructs (i.e. intentions \( \alpha = 0.908 \); perceived behavioral control \( \alpha = 0.854 \); personal attitudes \( \alpha = 0.7551 \); social valuation \( \alpha = 0.614 \)). The two items used to measure close people, were found to correlate significantly (\( r=0.453; p<0.000 \) )

5.4 RESULTS

5.4.1 Students’ entry profiles and correlations among variables

The average age of the 433 students was 25.2 years (SD = 7.5). The research group was made up of 252 males (58.2%) and 155 females (35.8%); 26 students (6%) did not respond to the gender question. This is a more or less representative sample of the Tanzania undergraduate population;
similar figures were reported in other studies on Tanzania (cf. Kapinga and Bie, 2010; Lihamba et al, 2007). The participation percentages of the students by institutions were: Institute of Finance Management (28.2%); Mzumbe University (4.6%); Sokoine University of Agriculture (47.6%); and the College of Business Education (19.6%). The students were from different fields of specializations, highest numbers of the students are from rural development, agriculture economics and accounting.

In relation to students’ entrepreneurial profiles, over half of the students (61.2%) had parent(s) who had started and or run own businesses (n=259). Also 29.3% of the students had taken a course that related to entrepreneurship prior to this one (n=127). 23.0% of the students had some experience in starting and /or running their own businesses (n=99), and 36.3% of them had employment experience (n=157). While previous research suggests a positive correlation between having a parent who is entrepreneurial and starting a firm yourself, the analysis does show a positive correlation between having an entrepreneurial parent and entrepreneurial intentions but a negative correlation between parent’s entrepreneurship and past entrepreneurial attempts and no correlation between previous entrepreneurial activities and entrepreneurial intentions. For the TpB variables, the mean scores at t = 0 indicated that students had started the courses with: very high entrepreneurial attitudes (M = 6.1, SD = 1.02), very high entrepreneurial intentions (M = 5.6, SD = 1.8), and high perceptions on close people (M = 4.91 SD = 1.8). Moreover, at t = 0, students exhibited an above average perceived behavioral control (M = 4.93 SD = 1.5) and a moderate level of perceptions on social values (M = 4.0, SD = 1.6).

Table 5.1 presents a correlation matrix of all the variables. We used the 1% level as threshold, because with the 5% threshold, almost all the variables within the TpB model (numbers 6 to 10) showed significant relationships among each other.
**Table 5-1: Correlations among the TpB variables and students’ entry profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prior Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Worked Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Started own Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parents E'ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Perception on Close People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Perception on Social Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.268**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P. B. Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.142**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E. Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.353**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed); Listwise N=410

There was however one exception: the correlation between perceptions on social values and intentions was not significant. Since no correlation had a score above 0.80 there was no danger for multicollinearity (Field, 2009). Also, relating to the relations of students’ entry profile variables with the TpB variables: Students’ gender is significantly positively related to entrepreneurial intention. This indicates that, in the Tanzanian context, male graduates are more likely to become entrepreneurs than female entrepreneurs as is similar to many other countries (see for instance Wilson, Kickul & Marlino, 2007). Further, there is a significant positive correlation between entrepreneurship by the parents and students’ entrepreneurial intention, indicating that students from entrepreneurial parents are likely to start their own ventures in the future. Also, there is a significant but negative correlation between having taken a prior entrepreneurship course and students’ perceived behavioral control (see Table 5.1). This is an interesting point since it works against a conventional wisdom that a prior course would be positively associated with students’ confidence in undertaking entrepreneurial activities. To some degree this may mean that the elementary/introductory courses that students took before their university experiences might have exhibited entrepreneurship as a challenging occupation thus lowering their confidence levels.
5.4.2 Validity of the intentions model

A step-wise multiple regression analysis was run to assess the predictive influence of each of the variables in the TpB model of entrepreneurial intentions, hence testing hypotheses H1, H2, H3 and H4. Step-wise multiple regression analysis was opted in order to control for the two entry-profiles variable (gender and parents’ entrepreneurship), which in table 5.1 indicated significant correlations to the dependent variable - entrepreneurial intention, and to discern the individual effect of the different independent variables on entrepreneurial intentions. The control variables were included in step 1 of the regressions. The regressions analyses were run both for the dataset at start of the course (t = 0) and at the end of the course (t = 1). Tables 5.2 and 5.3 presents the results for t = 0 and t = 1, respectively.

Table 5.2 and 5.3 indicate that the overall final models explained from 20% to 31% of the variance in students’ entrepreneurial intentions [i.e. at t = 0 (R² adj = 0.199) and at t = 1 (R² adj = 0.307)] (see step 4). Overall, the F-ratios for the two models confirm that the TpB entrepreneurial intentions model has a significant fit with the data (F = 34.160, p < .001 at t = 0 and F = 28.911, p < .001). The level of adjusted R², though a little lower than those reported in studies in western countries (Van Gelderen et al. 2008; Krueger et al. 2000), remains within the commonly reported ranges among Tanzanian samples [e.g. 22% in Lugoe and Rise (1999) and 30% in Kakoko et al (2006)]. Moreover, worth mentioning is the improvement of the Adjusted R² from t = 0 to t = 1. This, as noted by Fayolle et al (2006), may indicate that there is some influence from the entrepreneurship courses that result in the increased adjusted R². When looking at the control variables it is interesting to note that while gender and parent’s entrepreneurship did have an effect on entrepreneurial intentions at t=0, this effect no longer existed at t=1. This suggests that education has a clear socialization effect which reduces the effect of personal background as will be discussed in more detail in the discussion section. On the individual TpB independent variables, results consistently show that perceptions on social values were not significant in predicting intentions, and perceptions on close people’s support was a significant predictor only at t=1 at the 95% confidence level (hence giving a sign of improvement on the perception on close people support after the courses). The remaining variables (i.e. personal attitudes and perceived behavioral control) had significant positive influences on students’ entrepreneurial intentions. In both models (t=0 and t=1) it can be observed that the increase in explained variance from step 1 to step 2 is
considerable larger than the increase from step 2 to step 4, suggesting that personal attitude explain intentions to a much larger extent than perceived behavioral control. This was consistent in both instances of testing and leads to the full acceptance of hypotheses H1 and H4, and a full rejection of the hypotheses H2 and partial rejection of H3. This means that Tanzanian students’ entrepreneurial intentions are determined mainly by their personal attitudes and perceived behavioral control while their perception of opinions of others plays a minor role for their entrepreneurial intentions.

Table 5-2: Multiple regression results for TpB model at t = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square adj</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.384***</td>
<td>56.889***</td>
<td>34.325***</td>
<td>34.160***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.930***</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.834***</td>
<td>.862***</td>
<td>.852***</td>
<td>.846***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/mother run own business</td>
<td>.425***</td>
<td>.442***</td>
<td>.447***</td>
<td>.476***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attitudes</td>
<td>.521***</td>
<td>.506***</td>
<td>.425***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions on Close People</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions on Social Values</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>-.231***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable = Change EIntentions; * p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; *** p< .001

Table 5-3 Multiple regression results for TpB model at t = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square adj</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>38.648***</td>
<td>24.630***</td>
<td>28.911***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6.362***</td>
<td>4.102***</td>
<td>3.961***</td>
<td>3.513***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/mother run own business</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attitudes</td>
<td>.373***</td>
<td>.355***</td>
<td>.212***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions on Close People</td>
<td>.064*</td>
<td>.051*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions on Social Values</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.244***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable = Change EIntentions; * p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; *** p < .001
5.4.3 Impact of the courses

At the end of the course (t = 1), all TpB’s based variables had scores above the average mean of M = 4. Specifically, personal attitudes (M = 6.2401, SD = .92), perception on close people (M = 5.58, SD = 1.422), perceived behavioral control (M = 5.961, SD = .96), and the general level of intentions (M = 6.3731, SD = 0.71) were very high; only social values were rated at close to the mean of the scale (M=4.374, SD = 1.48).

To establish the direction and significance of the university entrepreneurship education impact, paired samples t-test was done, comparing these mean scores with those taken at start of the course (t = 0). The paired samples t-tests results are presented in Table 5.4. The results indicate that after the course there was a significant increase in all the five TpB variables. This means that H5 is fully accepted; hence the courses had a positive impact on the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial attitudes t=1 – t=0</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Social Values t=1 – t=0</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Close people t=1 – t=0</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>5.387</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>PB. Control t=1 – t=0</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>11.067</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Intentions t=1 – t=0</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>8.204</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.4 Change in intentions as a function of changes in its antecedents

Hypotheses H6 aimed at establishing whether changes in the TpB’s based antecedents of entrepreneurial intentions lead to changes in intentions. To test the argument, new change variables were created by computing the differences between TpB variables at t = 1 from those at t = 0. From the obtained differences, multiple regression analysis was done in the form of a TpB model, where change in intentions was treated as a dependent variable to changes in personal attitudes, in perception on close people, in perceptions on social values, and in perceived behavioral control. This regression model was run for the same variables as it was run for in Tables 5-2 and 5-3. Table 5.5 presents the results.
Table 5-5: Multiple regression results - changes in intentions a function of changes in antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square adj</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30.093***</td>
<td>25.380***</td>
<td>15.901***</td>
<td>15.809***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.704***</td>
<td>2.819***</td>
<td>2.747***</td>
<td>2.631***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.815***</td>
<td>-.852***</td>
<td>-.817***</td>
<td>-.799***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/mother run own business</td>
<td>-.728***</td>
<td>-.754***</td>
<td>-.732***</td>
<td>-.785***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attitudes</td>
<td>-.252***</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.195***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions on Social Values</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.109*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions on Close People</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.195***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable = Change EIntentions
* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001

From the last model (step 4) in Table 5.5, the results indicated that about 21.4% of the variance in the changes of students entrepreneurial intentions were explained by changes observed in its said antecedents (adjusted $R^2 = 0.214$). And of the four independent variables, changes in personal attitudes and changes in perceived behavioral control had significantly contributed to changes in students’ entrepreneurial intentions in a positive direction [i.e. change in attitude (B = 0.174, p < 0.05); changes in perceived behavioral control (B = 0.195, p < 0.001)]. The negative significant effect of changes in gender, parent’s entrepreneurship and perceptions of close people can be explained by the fact that these variables were only significant at one moment (either prior to or after the course). Changes in perception on close peoples’ support did not have any influence in changes in intentions as it neither have an effect prior to nor after the course. The overall results therefore lead us to largely reject hypothesis H6.

5.5 DISCUSSION

In this research a number of expectations concerning the extent at which university entrepreneurship courses influence students’ intentions towards entrepreneurship as a future career (in Tanzania) were formulated (cf. the six hypotheses). From these six hypotheses, three were fully accepted, one was partially rejected, one was largely rejected and one was fully rejected. So, although the hypotheses were based on Western literature (e.g. Ajzen, 1991, Krueger et al 2000, Fayolle, 2005, Linan, 2008,) and tested in a non-Western context, half the hypotheses were not rejected. Apparently, the results indicate that both the entrepreneurial intention model used in this study and
the role that university entrepreneurship courses play in influencing students’ entrepreneurial intentions are global, and not only specific for a certain part of the world. Whereas Lugoe and Rise (1999) and Masalu and Astrom (2000) had already shown that the theory of planned behavior could be applied in Tanzania in the context of health issues (resp. condom use and sugar intake), this study provides evidence that it use can now also be extended towards educational settings.

Given the context of this study, the two most striking issues from the empirical research are that the entrepreneurial intentions (and growth in intentions) are not explained by perceptions on social values and those of close people. The study has shown that changes in students’ entrepreneurial intentions were only influenced by the positive changes in students’ personal attitudes and by the positive change in entrepreneurial behavioral control of the students. The role of perceptions on social values towards students’ entrepreneurial intentions cannot be dealt with without looking at the recent history of Tanzania. As defined before, social values relates to issues of culture, which in the Tanzanian context has been argued to be unfriendly towards entrepreneurship (e.g. Tshikuku, 2001). This is mainly due to its past socialist political orientation. However, one needs to note that the political changes that started in 1986 and further have brought about new perspectives, especially among the current cohort of students. The lack of influence of social norms and close people perceptions may possibly be explained by the extensive variation in norms and opinions regarding entrepreneurship that graduates are confronted with in their surroundings. Whereas some people may still be very much against the idea of entrepreneurship as a suitable career alternative for graduates, others might express an opposing view, leaving graduates with a diffused picture and the need to make up their own mind. While it may probably be too early to assess the impact of political influences on the improvement of social values towards entrepreneurship, the results however signify that the current government policy intervention towards creating an entrepreneurial culture have some positive impact. This may also indicate that university education may not be suited to bring out changes on intentions by targeting peoples’ perceptions on social values. This calls for longer-term interventions other than formal education e.g. the media, role models, and political efforts.

Second, although demographic variables were treated as control variables, our study shows that while gender and parent’s entrepreneurship have significant relationship to students’ entrepreneurial intentions prior to entering a course on entrepreneurship this effect ceases to exist after partaking in the courses. Thus, entrepreneurship education seems to have an important socialization effect.
According to Brim (1966:3) socialization refers to the processes by which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions that make them more or less effective members of their society. This socialization process may have caused the effect of demographic variables on career intentions to be diminished. First, for gender, the reason why male graduates report higher levels of entrepreneurial orientation than their female counterparts prior to entering the courses might be due to the traditional division of labour that exists in Tanzania. There are some types of occupation which are generally thought to be only for men and others for women. In this case, it is thought the intentions of female students might be limited by this expectation, where women are more for taking care of the family than working and trading. The fact that this effect no longer exists is a positive indication that education helps female students to overcome these cultural biases. Second, we note a positive relationship between students future entrepreneurial intentions with having parents’ who run own business at t=0 but no relationship at t=1. While the socialization effect described above might be one part of the explanation for this, the previous reported negative correlation between parent’s entrepreneurship and previous entrepreneurial experience may also hold a clue. While we did not include previous entrepreneurial experience in the regression analysis for lack of correlation with entrepreneurial intention, the observed negative correlation may imply a more complex relationship between the presence of role models and children’s entrepreneurial activities. It may well be that whether parents are involved in entrepreneurship either as an opportunity-driven or as a survival or supplement activity determines the effect of the presence of role models. It may well be that children who see their parents struggle as entrepreneurs may be somewhat discouraged to engage in entrepreneurship themselves and rather use their university education as a route to more stable form of employment.

5.6 CONCLUSION

In this study the impact of university entrepreneurship education in Tanzania was assessed. The main aim was to assess the extent at which university entrepreneurship courses influence students’ intentions towards entrepreneurship as a future career. The study was based on change in entrepreneurial intentions as a success indicator. To do this, both the validity and changes in the TpB-based model of entrepreneurial intention and of the individual variables was observed, before and after the courses.
From the results, it is clear that entrepreneurship courses at universities in Tanzania strongly influence entrepreneurial intentions of the students. Specifically, the study proved that the TpB is a valid model even within this African context. However, the model seems to mainly work with a convergence of two variables i.e. personal attitudes and perceived behavioral control (subjective norms seem to be partially influential but after interventions). This is also a confirmation of previous studies within the TpB theory, both in the western countries and in Tanzania (though in a different field of study). However, after the courses, the observed changes in entrepreneurial intentions of the students are a result of changes in their personal attitudes and changes in perceived behavioral control. The results show that demographic variables such as age and parent’s entrepreneurship were no longer significant influences after partaking in entrepreneurship courses, suggesting the courses had a socialization effect that somehow overcomes differences in background. Further, perceptions on social values did not have a contribution on intentions, neither prior to nor after participating in entrepreneurship course, but its changes after the course had negatively influenced the changes of intentions. Perceptions on close people did not contribute to intentions. From the study, it is obvious that the TpB model of entrepreneurial intention is somehow universal. The variables personal attitudes and perceived behavioral control are strongly supported to work as in other contexts.

Overall, the positive impact of entrepreneurship courses in Tanzania gives significance to the current efforts in boosting graduate entrepreneurship in the country. But what remains to be uncertain is the sustainability of these intentions when students face the real world of entrepreneurship. With the persistent observations on how unfriendly the Tanzanian entrepreneurial environment is, this may probably call for additional interventions that will nurture and sustain these intentions into physical ventures. This means the drive for promoting graduates entrepreneurship, as it is emphasized in policy documents, should go simultaneously with practical improvements in areas that have the potential to inhibit graduates’ startup attempts.

As a limitation, this study could make use of a control group of non entrepreneurship students of which to compare the changes in intentions over time. But again, this could also face a limitation on choosing the appropriate control group. In Tanzania entrepreneurship courses are being offered in a number of modes and to different levels of education. That is why in this group there a significant number of students who reported to have taken some courses prior to the UEE. This fact would therefore render a control group to have some sort of contamination. Also it is noted
that the impact assessment is based on students’ self-report of the course experience, hence may be biased. Future research could be designed to seek for a proper control group, and also use another method of feedback like observation. Also although demographic variables like gender and parents’ entrepreneurial status were used as control variables, there is some evidence from correlational tables that other demographic variables may indirectly have some influence on students’ career choice as well. Future research directions could be targeted into ascertaining this level of influence, especially by looking at the differences that exist among male and female students, or students from entrepreneurial parents vs. those from non-entrepreneurial parents. To the later group an additional variable relating to parents’ entrepreneurial success could also be used in observing how a child is drawn to entrepreneurship. Lastly, for the current group of students, there is a need for prolonged longitudinal studies that would trace graduates into their career progressions. This will somehow clear the current doubts on whether entrepreneurial intentions created at university translate into startups in the real-world.

REFERENCES:


APPENDIX:

Appendix 5-1: Entrepreneurial intention questionnaire

ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS IN HIGHER LEARNING INSTITUTIONS IN TANZANIA

Start of Semester 2, 2009

My name is Ernest S. Mwasalwiba; I am a PhD student from VU University Amsterdam in The Netherlands. I am asking you to take part in a survey of entrepreneurship students in Higher Learning Institutions in Tanzania. The following questionnaire should take around 10 minutes to complete.

This study is part of my PhD project; it explores students’ personal attitudes, skills, perceptions and intentions towards a career in entrepreneurship.

Please review the response options carefully before you mark your answers. There is no right or wrong answers, just answer according to your first impression of the question; but be honest. You will be asked to complete a second survey at the end of this course; this will enable me to evaluate your progress in this course.

Your student registration number is requested for the purpose of matching the datasets and for providing a link back to your questionnaires in ensuring accurate data entry. I will personally ensure the confidentiality of this information. Neither your university/college nor lecturer will get access to this information. This information will only be used for this PhD study. Thank you very much for your participation.

For further information you may contact me via es.mwasalwiba@fsw.vu.nl

A. Education and Experience

Please fill in the following information:

A.01 Your student registration number: ____________________________
A.02 Name of your university/ institute/ college: ____________________________
A.03 Name of your bachelor programme: (e.g. Bachelor of laws etc.) ____________________________

A.04 Have you taken any entrepreneurship courses before this one? (tick the appropriate box) Yes ______ No ______
A.05 Do you have any employment experience? (tick the appropriate box) Yes ______ No ______
A.06 Have you ever started and operated your own business? (tick the appropriate box) Yes ______ No ______

B. Learning Expectations

To what extent do you expect that this course in entrepreneurship will help to develop any of the following aspects? Please circle one number for each learning expectation from 1(not at all) to 7 (very strong expectation).

Example: (how to fill in)

B.00 To be given ice-cream after each session 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B.01 To obtain a general knowledge about entrepreneurship 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
### B.02 To obtain the necessary abilities to work as an innovative salary-employee

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

### B.03 To obtain the necessary abilities for starting my own business venture [to become an entrepreneur/self-employed]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

### C. Professional Attraction

Considering all the advantages and disadvantages (economic, personal, social, job stability, etc), indicate your level of attraction towards each of the following work options from 1 (minimum attraction) to 7 (maximum attraction). Please circle one number for each career option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.01 Salary employment</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.02 Entrepreneurship [or Self-employment]</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Personal Attitudes

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. **Please circle only one number for each statement**, from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.01 I think it is very pleasant to start and run my own business</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.02 At least once I will have to take a chance and start my own business</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.03 The idea of starting my own business appeals to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.04 I often think of ideas and ways to start a business</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.05 Being an entrepreneur [or self-employed] implies more advantages than disadvantages for me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.06 A career as an entrepreneur is attractive for me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.07 If I had the opportunity and resources, I would be happy start my own business</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.08 Being an entrepreneur [or self-employed] would bring great satisfactions for me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.09 If presented with salary-employment, I will choose that instead of self-employment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Attitudes towards Entrepreneurship in the Society

Indicate your level of agreement with the following sentences about the values the Tanzanian society puts on entrepreneurship and self-employment. **Please circle one number for each statement**, from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement)

| E.01 The culture in Tanzania is highly favorable towards entrepreneurial activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| E.02 | The entrepreneur’s role in the Tanzanian economy is sufficiently recognized. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| E.03 | Many people in Tanzania consider it acceptable for a university graduate to become self-employed / an entrepreneur. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| E.04 | In Tanzania entrepreneurial activity is generally considered a good option. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| E.05 | My friends value self-employment more than any other type of employment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| E.06 | It is commonly thought in Tanzania that entrepreneurs exploit others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| E.07 | In Tanzania it is thought that entrepreneurship is for people who cannot find salary-employment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

After graduation, if you decided to become an entrepreneur [or self-employed]; Do you think the following people will support your decision? Please circle one number for each statement, from 1 (total disapprove) to 7 (totally approve)

| E.08 | Your close family [parents, spouse, etc] | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| E.09 | Your friends and mates | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**F. Confidence and Skills**

To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding your confidence (self-efficacy) in the following entrepreneurial activities? Please circle only one number for each statement, from 1 (Not at all confident) to 7 (Completely confident)

| F.01 | Starting a business and keep it working would be easy for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| F.02 | I have all the ability to start a viable business venture. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| F.03 | I can control the creation process of a new business. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| F.04 | I know the necessary practical details to start a business/firm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| F.05 | I know how to develop a business [entrepreneurial] project. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| F.06 | If I wanted to start my own business, I would have a high probability of succeeding. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| F.07 | I can handle the risks of self-employment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Please indicate your current capability in the following more specific entrepreneurial skills and abilities. Please circle only one number for each statement, from 1 (no capability) to 7 (very high capability)

| F.07 | To recognize a good business opportunity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
F.08 To write a clear and complete business plan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.09 To develop a new product or service 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.10 To do the legal procedures necessary to get a new venture to start 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.11 To estimate accurately the costs of starting a new business 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.12 To estimate accurately the number of people who are likely to buy a new product or service 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.13 To recognize and hire good employees for a new business project 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.14 To persuade investors/banks to give capital money for a new business 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.15 To communicate with and lead others as a team 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.16 To sell a brand new product or service to a first time customer 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.17 Networking and making professional contacts 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.18 To solve unstructured problems 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.19 To negotiate a sale or purchase an item for a favorable price 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.20 To pick the right marketing approach for introducing a new kind of product or service 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.21 To get suppliers and others to support the new venture creation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.22 To deliver a short statement to win the confidence of intended customers/supporters 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.23 To do the tasks needed to get a new business venture off to a good start 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
F.24 To analyze the strengths and weaknesses of a business plan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

G. Entrepreneurial Intention

Please consider the long-run after completing your studies in answering questions G.02 to G.07: Please circle only one number for each statement from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 7 (extremely unlikely)

G.01 Do you currently own a business venture?  
[if the answer is NO please go to G.02 below] Yes No

G.02 Do you intent to become an entrepreneur or to start your 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Please circle only one number for each statement from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.03 I am ready to do anything to become an entrepreneur [or self-employed]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.04 If I see an opportunity to start my own business venture, I will take it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.05 My career goal is becoming self-employed [or an entrepreneur]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.06 I will make every effort to start and run my own business venture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.07 I am determined to create my own business venture in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Personal Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.01 Your age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.02 Gender: Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your parents' levels of education? (Please circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following people has ever run their own business? (Please circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother/sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very close friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what degree they were successful entrepreneurs? Please circle only one number for each statement from 1 (not at all successful) to 7 (very successful)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother/sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very close friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
CHAPTER SIX

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This study aimed at assessing the impact of the UEE on Tanzanian university students. The main research question was asked “what is the influence of the Tanzanian University Entrepreneurship Education on students’ entrepreneurial intentions; and which characteristics of University Entrepreneurship Education hamper and or facilitate their inclination towards entrepreneurship as a possible career?” This question was broken-down into four sub-questions which later became a basis for chapter 2, 3, 4 and 5.

This chapter is intended to give an overall conclusion to the thesis by presenting a summary of the main findings from the four empirical chapters based on the overall conceptual framework in chapter 1. A discussion on the overall research question is presented next, followed by some significant theoretical, policy and practical implications of the study. The chapter ends by pointing out a number of research limitations and suggestions for future research directions.

6.2 SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

This section gives a summary of the study’s main conclusions relating to each of the state-of-art of global entrepreneurship (as reviewed in chapter 2) and a summary of main findings arranged according to the 4 components of the study’s conceptual framework (see figure 1.2) i.e. (1) profile of students before the UEE intervention; (2) the characteristic of the UEE and state-of-alignment among its components; (3) the product of the UEE interventions efforts (i.e. the changed students’ profile after the UEE); and (4) reflections on the contextual embeddedness of both the UEE and graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania.

6.2.1 State-of-the art of global entrepreneurship education

The state-of-art was covered in chapter 2, which applied a “semi-systematic” literature review in taking stock of global entrepreneurship literature of entrepreneurship education. The review covered issues of: definitions, teaching objectives, target audience, methods and impact indicators, to
mention just a few: Knowledge from this review, as it should be for a literature review, became a foundation in choosing specific definitional issues that were used to inform other empirical chapters.

From the findings, I established that the popularity of entrepreneurship education is driven by the interests of its key stakeholders namely: policy-makers, employers, students - on the demand side; and educators on the supply side. Likewise, the teaching objectives, at different levels of education, are highly influenced by the meanings that these stakeholders place on entrepreneurship. There are two competing views; one that focuses on entrepreneurship as the process of creating new ventures and the other that focuses on behavioral attributes of entrepreneurs. I further concluded that the new venture creation approach has been most dominant, especially among policy-makers. While this approach is losing some of popularity among entrepreneurship scholars stresses the development of practical skills that are students would need to start their own business.

In view of the above competing views, the review established that when entrepreneurship is taught as a subject, it is offered with either one or two objective(s) i.e. to impart skills in venture creations (termed as to educate for entrepreneurship), or to impart a theoretical understanding or influence the participants’ views of the phenomena (termed as to educate about entrepreneurship). Despite these differences the two objectives are overlapping and lack a clear line of separation. Teaching for seems to go beyond teaching about because, at least at the university level, teaching for specific skills should mean that the theoretical underpinning of the subject matter are explained (which is teaching about it) before moving on to specific skills-related teachings (which is teaching for it).

From the literature review it became apparent that most research on entrepreneurship education focuses on activities initiated at universities rather than other levels or types of education. At this level, however, there is neither a generally accepted course content/structure nor an agreed teaching approach. I found that there might be even more debates about how to teach entrepreneurship to university students than there are debates about the meaning of the word “entrepreneurship”. Two camps are in competition: the traditional methods using lectures, group discussions, seminar groups and case studies as used in other business subjects; and the action-based or student-centered methods using simulations, setting of real business ventures, study visits, and use of real-world entrepreneurs. I also noted that most scholars seem to favor action-based methods, and prefer entrepreneurship to be taught by educators who have personal experience in starting and running a
business. While this view is much debated, it also faces feasibility challenges when practiced at university due to its cost implications, difficulties in recruiting experienced entrepreneurs, and the inherently theoretical orientation of most universities.

A review of studies on impact and evaluation assessment revealed that impact indicators could be categorized into two groups: (1) indicators based on long-term and physical learning outcomes e.g. number and types of start-ups, technologies, innovations, jobs created or jobs held by graduates, and contribution to society; (2) indicators based on the most immediate learning outcome, measured soon after the course end, using things like GPA/examination scores, number of students completed the course, students’ satisfaction, and change of some behavioral attributes (e.g. attitudes, perceptions, and intentions toward entrepreneurship). Most researchers seemed to favor impact measurement based on the change in behavioral constructs (as opposed to physical outputs like start-ups). This not only converges with scholar’s growing preferences towards a behavioral-view of entrepreneurship, but also on the time-lag that exists between students’ graduation and actual venture creation. This makes it difficult to separate between the effects of educational interventions from the influences of other contextual experiences after graduation. It is said that normally a graduate would attempt to start something after 5 to 10 years from graduation. Moreover, a major critic towards the behavioral (especially intentions-based) impact indicators is the absence of empirical evidence to substantiate that behavioral attributes as measured at course end, can actually lead to entrepreneurial actions.

6.2.2 The presage: Students’ entry-level profile

Results both in chapter 4 and 5, gave a clear picture that the Tanzanian UEE is enjoying a cohort of students with very positive entry profiles in terms of attraction to entrepreneurship and very high learning expectations (in chapter 4); and high entrepreneurial attitudes, positive perceptions on social values, and on perceived behavioral control. And their overall entrepreneurial intentions were also very high (see chapter 5). More than a half of these students had come from entrepreneurial parents, and also 23.4% of the students had some experience in starting their own businesses.

The interesting part of the findings concerns the inter-relationship among the variables, and how some of them determine students’ entrepreneurial potentials. In chapter 4, for example, it seems that
having an entrepreneurial parent has a significant relationship with students’ attempts to start their own business. Again, students’ career attractions have significant relationships to their relevant learning expectation, such that attraction to salaried employment had a positive and significant relationship with expectations to learn in entrepreneurship (i.e. to learn to become entrepreneurial at work place); and attraction to a career in entrepreneurship had significant relationship to expectation to learn for entrepreneurship, and with all the other learning expectations (i.e. about and in). In chapter 5, where the Theory of Planned Behavior (TpB) was used, it was evident that the very high students’ entrepreneurial intentions were influenced by only two variables i.e. their personal attitudes towards entrepreneurship and their perceived behavioral control (or sense of efficacy in performing entrepreneurial intentions). It is also surprising, at least for this context, that those social norms became less relevant to determining students’ entrepreneurial intentions. This suggests that Tanzanian norms are losing their grip in the current generation and that entrepreneurship is becoming a legitimate career (a sign of less influence from the remnants of the socialism era).

In the overall UEE model, an important question that the next sections reveal is how Tanzanian educators attempt to align the student profile variables with other UEE variables, at the presage and process, in order to produce the specific teaching products.

6.2.3 The presage: teaching context and process of Tanzanian UEE

Results in chapter 4 covered issues that related to the overall teaching context, but at the institutional-level i.e. policy drivers behind entrepreneurship education, teaching objectives at the university level, lecturers’ profiles and perceptions of both the subject and of students’ profile (student factors); and the overall teaching/learning climate at universities. In summary, the results in chapter 4 provide evidence that, apart from internal initiative by academicians, the Tanzanian entrepreneurship education receives a strong push from government policies. Both these factors contribute to the formulation of teaching objectives, but there is still a problem for universities in descending from the various policy pronouncements to their specific teaching objectives. It was noted in chapter 4 that universities teach the subject with objectives that match with those identified in chapter 2: to teach about it (i.e. to raise awareness and improve perceptions) and to teach for it (i.e. to prepare graduate who are destined for starting own ventures). Of the two objectives, the latter received stronger emphasis from both policy-makers and individual lecturers. This is also a major learning expectation among the students.
It was also found out that most faculties that house entrepreneurship courses are characterized by limited human and financial resources. Despite the growing popularity of the field, many lecturers who teach the subject do not have sufficient educational or practical background in entrepreneurship. Again, due to limited research on the subject, the teaching staff is somehow less informed on the prevailing levels of entrepreneurial attributes among the students. As it will be discussed later, this has caused lecturers to misjudge students’ entrepreneurial potentials, hence misdirect their teaching approach (mainly lectures and group discussion). Speaking of teaching approach, chapter 4 reports an extensive use of traditional lecturer-centered teaching methods. There is less application of practical-based methods and, the extensive use of imported training material cause the students to have no connection with the local context. Again it was also reported that the Tanzanian UEE is operating amidst a very limited financial resources, over-crowded classes, and poor teaching facilities. In the following paragraph I will discuss how these issues influence the effect of the UEE interventions.

6.2.4 The product: impact of UEE interventions on students

Impact assessment was presented in chapter 4 and 5. Chapter 4 concentrated on measuring the UEE influence on students’ career attraction and extent at which it met their learning expectations. Chapter 5 specifically assessed the extent at which the UEE had an impact on their entrepreneurial intentions, but through its significant antecedents (i.e. personal attitudes and perceived behavioral control).

Results in chapter 4 indicate that the UEE had succeeded in raising students’ attractions towards a career in entrepreneurship, and likewise reducing their attractions towards salary employment. Similarly, results in chapter 5, indicated that the UEE had positively and significantly influenced the antecedents to students entrepreneurial intentions i.e. personal attitudes and perceived behavioral control. Perception on close people also indicated some levels of significance in influencing a change in entrepreneurial intentions. In chapter 4, it is noted that there are some significant differences between universities in terms of their UEE effectiveness. Though there was no attempt at tracing the origin of such differing levels of impact, conventional approaches would look into how these universities differs in terms of the internal policy importance of entrepreneurship, levels of investment into the course, teaching facilities, profile of the lectures, methods used, and even the main specialization that students are taking.
Despite this level of success in all the universities, chapter 4 results still indicate that the course had failed to meet students’ learning expectations; this was significantly negative especially in relation to expectations to learn to become entrepreneurs (i.e. learning for entrepreneurship). The overall implication, relating to the impact of the UEE, is that although there were notable success levels (i.e. positive and significant changes in career attractions and intentions) the UEE fell short of what students needed most – the practical applications of entrepreneurial skills.

6.2.5 Contextual embeddedness of the UEE and graduate entrepreneurs

In this study, context was assessed at two levels: (1) the macro-environment level in chapter 3 – considering factors affecting graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania; and (2) the university level in chapter 4 – considering issues with universities. In chapter 3, the findings proved that the Tanzanian graduate entrepreneurs are embedded in an ambivalent environment, where both enabling and inhibiting factors apply. The factors do not act on entrepreneurs in a singular fashion, but exert a mixed impact such that an inhibitor to one entrepreneur may become an opportunity to another. It is learnt that graduate entrepreneurs in Tanzania have taken advantage of the changed political environments and are embedded in a context with mixed contextual forces that interact to both inhibit and facilitate entrepreneurship. We learn that embeddedness is both an issue of social structure and actors- the entrepreneurs. Tanzanian entrepreneurs, as actors, innovate ways of dealing with less developed institutions which are more inhibitive than facilitative. However, due to the limited link that exists between universities and industry, students are not prepared to overcome these inhibitive forces. Graduate entrepreneurs do not entirely attribute their entrepreneurial success to their university education. Education to these entrepreneurs becomes of use only when dealing with issues relating to business administration and on specific routine tasks, but not on issues of opportunity recognition or innovation in general and in dealing with other entrepreneurial challenges specific to Tanzania. Moreover, the absence of government support for graduate entrepreneurs and inhibitive banking systems has hampered their progress.

At the university level, the main concern was to see: First how the university internal arrangements affect/align to meet teaching objectives (This has already been discussed above). Second is on how the UEE is context-rich i.e. how the curriculum takes into account the local entrepreneurial environment such that it prepares its students to operate within these environments. Evidence from chapter 3 given by graduate entrepreneurs and observations from chapter 4 on the
assessment of the UEE teaching/learning activities have proved a limited association of local contextual consideration in the Tanzanian UEE. This is a common scenario in the African context where the majority of universities have limited partnerships with the business community (Abeli, 2010). He limited interaction between universities and industry hinders universities from having context-informed teaching program which would give the students the capacity to students to swim in local but troubled waters. Moreover, this has the effect of denying both the students and faculty members in turning different innovation into commercial products.

6.3 DISCUSSION ON THE OVERALL RESEARCH QUESTION

From the overall research question in chapter 1, this study had two main purposes. First, it aimed at assessing the influence of the Tanzanian UEE on students’ entrepreneurial intentions, and second to examine its specific characteristics that hamper and or facilitate students’ inclination towards entrepreneurship as a possible career.

6.3.1 Overall impact of the Tanzanian UEE

A general response to the first part of the question is that the Tanzanian UEE seems to achieve a significant level of success in influencing students’ entrepreneurial intentions. Although the UEE influence on intentions (using the TpB model of entrepreneurial intention) was mainly specifically covered in chapter 5, this had originated from chapter 4 where this issues had a wider coverage to include the assessment of how the UEE had impacted students’ career attraction (entrepreneurship vs. salaried employment). In both scenarios, students had shown an upward increase both in their attraction towards entrepreneurship as a possible career and in their intentions to become entrepreneurs sometimes after graduation. The only sign of negative impact was on comparing between the learning expectation of the students and on how the UEE had met them at the end of the courses. This, as will be discussed in the practical implication section, somehow creates a paradox relating to how the students would evaluate teacher’s performance or a course achievement versus their own capabilities.

The focus of this argument could probably be directed to one learning/teaching objective i.e. to learn for entrepreneurship. There is sufficient evidence from chapter 2, 4 and 5 that when entrepreneurship education is in discussion, most Tanzanian stakeholders (i.e. policy-makers,
educators and students) equate it with venture creation. It is this orientation that has affected the perception of the objectives of teaching the subject. The UEE is more viewed in terms of its role in creating future entrepreneurs who start their own business than other possible outcomes (including the stimulation of intrapreneurial employees). Yet, as shown in chapter 4, it is evident that neither the lecturers nor students have the confidence that this has been achieved by the UEE, implying that the UEE, despite its current success level, it has been more on teaching/learning \emph{about} than \emph{for} entrepreneurship. The general implication is that the UEE has created in students a sense of acceptance that entrepreneurship is a possible career option. Although the entry-profiles of the student give an indication that students were more in favor of entrepreneurship than salary employment, it is thought here that the UEE has help in cementing the students career orientation by influencing them to seriously consider entrepreneurship as a possible career option.

6.3.2 Factors affecting UEE success levels

In response to the second part of the overall research question, the Tanzanian UEE model is characterized by a number of factors that facilitate or/and hamper its effectiveness. In the study there is strong evidence that indicates a number of opportunities that work to the advantage of the Tanzanian UEE. Overall, entrepreneurship courses have emerged as result of dedicated policy, which also came as a result of the changed political arena which has influence the overall perceptions and support among different stakeholders (e.g. politicians, development partners, academicians, the media and students etc.). As reported in chapter 4, these not only work to the advantage of the UEE, but has also created more pressure on universities to accommodate issues of entrepreneurship development in their curriculum. It is also noted that there has been an increased investment in the field of entrepreneurship. Universities have recruited more entrepreneurship lecturers and existing lecturers are sent for further training (both at masters and PhD levels). As pointed out in previous section, the Tanzanian UEE is also enjoying a student population that has very positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship. In both chapter 4 and 5, the overall student profile is more entrepreneurial than perceived by the lecturers. This forms a very good starting point in the intervention process. Although the study did not go as far as investigating the source of students’ positive attitudes and attraction towards entrepreneurship, it is thought that the improved entrepreneurial environment (as reported in chapter 3) may have contributed to the perception of feasibility of this career among graduates. This also is an enabling factor to the UEE where students
become assured of the possible success and can readily identify the possibilities of obtaining start-up capitals, new market opportunities both local and international, and improved business registration and taxation systems.

Looking at the negative side, apart from common problems affecting Tanzanian universities (cf. Abeli, 2010) Tanzanian UEE is characterized by a number of hindrances that limit its achievement. A review of policy documents in chapter 4 (compared to university documents) pointed to a dilemma in defining the objectives of teaching entrepreneurship at university. There is a problem that universities face in descending from policy objectives to their specific teaching objective, again with the strong emphasis on start-up; there is also an internal mismatch between official course objectives vs. teaching objectives among individual lecturers. This has the potential to create yet another hindrance - misalignment between objectives, teaching methods, facilities, course duration and assessment methods. For example, in a semester-long course, the objective will include to educate for entrepreneurship, where the teaching/learning activities are mostly lectures and group discussion, which are assessed through tests and examinations.

Also as shown in chapter 4, there is limited understanding of the students’ entry profile in relation to entrepreneurship. In this study, this is seen to be one among the major hurdle which led to students’ dissatisfaction with the UEE achievement. Understanding of the students’ profile enables a teacher to adjust both the methods and emphasis of particular learning activities that match with the students’ profile by targeting their most important needs or long-held beliefs about the subject and confidence in facing the related real world challenges. Another obvious hindrance, as noted in the interviews with graduates in chapter 3, is the limited connection between entrepreneurship courses at university and the practical world of entrepreneurship. Courses are not contextually aligned with the local business environments; this is due to the fact that there is little or no connection with the business sector or involvement of local entrepreneurs and other practitioners both in the design and teaching of the courses. This to a large extent makes the current success level seems more superficial because the students from the UEE will hardly be able to implement their intentions when faced with contextual challenges.

It should be noted that, both the UEE and graduate entrepreneurs are operating in a less friendly environment. Despite the fact that improvements in the business environment are mentioned in the previous section (and in chapter 3) these improvements have not led to
environments that are as conducive as they are in the contexts where most textbooks and case-studies originated (e.g. the Europe and America). As such the available study materials do not prepare students adequately for the environment in which they have to operate. A discussion on contextual hindrances, in the instructional design sense, means two things: one for the UEE to be context-rich (i.e. to give the students the learning activities that reflect what is in the local business context), and for policy-makers behind promoting graduate entrepreneurship to introduce and implement other macro-level interventions that will support graduates in implementing their entrepreneurial intentions created by the UEE.

6.4 CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

6.4.1 Contribution to literature and research

The study makes a contribution, to the entrepreneurship education literature and research efforts, by explaining the role (and limitations) of entrepreneurship education in fostering graduate entrepreneurship as the product of the interaction processes unfolding within both universities and the broader society. Most of the study’s contributions are globally applicable; some are specific to the Tanzanian and the developing world context.

To entrepreneurship education literature, of specific notice is the focus in chapter 2. Chapter 2 was published in *Education + Training* and later requested for re-publication in *Engineering Management Review* (to appear in the issues of May, 2012). This chapter provides a state-of-art of the existing literature on entrepreneurship education by taking stock of existing studies and bringing into one work all the generic issues that need to be considered in the design, implementation and assessing the impact of entrepreneurship courses. This was done by systematically reviewing a total of 108 publications using a conceptual framework that is also thought to be another contribution since the same can used as a guide for empirical evaluations of entrepreneurship courses in any context. Moreover, chapters 3, 4 and 5, are based on empirical assessment of the Tanzanian UEE. Each of these chapters is dedicated to a specific issue affecting the design, implementation and success of the UEE. Chapter 3, to be specific, gives a qualitative contextual assessment of graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania. As it is with chapter 2, the chapter was accepted for publication. This not only that it has added knowledge to body of literature, but also brought forth a concise discussion enabling/inhibiting factors as viewed by graduates. The results in this paper add inputs on what
need consideration by both educators (when designing entrepreneurship courses) and policy-makers (when designing and implementing their policy interventions). Chapter 4 has a strong message on the need for alignment of components and other instructional design issues. This concept was empirically tested and brought a clear picture of the effect (on teaching outcome) caused by the state of alignment among the UEE components, especially at presage and process in view of the intended outcome. While the empirical data was based on Tanzanian universities, the findings in this chapter are not limited to this context only. Chapter 5 gives a contribution on both the relevance of the TpB and impact assessment methods in the developing world context. In this chapter, the TpB was tested of its validity to the Tanzanian sample. This did cement the well rehearsed relevance to global applicability of intentional based models in assessing entrepreneurship courses.

Specific contributions to the Tanzanian context (and the developing world at large) this study has added to the much needed research efforts. It is known that Tanzania, and Africa in general, despite the current efforts in promoting entrepreneurship, are among the less researched contexts. Naudé and Havenga (2003) explain that for such efforts to be successful, more rigorous research in African entrepreneurship will have to be undertaken, reviewed and disseminated. Among the issues that this study will add value is the revelation as to whether the current model of the UEE yields what policymakers and educators expected. To a large extent, the results will highlight what works (or does not work) and where the focus should be. For example, at the university level, it brings more insights in the challenges that universities face in descend from the market demand and policy directives towards their specific teaching objects; in contradictions existing between students’ self-reported attitudes, career interests, and learning expectations vs. lecturers’ perceptions of the subject, students’ profile, choice of specific teaching approach, and the overall learning outcome. At the macro level, this study does not only highlight the most immediate contextual forces shaping graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania, but it also gives an assessment of how these factors need to be taken into account both in the teaching of entrepreneurship at universities and when implementing other policy-related interventions aimed at boosting graduate entrepreneurship. Of specific notice are interviews with the graduates presented in chapter 3 which, though at a limited level, will add value to a few case studies on Tanzanian entrepreneurs. As noted earlier, most of the examples and textbooks given in entrepreneurship classroom originate from contexts different from Tanzania (mainly the USA and Europe). The interviews from this study have provided a platform
for graduate entrepreneurs to express what is actually prevailing in the practical side, which again will assist in supplementing the teaching materials at universities.

While the combination of quantitative and qualitative data collections methods has offered the best of the two methodological worlds, the novelty of this study rests on its simultaneous investigation of the interaction of two entrepreneurship developmental processes from two different environments i.e. the university context where students are subjected to interventions aimed at creating an entrepreneur, and the local social context that is responsible for shaping the real-world entrepreneurs. This double-review of the UEE is rare, as most studies have reviewed educational program in isolation, only in terms of their objectives versus either academic standards within the university context only, or with a given set of indicators. This has limited pedagogical approaches to more theoretical issues at the expense of the real environments that students are to face after graduation.

6.4.2 Theoretical implications

6.4.2.1 Place of the individual in entrepreneurial embeddedness

By definition, embedding is a process whereby an entrepreneur becomes part of the social structure. It is when an entrepreneur understands the nature of the structure, forges and maintains ties, and acquires knowledge of how business is conducted (Jack and Anderson, 2002). From this definition, we deduce that the questions of what [structure, factors] is not exhaustive enough unless complimented by who [the actor, entrepreneur] and how [ways of, methods]. In the educational context, the contextual embeddedness would more deal with how the UEE prepares the actors/graduates than how educational factor effect learning. The later will mainly concern on how the learning/teaching process prepares the graduates (as actors, entrepreneurs) to “embed” themselves in the local context by acquiring knowledge and ability to identify opportunities, by equipping them with abilities to beat around the factors (both facilitative and inhibitive) that shape the trade in a given entrepreneurial environment.

Studies in the African context have tended to focus more on the structure [contextual factors] than on the entrepreneur [the actor]. This, we argue, has limited the understanding of African entrepreneurship, but skewed the debates towards informal, small-scale, survival businesses. Our view is that, if embeddedness is to be understood, it must have a wider coverage – to include the
actor. To include how entrepreneurs manage to emerged and survive in what seems to be harsh business environments. In other words, we attempt to bring more focus on the peculiar abilities of entrepreneurs in embedding themselves by both acquiring knowledge and applying in dealing with context. As Marsden (1990) observed, entrepreneurship in Africa is alive and well, and it has managed to survive in hostile environments. Entrepreneurship is not merely the innovation of new products, but also of [new] ways of doing things and dealing with uncertain conditions. Therefore, surviving in hostile environments entails innovating ways of becoming part of the local context. In these situations, the contextual hostility would not be as interesting as the individual entrepreneurs who manage to emerge and grow.

6.4.2.2 Relevance of social values and close-people on intentions

In chapter 5 the TpB based Entrepreneurial Intention Model was used. This model has its origin the West. Although only two of its three predictors of intentions were accepted (i.e. personal attitudes and perceived behavior control), the model proved to be valid among the Tanzanian sample. This not only supports the universal relevance of the Ajzen (1991) TpB theorization and related model of entrepreneurial intentions, but also indicates that entrepreneurship, regardless of context, rests in the same principles.

In specific tests of the individual variables, subjective norm variables (which in this study were divided into social values and close people) were found to be insignificant in predicting intentions. This is contrary to two earlier studies in Tanzania (see Masalu and Astrom, 2001; Lugoe and Rise, 1999) that used the TpB, both of which confirmed that all the variables including subjective norms were significant in predicting students’ intentions. However, these two studies were conducted over a decade ago and in the area of health care research. Since then, a lot has taken place in Tanzania that has influenced social values and norms. The 1990s have been turbulent times in Tanzania, both economically and socially, rendering most of the old norms, values and family-ties a little shaken and some have lost relevancy among the youth. This study points to the re-thinking of the above generalizations, especially in relation to entrepreneurship. Starting from parents’ role (and that of close-ones in general) to a child’s career, our results in chapter 3 showed that the interviewed graduate entrepreneurs indeed had discussed their intentions with parents and close-ones, but this was after they had made-up their minds. Although parents and family members were hesitant, they did not stop these graduates from proceeding with their intentions. The hesitation of these parents is
understandable first because when they were young it was unconventional for graduates to become self-employed. And second, to parents, entrepreneurship may have different meaning compared to what the young generation knows about it. For many of them, for a graduate to seek self-employment, may indicate that one is unemployable. In this case, entrepreneurship makes more sense to the current group of students than the older, which makes it easy for them to not regard their parents’ opinion as feasible as their colleagues, the media and lecturers. It should be acknowledged that, after primary school, students in Tanzania spend most of their school life away from home hence have relatively less connection with their parents or relatives. Furthermore, as discussed in chapter 5, the people surrounding the graduates may hold opposing ideas regarding the value of graduate entrepreneurship as a consequence of the numerous governmental campaigns directed at stimulating entrepreneurship over the past decade. As a result of the opposing views, graduates might have to make up their own minds about entrepreneurship rather than turning to their close ties for advice on this matter.

6.4.2.3 Links between background variables and career attraction and entrepreneurial intentions

Results in chapter 4 indicated a significant link between students’ entrepreneurial attempts with having a parent who has started/or is running own business. Actually, this may not be a new insight (cf. McLarty 2005). Of interest however, is the fact that while parent entrepreneurial activities do affect the student’s intentions to become an entrepreneur prior to participating in entrepreneurship courses, they are no longer a factor after such courses. One could argue that a child coming from an entrepreneurial family, would, more than on average, be attracted to this career his or herself. My findings show that in the Tanzanian context this might not necessarily be the case and that education may act as a socialization mechanism that renders the effect of the role models insignificant. This moderating effect of education has so far been overlooked in most studies on the influence of role-models (Crant, 1996; Scherer, Adams, Carley, & Wiebe, 1989; Van Auken, Stephens, Fry, & Silva, 2006) and warrants further research.

With respect to the effect of gender, my findings provide a similar picture. While gender affects entrepreneurial intentions prior to entering a course on entrepreneurship, it no longer does so after taking these courses. Given the disadvantageous position of women in the Tanzanian, the study justifies the relevance to the gender-focused educational interventions which are aimed at
empowering women in entrepreneurship. Of interest, as it is given in the future research section, could be the empirical understanding of specific behavioral variables that need targeting to ensure maximum interventional impact among female students.

With respect to the effect of previous entrepreneurial activities of the students themselves our findings show that while quite a number of students have such experiences; these experiences do not have a significant effect on entrepreneurial intentions. The absence of a direct relationship between these variables suggests that contextual factors (e.g. changed political orientation, the currently high profile of entrepreneurship both in the media and in political arenas, inspirations from successful entrepreneurs, growth in micro-credit etc) are responsible for shaping students’ career aspirations and their learning expectations rather than previous experiences. An alternative explanation might be that for some students previous entrepreneurial activities were not successful causing a reduction in confidence level and future entrepreneurial aspirations. As we have not controlled for previous entrepreneurial success levels future research is needed to determine which of these explanations is valid.

Again, literature on career studies suggests that there is a link between students’ learning motives and their career aspirations. According to such studies students’ learning expectations, motivation and career aspirations originate in some demographic factors and past experiences in which a particular student has come from (cf. Byrne and Flood 2005; Wall et al 1999). My study shows that students’ learning expectations significantly correlated with their career interests. This provides a justification for educators to design courses that mirror the current demand in the job market, as well as a basis for re-aligning different subjects with the changing career patterns. It should also be noted that students’ career aspirations are changing as a reflection of the changing demands of employers and the overall career patterns (including self-employment) in a given context.

6.4.3 Policy and practical implications

At policy level, in each chapter, there is strong evidence that entrepreneurship, and its educations, is at the top of the national development agenda. The Tanzania Development Vision 2025 and other policy documents have highlighted the need and strategies to integrate entrepreneurship education in different levels of education. From this study, especially in chapter 4, it is noted, while there was a speedy response by higher learning institutions towards adopting
entrepreneurship courses, such adoption and integration were haphazardly done, without a common philosophy/framework at ministerial level.

In all the policy documents, (i.e. from Vision 2025, Higher Education Policy, SME Development Policy 2002, to the Trade Policy 2003 and others), despite the emphasis on the need for entrepreneurship (and self-employment) there is no working definition of what it is, and what attributes that education is to build in the students. This has resulted in universities to implement policy directives based on their own theoretical orientation of entrepreneurship, hence a wide variation of entrepreneurship courses. Decision-makers from the political and business spheres tend to use definitions that refer particularly to specific needs and objectives (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008). It is important to understand these needs and formulate an explicit definition of what entrepreneurship is (and is not) and of what education implies (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008). The definition, therefore, as suggested in chapter 2, should be a starting point in choosing other educational inputs and community related initiatives. At the current state, we see that Tanzanian universities are experiencing difficulties both in translating government policy needs and descending from the macro aims of entrepreneurship development towards specific teaching objectives.

Further, from the review of contextual factors in chapter 3, it seems that the government’s call for more graduate entrepreneurs end with charging universities with the responsibility to create these graduates, but not backed-up by strategies for supporting graduates after university. In other words, there is a need for a specific framework that would take over from UEE. This could be in terms of supportive facilities, especially at the start-up stage. From chapter 5, it can be established that the Tanzanian UEE has a significant success rate in creating positive intentions among students. The question is “what happens to these intentions after graduation?” Fishbein and Ajzen (2005) argued that in order for a person to perform an intention, two types of interventions may be required: one to produce the desired intentions (e.g. teaching during the UEE) and another very different intervention to facilitate the performance of the intended behavior. This study and a number of others (cf. Marsden, 1992) have established that insufficient finance has been a significant impediment for most African entrepreneurs to fulfil their entrepreneurial ambitions. Most entrepreneurial intentions die at the funding stage even before facing other institutional hindrances.

Also as reported in chapter 3, governments’ policies at the ministerial level are hampered at the implementation stage – at the institution level e.g. banking, taxation, local governments, business
registration etc. These institutions are a key in implementing initiatives towards graduate entrepreneurship development. In these institutions, there are two factors that inhibit graduate entrepreneurship: one the absence of special directives/framework on how to handle graduates; the sluggish working habits and lack of entrepreneurial awareness among official. The later is more serious that the first. In chapter 3, graduates have indicated concerns on how slow or reluctant are public officials and bankers are towards serving entrepreneurs. This signifies the need for capacity building among both policy-makers and key players. This could be another opportunity for UEE, to have special programs with these players, both to educate them and involve them in forums with entrepreneurship students at universities.

An overall practical consideration may relate to the state of the Tanzanian UEE curriculum in view of its efforts to accommodate the vocational teaching of entrepreneurship (i.e. educate for). Traditionally, universities are theoretical, meaning that they are more suited to educate about entrepreneurship than for entrepreneurship. From chapter 4 and 5, it is proved that the Tanzanian UEE plays a important role promoting entrepreneurship, but its impact is observed mainly on behavioral changes (e.g. change in attractions, attitudes and intentions) as opposed to the practical abilities in setting up new ventures (either at campus or after graduation). A link between these behavioral attributes to the physical entrepreneurial attempts is missing. Unlike the lower training institutions, e.g. those under the Vocational Training Authority (VETA), a typical Tanzanian university is overtly theoretical and has very limited links to both industry and practitioners. The inclusion of educating for entrepreneurship, as a teaching objective, need to be done by considering the cultural gap that exists between the world of universities and that surrounding a venture undertaking. Universities entrepreneurship education, as evidenced in the study, may focus more on the cultural aspect of entrepreneurship than on the implementation of an entrepreneurial project (Clergeau and Schieb-Bienfait, 2007). To balance the two worlds is a formidable challenge because it calls for a curriculum that is uncommon for traditional universities. With the limited resources that Tanzanian universities are facing, the most feasible solution would be to harmonize the teaching objectives in a way that it will align with other educational inputs. Probably, to refocus the teaching objectives such that they reflect what the study has proved to be achievable i.e. to develop students’ awareness, interests and willingness to become entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs. This would not be confined to own initiated ventures, but to other types of organizations.
There is also an issue with the choice of impact assessment methods and types of questions to the respondent students. In questionnaire, the students were to respond to two related types of questions: (1) how the course had met their learning expectation (i.e. their satisfaction with the course) – in chapter 4; (2) to evaluate their own entrepreneurial abilities (before and after the UEE) – chapter 5. As once noted, there seem to be a conflict between the two types of responses given by the students. According to the students’ response of how the course had met their expectations, the course had failed to satisfy their learning expectation linked with abilities to become entrepreneurs (i.e. learning for). But at the same time, relating to responses on self-evaluation, the students showed significant increase in levels of their attraction towards entrepreneurship (at the same time, lowering their interest towards salary-employment), as well as significant improvement in their abilities to handle entrepreneurial activities (i.e. perceived behavioral control). While on one hand, this could mean that, despite course failure in meeting their expectations, it did however manage to improve students’ perceived confidence levels in undertaking entrepreneurial tasks, but leaving much to be desired in terms of the practical applications of their entrepreneurial skills in the real-world. On the other hand, these paradoxical findings may be calling for educators to be aware of the possible bias among students’ responses, to the extent that they would lowly rate questions/issue relating to their satisfaction with the course outcome, but highly rate issues that have to do with their own ability-levels. If this is the case, this may therefore raise contradictions on using students’ self-reporting surveys as ways for impact assessment. Similar contradictions have been noted in the past. For example, while Eon et al (2006) suggested that students’ ratings of satisfaction is a significant indicator of learning outcome; Costin et al (1971) cautioned on using these ratings, arguing that such ratings only provides an indication on students’ reaction to the course (but not learning outcome). According to Costin et al (1971) students’ responses may be influenced by their relationships with the lecturers and other features during the course.

6.5 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The study could be improved by having a control group of which to compare the changes in intentions over the period at the university. This could somehow give an indication of whether the UEE, apart from other university factors, is the sole cause for changes in students’ intentions. However, there could be some problems in choosing the appropriate control group since a large proportion of students happen to have taken some type of entrepreneurial training sometimes
before university. However, the lack of control group is not a major setback since a number of other studies in this field had acceptable impact assessment results, without a control group (see Fayolle et al 2006).

Of interest from the set of demographic variables are gender and parents’ entrepreneurial status. First, gender and entrepreneurship have a special connection in Tanzania. In most cases, when the two are discussed it is on how entrepreneurship would contribute towards female empowerment. Our findings show that entrepreneurship education does indeed fulfill this function as after participating in entrepreneurship courses gender no longer seems to have an effect on entrepreneurial intentions. Further research, as pointed out earlier, should be in understanding the gender-based behavioral patterns that play a role in affecting entrepreneurial intentions between the two genders. Second, as another area that may be of research interest, is the link between parents’ (career) entrepreneurial status with a students’ career choice. As reported earlier, a significant link is found between a parents’ having/running own business with students’ entrepreneurial attempts. While this gave a very logical support for the role-model argument, the absence of a link between parents’ running own business with students’ attraction to entrepreneurship (in chapter 4) made the role-model argument suggest that there are factors other than having an entrepreneurial parent that come to play for a child to be attracted to a parents’ career. This study did not go as far as to inquire those other factors. This is also another good research opportunity, where the proposed study could measure issues like the role of parents’ entrepreneurial success and quality of life that a child enjoyed by having an entrepreneurial parent.

As it could be noted both in chapter 4 and 5, while students show a very positive entrepreneurial entry-profile, there were no efforts in examining the sources of such tendency before the UEE. It was generally assumed that these could be a result of the changed entrepreneurial environment, the transition from socialism to market-led economy, the media etc. This fact needs more investigation so that to quantitative to identify the significance of these contributing factors. This to a large extends will help educator in the choice of teaching approaches and decide which interventions need to be emphasized at university (e.g. use of role models) and which need to be done by the government (e.g. improvement in entrepreneurial environments) or civil societies (e.g. more media coverage of entrepreneurial success stories).
To conclude this thesis, like any other studies within the TpB, this study did not provide evidence on whether the improved entrepreneurial intentions in chapter 5 will someday materialize into real start-ups. This problem is also note in chapter 4 where the 3P model was used. The challenge within this model was on how to link the first two phases of the 3P model (i.e. presage and process) with the last phase (i.e. the product). In both scenarios (i.e. in TpB and the 3P model), there is a conflict in matching the subject’s teaching objectives (i.e. teaching for), the time of impact assessment, and the desired high ultimate outcome (e.g. new venture, new jobs, etc). Taking into consideration the 5 to 10 years time that graduates are normally said to start their first ventures, this problem may call for an extended longitudinal study, which will trace graduates’ career progressions from university, and help to indentify the sustainability of entrepreneurial intentions created at university.
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