

Perceived value of Entrepreneurship Course Content among University Students in Uganda

Jacob L. Oyugi

School of Management and Entrepreneurship, Kyambogo University

Gorretty A. Ofafa

School of Business, Kenyatta University

Wilson M. Mande

School of Business Administration, Nkumba University

This article is part of a study that focused on the contribution of entrepreneurship education to the development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions among university students in Uganda. It reports on students' perceived value of course content of entrepreneurship education at universities. The basic problem investigated involved the public concern that many students who study entrepreneurship at the universities in Uganda might simply not have developed self-efficacy and intentions to become entrepreneurs. Primary data was collected mainly through self-administered questionnaire, focus group discussion and in-depth interviews. A total of 255 students, selected through simple random sampling, participated in the study. Correlation matrix results showed significant positive relationship between perceived content and self efficacy ($r=0.454$, $p<0.01$), self efficacy and entrepreneurial intention ($r=0.418$, $p<0.01$) but no significant relationship between perceived content and entrepreneurial intentions. Students perceived the course content to have given them knowledge about business in general, venture creation and opportunity identification. These are necessary but insufficient for business start up. This implies that reliance on the current course content may not adequately contribute to developing entrepreneurial intentions among university students.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Self Efficacy, Entrepreneurial Intentions

Introduction

For both start-up companies and existing firms, entrepreneurship spurs business expansion, technological progress and wealth creation (Lumpkin and Dress, 1996). The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (Reynolds, Bygrave, and Autio, 2004) confirms the importance of entrepreneurship. A wide range of factors have contributed to the revival of interest in entrepreneurship. Among these are the economic recessions brought about by the Second World War and high unemployment rates in Europe and America. Given the prevailing economic conditions, policy makers worldwide, starting from 1947, began to recognize the instrumental role of entrepreneurship for economic growth.

As a result of proliferating emphasis worldwide on entrepreneurship as the catalyst for economic development and job creation, policy makers have developed a wide range of measures to support

entrepreneurship. Key among these is the call for academic institutions, such as universities, to contribute through appropriate educational programmes, that is, entrepreneurship education (Laukkanen, 2000). According to Gibb and Nelson (1996) entrepreneurship education relates to the development of fundamental management skills and abilities that train the individual to start, manage and develop a business. Formal entrepreneurship education has its origin in the USA and Canada (Gibb, 1993, Kolvereid and Moen, 1997) where most universities started to offer courses in entrepreneurship, along with majors in more traditional business areas such as finance, accounting and marketing.

Formal education had been found to affect attitudes of college students toward entrepreneurship as a career option (Haffen and Ruhland, 1995; Hansemark, 1998) cited by Rasheed (2000). The contribution of entrepreneurship education to economic growth in western society is well documented (Charney and Libecap, 2000; Ronstadt, 1985; Sexton and Upton, 1987; and Donckels, 1991). As noted by Galloway and Brown (2002), in addition to developing skills for business start-up and ownership, entrepreneurship education makes a significant contribution in terms of the quality of graduate start-ups, and it influences general attitudes to entrepreneurship in the long term. In line with the critical role entrepreneurship education serves in the venture creation, numerous studies have been carried out to investigate the effects of entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurship (Charney and Libecap, 2000; Donckels, 1991; Sexton and Upton, 1987; Ronstadt, 1985). Acs et al (2004) cited in Urban (2008) asserted that in high income countries, 57% of entrepreneurs had post secondary education, suggesting that in those countries the education systems tend to build a suitable skills base for entrepreneurs. In poorer countries only 23% of entrepreneurs had post secondary education. These key differences suggest that more educated entrepreneurs are pursuing more opportunity-based ventures, while less educated entrepreneurs are involved out of necessity.

Following a trend initiated in the USA in the 1970s, and considering the contribution of entrepreneurship education, the number of public and private initiatives to train and educate people to be more entrepreneurial has multiplied on both sides of the Atlantic (Fayolle, 2006). This spread to other countries such as, UK, Netherlands, and South East Asia just to mention a few. Kee, Rodrigues, Kundu and Racine (2008) surveyed the status of entrepreneurship education in different countries and indicated that entrepreneurship education exists

in the secondary vocational, medium or at the graduate level through business management courses.

A similar trend is being followed in African countries. Among the African countries Uganda is one of the economies that appreciate formal entrepreneurship education as a way of developing entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurship Education in Uganda

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

Research by Walter, Balunywa, Rosa, Sserwanga, Barabas and Namatovu, (2003) has shown that in Uganda there is no clear definition of an entrepreneur. People try to start all sorts of businesses and when they succeed they are referred to as entrepreneurs. The Uganda 2003 GEM National Report looked at the informal sector as one involved in entrepreneurial activities, which contributes to high levels of employment both in urban and rural settings. The report further observed that in 2003 Uganda was the most entrepreneurial country in the world. Uganda had the highest Total Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) Index (29.2) among all GEM countries, signifying that 29 out of every 100 Ugandans are entrepreneurial. In 2004 Uganda ranked second (33.7) after Peru (42.6), with a slightly higher TEA than (2003). Most of the businesses are family-owned and/or are operated as sole proprietorships. The start-up capital is either from personal savings, borrowed from family friends, or other informal sources. Many who start businesses do not generally innovate but duplicate existing trends, so differentiation in the market is quite uncommon.

The GEM report (2003) also indicates that the few individuals who have succeeded as entrepreneurs only started business because they had

dropped out of school and had no other employment options. This trend could be in line with Ocici's (2006) observation that entrepreneurship was not championed in the traditional educational system, and it was just introduced in the curriculum of institutions of higher learning in the recent past.

GEM (2004) investigated the extent and quality of training in starting or managing small, new, or growing businesses through the educational system at all levels - from primary school to postgraduate courses. The result of the interview ranked education and training number one (named by 33%) as a contributing factor. The GEM report (2004) also indicates that colleges and universities have enough courses and programmes on entrepreneurship. Much as the GEM report (2004) has documented this, no empirical study has been conducted to measure how the courses are stimulating to the students. The courses may be adding to the stock of existing courses without much value.

Based on the researches conducted, as elaborated in the foregoing sections, it was possible to identify that entrepreneurship education was indeed a felt need and critical for economic development. The aim of this study was therefore to investigate entrepreneurship education in universities in Uganda and to explain the variance in their entrepreneurial intentions. As confirmed by the GEM report (2004) entrepreneurship courses and programmes exist in universities in Uganda as formal academic programmes.

In school context entrepreneurship education can be divided into three aims that are learn to understand entrepreneurship, learn to become entrepreneurial and learn to become an entrepreneur (Hytti, 2002). Therefore entrepreneurship education should be considered both as a content of learning as well as a method of learning. Gibb (2001, 2003) has stated that entrepreneurship education is about learning for entrepreneurship, learning about entrepreneurship and learning through entrepreneurship.

Like any other university programmes, entrepreneurship education programmes at universities have objectives. Table 1 shows the objectives of entrepreneurship courses of each of the three universities included in the study. These were Makerere University Business School (MUBS), Uganda Martyrs University (UMU) and Kampala International University (KIU).

Although the course titles and objectives may be stated differently, they all focus at the same end result of equipping the learner with entrepreneurial skills so as to give the students the confidence and willingness to choose entrepreneurship as a career. For example, Makerere University Business School, which offers Bachelor of

Entrepreneurship and Master of Science in Entrepreneurship, had part of the objectives of its entrepreneurship programmes (2007) as follows: (i) to provide specialist knowledge and skills to students about how to start and manage small businesses, (ii) to inspire graduates of the programmes to start-up and grow businesses and (iii) to inculcate an entrepreneurship culture in graduates of the programmes.

Statement of the Problem

Given the course titles, and objectives of offering entrepreneurship education by the universities in Uganda, it is presumed that entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions would be enhanced through entrepreneurship education. It is for this objective that universities try to ensure that students graduate and become entrepreneurial. Yet there has been a debate regarding entrepreneurship education. The debate questions how entrepreneurship should be taught and whether it can be taught at all.

Even when entrepreneurship education is taught, there are still people who argue that it is all purely academic, meaning that students do not acquire the skills that make them job creators or entrepreneurial. For instance, Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, GEM (2003) and National Council for Higher Education, NCHE (2006) point out that the education system in Uganda is too academic and does not deliver any practical entrepreneurial know-how and skills. The education system does not promote entrepreneurship as a career option. Similarly, the Vice Chancellor of Uganda Christian University, Rev. Professor Stephen Noll, commented (Ssenkaaba, 2007) that the tendency for university education in Uganda to concentrate on academic knowledge at the expense of hands-on experience has compromised skill development among graduates. The New Vision (2007) Editor commented that one of the biggest problems with Uganda's education has been lack of emphasis on practicality. He pointed out that many students do even practical courses without hands on experience. This is consistent with a statement by Tamale (2002) who noted that although entrepreneurship is perceived as a value, attitude and behaviour that enables one to appreciate self-employment as a career, the programmes in the formal education system do not provide such needs and has traditionally produced job seekers and not job creators.

The debate on the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education was the genesis of this study and it was important for answering the sub-question: Does entrepreneurship education contribute to the development of entrepreneurial self efficacy and intentions? This

question is in line with the observation made by Kennedy and Peterman (2003), that the impact of entrepreneurship education, as distinct from general education, on attitudes and intentions of entrepreneurs were still not clear. Accordingly, the purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of entrepreneurship education on students' perceived self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions among university students in Uganda.

Objective and Hypothesis

The objective of this research was to analyse the extent to which university students perceive the content of entrepreneurship education in relation to the contribution to the development of their self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions. In order to shape and focus the study, a corresponding hypothesis was formulated as follows: University students who have done entrepreneurship course perceive content of entrepreneurship education to have positively contributed to the development of their self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention.

Methodology

Design

This paper explores perceived value of entrepreneurship education course content from the student's perspective. To achieve this objective, a cross-sectional survey design was used since it provides a quantitative or numeric description of attitudes or opinions of a population by studying a sample or cross-section of the population (Creswell, 2003) as well as collection of data from a sample from varied sources at one point in time. The cross-sectional survey is the most commonly used research method in social research (Amin, 2005) and can produce data which permit the establishment of casual relationships (Sarantakos, 2005). Apart from advantages in costs and time, compared with experimental method, cross sectional studies are the appropriate choice for preliminary studies (to discern and define problems and for exploratory studies, seeking optional actions, (Luck and Rubin 2002:58). Earlier studies by Ajzen (1997) confirm that cross-sectional models are widely used in intentional research without losing validity or robustness.

This research employed a mixed methodology approach using quantitative and qualitative design (Creswell, 2003) which is highly grounded in the philosophy of social sciences literature. The

quantitative data was to help establish the relationship and its magnitude between entrepreneurship education, self efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions of university students. On the other hand, the research methodology relied on qualitative data where the body of data consisted of texts and narration to help in explaining what was happening in as far as entrepreneurship education in the selected universities was concerned. The choice to collect the data using a combination of methods was based on the idea of triangulation for creating a richer and deeper understanding of the phenomenon as well as increases the validity of the research findings.

Target Population and Sample

Population of interests for the study was final year students (who studied entrepreneurship) from three universities out of a population of 22 universities in Uganda at the time of the study (2006 - 2009). The targeted universities were: Makerere University Business School, Kampala International University and Uganda Martyrs University. The three universities were purposively selected because they had been teaching and examining business and entrepreneurship courses for more than five years. From these universities, all the final year students (2008/2009) studying entrepreneurship in their programmes were the target. A total of 2,042 students were identified from Makerere University Business School, 85 from Uganda Martyrs and 96 from Kampala International University giving a total of 2,223 to form the student population.

In addition to the students, a total of 37 university managers and academic staff directly involved in managing the programmes and teaching the entrepreneurship courses for each of the three universities were included. This category included: Deputy Vice Chancellors/ Principals/ Directors in charge of Academics Affairs, Academic Registrars, Deans of Faculty housing the entrepreneurship education course/programme, Head of Departments and Academic Staff involved in the implementation of the entrepreneurship programme.

Data Collection and Analysis

The overall purpose of this chapter is to lay out the concise methods and course of action that was followed in conducting the research for this thesis. This was accomplished in this section by describing the strategy and procedures that were employed in the data gathering efforts. The questionnaire was the main data collection instrument. Even though

the questionnaire was the main method of data collection from the selected university students, focus group discussion and interviews were also used to gather more information from students, lecturers, heads of department, and deans.

Data obtained from the questionnaires was analysed using SPSS 17.0 software programme. The analysis was done at three levels: univariate, bivariate and multivariate. At the univariate level, descriptive statistics were used; at the bivariate level correlations were used to determine relationships between variables; and at multivariate level, regression analysis was executed in order to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent one. Furthermore, a path analysis was used to develop a predicative model about the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions among university students in Uganda.

Results and Interpretation

This paper presents a report on the perceived value of course content of entrepreneurship education among university students who were in the final year of their university education.

All the three universities offer mandatory entrepreneurship courses for all students doing business courses. Makerere University Business School offers it also as an independent programme at both undergraduate and graduate level. Regardless of the differences, course content was one of the constructs of entrepreneurship education used to explain entrepreneurship self efficacy and intention. Students' perceptions of content of entrepreneurship courses were expected to be positively related to their level of entrepreneurial self efficacy and entrepreneurial intention. The three universities have entrepreneurship education curricula with detailed course contents. Their methods of generating course contents, according to the Heads of Department, included: (i) benchmarking with other universities. Benchmarking was the most common method (67%) of generating content for entrepreneurship education just because competitor universities are offering them, (ii) analysis of job market, (iii) input from industry experts (iv) discussion with entrepreneurs, (v) using visiting professors, and (vi) knowledge acquired through training. The most common topics identified in the content of the courses include: the concept of entrepreneurship, characteristics of an entrepreneur, entrepreneurial process and development. NCHE (2009) gives details of the courses offered by Makerere University Business School (MUBS), Uganda Martyrs University (UMU) and Kampala International University (KIU).

The findings indicate that the course titles are unique to each university though the topics and content overlap in most cases. What is not clear is whether the overlapping courses are delivered in the same way across universities and given the same number of contact hour. There was no standard way of presenting the course content in terms of topics, content, duration and methods so as to compare. The variation could be due to the fact that universities are autonomous in designing and implementing the courses of study. Although there appear to be variation in the presentation, the overall purpose is for students to take more responsibility for themselves and their learning, to try to achieve their goals, be creative, discover existing opportunities and in general to cope in the complicated society. Moreover, the aim is for them to take an active role in job markets and consider entrepreneurship as a natural career choice. The extent to which the variations in course content affect the students' self efficacies and intentions is not much of the focus of this study.

However, in an attempt to reduce the effect of variations in the course offering, National Council for Higher Education (2009), started controlling quality by setting minimum standards for all programmers and courses in universities in Uganda. Entrepreneurship education was among the first programmes for which a minimum requirement standard was set. The minimum standards were based on the courses offered in each of the three years, contact hours, credit unit and duration for each course. The National Council for Higher Education regulates quality by establishing the minimum standards for content to which all universities, in Uganda, teaching or planning to introduce the programme must comply.

While minimum standard for entrepreneurship course content exists, analysis of the course content revealed that a great deal of the content relate to management, finance, marketing and other functional areas. These functional areas assumes the company is in existence and have very little to do with creation of new ventures. Courses that relate to entrepreneurship still remain limited. For instance, there are only two courses out of eight in year one that directly relate to entrepreneurship. Similarly there are only two out of eleven courses in year two that relate to entrepreneurship and so is the same structure in year three. This issue was raised in the focused group discussion with the lecturers. According to the findings the lecturers have at times had difficulties in identifying contents and means by which to respond to challenges posed by entrepreneurship education. It also seems that the entrepreneurship education in terms of the given content is still rather

insignificant. One of the gaps in the content is business idea development.

It can be argued that entrepreneurship education can be delivered in a number of different knowledge contexts but the common context is that of setting up a business or self employment. It has been argued by Gibb (1987, 2002) that the conventional organization and delivery of knowledge around functional inputs of management, finance, marketing, operations, human resource development, and so on, is not appropriate. The fact that so much knowledge for business start-up is delivered in this way reflects the corporate 'institutional' bias of the universities. It does not reflect the holistic 'knowledge of the totality of the business' that is needed by the entrepreneur. In reality there is no such thing as a marketing problem, a finance problem or human resource problem, only multifaceted problems and opportunities. On the other hand it was observed that the business plan is often placed at the centre of entrepreneurship education. Yet there is little evidence to demonstrate that such plans are central to developing entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions at the start-up stage. Business plans were almost certainly not invented by entrepreneurs but by bankers, accountants, suppliers of finance and donors. They are important as relationship management instrument in raising finance from and through the above but are probably not core to initial entrepreneurial endeavour. While much of the content is interesting in itself it does not necessarily equip the student with the entrepreneurial spirit.

If for example the aim is to primarily encourage students to think about, and be excited by, the opportunities for personal entrepreneurship then the focus would be much more on the 'need to know', 'know how', and 'know who' of going into business. A key question to ask in this respect is what would an entrepreneur really need to know about and for what outcome? In other words there is need to have an entrepreneur's profile. One of the things expected of an entrepreneur is opportunity recognition. Opportunity recognition is commonly considered the first stage of the entrepreneurial process (Christensen et al., 2004; Timmons, 1999), which Bygrave and Hofer (1991) argue involves all functions, activities and actions associated with perceiving opportunities and creating organizations to pursue them. Entrepreneurship education in the higher education system primarily targets students in the pre-entrepreneurial phase (Leskinen, 1999; Melin, 2001; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003) cited by Luoto et al (2009). While writing a business plan is a common focus of entrepreneurship education in universities, Paasio et al., (2005) in Luoto et al, (2009),

argue that the business idea development process is not paid sufficient attention.

The entrepreneurship education content as it stands raises a number of questions: First, to what degree does the content have activities that seek clearly to develop opportunities, initiative taking, commitment to see things through, networking capacity and incremental risk taking? Second, to what degree does the content help the students feel the world of living with uncertainty, building know who and trust relationships, learning by doing, problem solving? Third, to what extent does the content seek to inculcate and create empathy with values such as self belief, strong sense of ownership, belief that rewards come with own effort, believe can make things happen and strong belief in freedom to take action? Fourth, to what degree does the content help students understand the benefits from an entrepreneurship career and compare with employee career? Fifth, to what degree does the content take students through the total process of setting up an organization from idea to survival and provide understanding of what challenges will arise at each stage? Sixth, to what degree does the content build the capacity to find an idea, appraise an idea, see problems as opportunity, improve emotional self awareness and know where to look for answers? Seventh, to what extent does the programme help students to identify the appropriate scale of a business to make a living, finance the business appropriately from different sources, develop a business plan as a relationship communication instrument?

In order to analyse and understand the issues of entrepreneurship content raised above, seven items were used to measure the desired outcome of the content of entrepreneurship education. These were capacity for opportunity seeking, creating empathy with key self belief, confidence to consider entrepreneurship as a career option, capability of setting up an organization from idea to survival, seeing problems as opportunity, living with uncertainty and developing a business plan. These outcome dimensions of content were investigated to establish which of them are important. To do this, exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the underlying factor structure of the items for measuring expected outcome of content.

Out of the seven items only five emerged to be important with eigenvalue greater than 1. These were loaded on one factor. Since only one component was extracted, the solution could not be rotated and it was reported using the component matrix. This factor was referred to as entrepreneurial capabilities. Individuals who perceived themselves as “entrepreneurially capable” are expected to be alert and sensitive to opportunities, and able to take advantage of such opportunities if they

consider the endeavour worthwhile. The result of the factor analysis is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Component Matrix for Content

Outcome Dimension of Content	Entrepreneurial Capability
1 See problems as opportunity	.73
2 Capable of setting up organization	.70
3 Opportunity seeking	.69
4 Empathy and self belief	.68
5 Cope with uncertainty	.65
Eigenvalue	3.2
Percent Total Variance	45.2

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. a. 1 components extracted.

The first item related to desired outcome is developing the students' capacity to see problems as opportunity with coefficient of 0.73, measured entrepreneurial capabilities strongly. This involves scanning the environment to identify problems which can be translated into opportunity. This relationship is consistent with Christensen et al., (2004) and Timmons, (1999) who stated that opportunity recognition is commonly considered the first stage of the entrepreneurial process, which Bygrave and Hofer (1991) argue involves all functions, activities and actions associated with perceiving opportunities and creating organizations to pursue them. The second (item 2) is the capability of setting up organization with coefficient of 0.70. The third item (item 3) pointed towards the development of opportunity seeking behaviour seeking with coefficient of 0.69 which is closely followed by empathy and self belief with coefficient of 0.68. On the other hand, the fifth item (item 5) described the ability to cope with uncertainty and complexity of the world, as the least measure of entrepreneurial capability with coefficient of 0.65. These items are the ones that measured entrepreneurial capabilities strongly. All the items explained 45.2% of the students' entrepreneurial capabilities.

It can be argued that knowledge input (entrepreneurship education) can be delivered in a number of different knowledge contexts dependent upon the desired outcomes stated above. Although the conceptualization of entrepreneurship education content appears to be widely accepted by the universities in Uganda, in practice it is difficult to link it with clear, targeted outcomes. Furthermore, the conventional organization and delivery of content around functional inputs of marketing, human resource development, operations and finance is not

appropriate. The fact that so much knowledge for business start-up is delivered in this way reflects the corporate 'institutional' bias of the universities. It does not reflect the holistic 'knowledge of the totality of the business' that is needed by the entrepreneur. In reality there is no such thing as a marketing problem, or a finance problem for instance, only multifaceted problems and opportunities. The functional delivery approach also tends to lead to an over-sophistication of the knowledge delivered.

The priority is to deliver on a 'need to know' and 'need to apply'. The desired emphasis which also substantially affects the organization of content is upon 'know how'. Thus instead of delivery of generic marketing material, the emphasis might be upon, 'how to find customers', 'how to educate the customer', 'how to build a customer base', 'to learn from customers' and so on. The emphasis is therefore upon how to take up different opportunities, anticipate problems and transform this into new venture. This argument is raised in recognition that the major learning field for those who set up and run businesses is that of responding to and anticipating the desires of the stake holders (customers, suppliers, financiers, agents, professional service providers, tax and other regulatory authorities, other business persons, family, staff and competitors).

As noted in all the entrepreneurship courses, the business plan is often placed towards the end of content with the hope that the students would be able to translate the acquired knowledge and skills into a viable venture. Yet Gibb (2006) argues that there is little evidence to demonstrate that such plans are central to entrepreneurship at the start-up stage. They were almost certainly not invented by entrepreneurs but by bankers, accountants, suppliers of finance, regulatory bodies and donors. They are important as a communicating tool and management instrument in raising finance from the above sources but are probably not core to initial entrepreneurial endeavour. However, respondents in Uganda say that the idea of business plan is good because it enables the students go through the rigour of business start up. They say that it the practice of real business but on paper. In their view, they strongly recommend business plan competition and institutional support for the best business plan for implementation. Finally linked with this is the importance of delivering 'know-who' capacity in recognition that it is the capacity to build, work and learn from networks that arguably is the most critical factor in entrepreneurial endeavour.

This result was further analysed using statistical analysis to establish the extent to which content contributes to the development of self-efficacy and intentions. First, Pearson correlation matrix was used to

examine the relationships between content, self efficacy and intention variables. The results of the correlation matrix are shown in the Table 2.

Table 2. Relationship between Content, Self-efficacy and Intentions

	1	2	3
Content(1)	1.000		
Self Efficacy (2)	.454**	1.000	
Entrep.Intentions (3)	.049	.418**	1.000

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

The result indicates that Content of entrepreneurship and Self Efficacy were found to be significantly positively correlated ($r = 0.454$, $p < 0.01$) supporting part of hypothesis one. However, the result did not show support for significant relationship between content and intention. Instead relationship between self efficacy and entrepreneurship intention was significantly positively correlated ($r = 0.418$, $p < 0.01$). This finding was further explored by conducting interviews with the students. The result of the interviews with 20 students, revealed that content and time allocated was not enough. They reported that course unit in entrepreneurship is usually done in one semester and for two hours per week. They would prefer the course to be spread throughout the programme.

Two Students commented that there is lack of continuity since the course unit is done in one semester and usually in the second year of their study. This creates a gap in as far as flow of knowledge is concerned and students lose the interest and see less value of the course. Instead they concentrate on their core courses. Despite the limited scope of content and time, all the 20 students interviewed admitted that entrepreneurship course is a good course and whatever content they learnt was in line with their expectations. This finding means that students appreciate more content and time in order to build the necessary skill and be able to assess whether they are entrepreneurial. This is consistent with De Noble et al (2000) findings that students have to be given time to develop an appreciation for the myriad of activities necessary to raise capital, attract critical human resources, and define the company's core purpose. Thus the course contents determine whether the students can build the confidence and intentions to be entrepreneurial or not, and it is the means of assessing the curriculum as a whole. Johannisson (1991) asserts that if the quality of content is sub-standard, teachers will find it difficult to address issues related to confidence building in their students which in turn will affect their entrepreneurial intentions.

The issue of content of entrepreneurship education was probed further during a focus group discussion. In their view, they agreed that the content was good but suggested that risk management was important missing link in the content. They argued that the students would receive the knowledge but would still lack confidence to venture into entrepreneurial activities because of fear of the risks. However, a lot has been said about content but the question that remains to be answered is whether it is the content which is at stake of skills-building that are not well taken care of. It was found that the issue of timetabling could not allow for skill-building which requires longer hours during and outside the lectures. First there are so many other courses in any one semester which leaves very little room for effective skill-building hence less confidence-building and less entrepreneurial intention.

Correlation matrix results did show significant positive relationship between content and self efficacy ($r=0.454$, $p<0.01$), self efficacy and entrepreneurial intention ($r=0.418$, $p<0.01$) but could not be used to predict their behaviours. Linear regression takes us a step further in the direction of prediction. If the correlation between content, self efficacy and intention variables is sufficiently consistent, content can be used to predict self efficacy or intentions

The model summary table provides the value of R and R² for the model that has been derived. R has a value of .454 which indicates the correlation between content and self efficacy. The value of R² is .206 which tells us that content accounted for 20.6% of the variation in entrepreneurial self-efficacy. This means that 79.4% of the variation in entrepreneurial self efficacy cannot be explained by content alone in the model. Therefore, there must be other variables that have influence also. Adjusted R² shows that 20.3% of the variance in entrepreneurial self-efficacy of the students is explained by content of entrepreneurship. It can be said that content contributes 20.3% to the development of self efficacy. The model also produces *Durbin-Watson test* statistics value of 1.833. The test statistic can vary between 0 and 4 with a value of 2 meaning that the residuals are uncorrelated. The value depends upon the number of predictors in the model, and the number of observations. As a very conservative rule of the thumb, values less than 1 or greater than 3 are definitely cause for concern (Field, 2005:170).

Meaning there is a problem of correlation. Since the result of the Durbin-Watson test statistic is $1.833 > 0.203$ Adj R², it can be concluded that the model is well specified. This means that content and self-efficacy are uncorrelated.

The regression output compares very well with the correlation ($r=0.454$, $p<0.01$) results and therefore it can be concluded that the

hypothesis was partially achieved. Content positively contribute to development of entrepreneurial self efficacy. A separate regression analysis was conducted with entrepreneurial intention as the dependent variable with content and self efficacy as predictor variables. The results were presented in Table 3 where there is no significant relationship between content and entrepreneurial intention ($r=-0.157$, $p>0.01$).

Table 3: Relationship between content, self efficacy and entrepreneurial intention

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.492	.018		27.603	.000		
	Content	-.039	.021	-.157	-1.851	.066	.819	1.221
	Self Efficacy	.164	.029	.485	5.705	.000	.819	1.221

a. Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intentions

Results show that self efficacy is a significant predictor of entrepreneurial intention. The overall regression was significant at 1% level. The modal summary is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Regression Model with entrepreneurial intentions as dependent variable

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			Sig.	F
					Change	Change	Change		
1	.442a	.195	.183	.20012	.195	16.476	2	136	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self Efficacy

b. Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intentions

The regression model predicted 18.3% of the variance in entrepreneurial intention. The table reveals that content is not a significant predictor of entrepreneurial intention unless mediated by self efficacy.

Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Discussion of Findings

The result from this study indicates that content of entrepreneurship and Self Efficacy were found to be significantly positively correlated ($r = 0.454$, $p<0.01$) supporting part of hypothesis one. However, the result did not indicate significant relationship between content and intention. This was confirmed by result of the path analysis which indicated a very weak effect (0.06). Instead relationship between self efficacy and

entrepreneurship intention was significantly positively correlated ($r = 0.418, p < 0.01$). This implies that the students had gained confidence from the knowledge they acquired which might not be necessarily from the content. This finding was based on how the students perceived the knowledge passed onto them as entrepreneurs to be.

According to Vesper (1998) there are four kind of knowledge useful to entrepreneurs: first is business general knowledge which applies to business in general, both new and established firms; second is venture general knowledge which is distinct from business general knowledge but fairly general to ventures; third is opportunity specific knowledge which is the knowledge about the existence of an un served market and/or about the resources needed for venturing in it; and lastly is venture-specific knowledge which is the knowledge on how to produce a particular product or service. The last two are generally the most important ones for entrepreneurial success, but business schools normally offer courses that foster the first two categories of knowledge. It is widely recognized that most of them educate 'about' entrepreneurship and enterprise rather than educating 'for' entrepreneurship. Only rarely do they focus on developing in their students the skills, attributes and behaviour of the successful entrepreneur.

This situation was comprehensively described in an interview with the students and is also evidenced by the content of textbooks on entrepreneurship. For instance, most of the content talk about the entrepreneurial process, opportunity recognition, entry strategies, market opportunities and marketing, creating a successful business plan, financial projections, venture capital and other forms of financing, franchising and corporate entrepreneurship (intrapreneurship). While these skills traditionally taught in business schools are necessary, they are not sufficient to make a successful entrepreneur.

There is also little uniformity in program offerings across universities, and this is commonly considered related to the fact that entrepreneurship is an emerging field and there is no entrepreneurship theory yet which can decrease the divergence. This may need to be revised. Revision in course contents was first suggested by Fiet (2001) who emphasized that the only way to effectively teach entrepreneurship is to strongly rely on theory. Fiet (2001a) stresses that there is nothing more practical than theory. He stated that entrepreneurship theory is a set of empirical generalizations about how entrepreneurs should behave that allows for predictions of true outcomes. Theory must be taught to aspiring entrepreneurs because nothing is more practical than understanding the consequences of committing resources to launch a

venture. On the basis of a survey, Fiet (2001b) notes the divergence in topics within entrepreneurship courses and attributes it to the lack of a comprehensive theory of entrepreneurship.

Even though a comprehensive theory exists, still little attention has been given to how to measure the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education content towards individual. The main problems related to the assessment of entrepreneurship education content may be measuring output from the entrepreneurial education process. Although it seems difficult to determine causality, some output measures such as increased orientation towards entrepreneurial careers could also be examined. A satisfaction index of students regarding course content, usefulness and instructor appeals can be used. Even though this seems to be a reasonable measure of satisfaction, this kind of instrument does not state directly whether the students learnt anything. On the contrary, the key question for assessing entrepreneurship education content should be: what value is added by a specific course?

On the other hand there are tests, assignments, projects and examinations conducted in the course of the training. Still, this measurement does not grasp the real value the content of entrepreneurship education generates. Programmers in entrepreneurship education generally have the overall objective to bring about some kind of change in the economy, society or even individuals. The expected changes may involve change in behaviour, such as establishing new venture. Measuring dimensions of change implies also that the point of departure has to be established in addition to the achieved results of entrepreneurship education content. All these may require careful evaluation before, during and after the educational process in order to trace and assess the changes due to the pedagogical intervention.

The debate on the contents of entrepreneurship education may be partly related to the debate on the objectives of entrepreneurship education and which target group should be focused at the universities. If the objective is to increase the number of new enterprises resulting from the university context, the tendency will be towards contents which are tailored to the needs of those directly interested in becoming entrepreneurs. However if the objective is to improve the social culture of entrepreneurship, suitable target groups would be future opinion-leaders, decision-makers or managers in larger companies who require more precise analytical skills, situational decision-making and action-taking aspects of entrepreneurship. Further responses from the students interviewed together with that of the lecturers during focus

group discussion, showed that feasibility study and risk management were noted as problems. Therefore some of the topics that students perceived as important to entrepreneurial learning were not being adequately covered in the content. Based on these results, one could deduct that entrepreneurship education content may have less value as far as the development of entrepreneurial intentions among university students in Uganda is concerned.

Conclusion

This paper presented students' perspectives on the perceived value of entrepreneurship education content in relation to developing their entrepreneurial self efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions. Based on the findings and discussions presented in this paper, it can be concluded that universities in Uganda have traditionally focused on offering courses which are relevant only prior to the "awareness" of "new venture creation" and management of established business organizations. Furthermore, it was found that while educators frequently debate the issues surrounding the appropriate content of entrepreneurship education, no concrete theory of entrepreneurship is available to guide the content development. The current content of entrepreneurship education is overcrowded with courses that relate to functional areas of established businesses. The content is necessary but not sufficient in developing the entrepreneurial intentions of the learners.

Recommendation

The finding under objective one points out that the content of entrepreneurship is overcrowded with theoretical courses that relate to functional areas of established businesses. Based upon this finding, entrepreneurship scholars should review the content to have more practical than theories. Where the content is derived from various courses as it is the case at the time of this study, senate should assess value added by each course to the development of entrepreneurial intentions among university students and leave out those that may add no value. Arising from focus group discussion, one of the key areas to be emphasized in the content of entrepreneurship is feasibility study and risk management. As providers of entrepreneurial knowledge and skills, students are our "customers" and universities must continually seek out their perceptions of how well their needs are being served.

References

- Ajzen, I., (1991). Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179 – 211.
- Amin, M. E (2005). *Social Science Research; Conception, Methodology and Analysis*; Kampala: Makerere University Printery; ISBN No.9970-05-019-2.
- Bygrave, W.D., & Hofer, C.W. (1991). Theorizing about entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16, (2): 13-22.
- Charney, A., Libecap, G.D., (2000). *Impact of Entrepreneurship Education. Insights.*
A Kauffman Research series. Kauffman Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design – Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed methods approach* Sage Publications, Inc. California, London and New York.
- Christensen, C.M., Anthony, S.D. & Roth, E.A. (2004). *Seeing what is next*, Boston College, Harvard Business School Press.
- Donckels, R. (1991). Education and Entrepreneurship Experience from Secondary and University Education in Belgium. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise* 9(1):35-42
- Fayolle, A. (2006). *Essay on the Nature of Entrepreneurship Education*, Universite Libre de Brussels.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS*, SAGE Publications. London.
- Fiet, J.O., (2001a). The Pedagogical side of Entrepreneurship Theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*; 16(2):101-117.
- Fiet, J.O., (2001b). The Theoretical side of Teaching Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*; 16(1):1-24.
- Galloway, L., and Brown, W., (2002). Entrepreneurship education at university: a driver in the creation of high growth firms? *Education + Training* 44(8/9).
- Gibb, A.A; (1993). The Enterprise Culture and Education. Understanding Enterprise Education and its links with Small Business Entrepreneurships and Wider Educational Goals. *International Small Business Management Journal* 11(3).
- Gibb, Y.K., and Nelson, E.G., (1996). Personal Competences, Training and Assessment: A Challenge for Small Business Trainers. *Proceedings of the European Small Business Seminar.*
- Hytti, U. (2002). *State-of-Art of Enterprise Education in Europe – Results from the entreduc Project.* Small Business Institute, Business Research

- and Development Centre. Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Turku.
- Johanisson (1991). *University Training for Entrepreneurship: A Swedish Approach. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*; (3(1): 67-87.
- Kee, J; Rodrigues, P. Kundu, S; and Racine, J.L; (2008). *Entrepreneurship Curriculum, Project Report for JIP Grant.*
- Kennedy, J., and Peterman, N.E., (2003). *Enterprise Education: Influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28: 129-145.
- Kolvereid, L., and Moen, O., (1997). Entrepreneurship among business graduates: does a major in entrepreneurship make a difference? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 21(4):154-161.
- Laukkanen, M., (2000). Exploring alternative approaches in high-level entrepreneurship education: creating micro-mechanism for endogenous regional growth, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*.
- Luck, D.J; & Rubin, R.S. (2002). *Marketing Research: Prentice - hall of India, New Delhi - 110001.*
- Lumpkin, G.T., & Dress, G.G., (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*; 21: 135-172.
- Luoto, S. Hakala, H; Kautonen, T, & Lammi, M, (2009). *Business Idea Development in Entrepreneurship Education: A Semiotic Structuration Approach.*
- National Council for Higher Education, (2006). *The State of Higher Education and Training in Uganda*; A report on higher education delivery and institutions.
- New Vision, (2007). Can Entrepreneurship be taught? Education Pullout, July 23.
- Ocici, C. (2006). "Legal Empowerment of the poor." *A working paper on Entrepreneurship presented at National Consultation Conference, 24-25, November, Speke Resort Munyonyo, Kampala-Uganda.*
- Rasheed, H.S; (2000). *Developing Entrepreneurial potentials in Youth: The effect of Entrepreneurial Education and Venture Creation: University of South Florida. 4202, E. Fowler Avenue BSN 3403 Tampa.*
- Reynolds, E., Carter, N., Gartner, W., Greene, P., & Cox, L. (2002). *The entrepreneurs next door; characteristics of individuals starting companies in America. Kansas City: MO: Ewing Marion Kauffman foundation.*
- Reynolds, P.D., Bygrave, W.D., and Autio (2004). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2003): Executive Report, Babson College, retrieved from World Wide Web.*

- Ronstadt, R., (1985). Training Potential Entrepreneurs. *In Entrepreneurship: What is and How to Teach it*; Harvard Business School.
- Sarantakos, S., (2005). *Social Research*; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sexton, D.L., & Upton, N., (1987). Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to Teaching Entrepreneurship: *Journal of Small Business Management*.
- Ssenkaaba, S. (2007). Can Entrepreneurship be taught, Education Pull-out, *New Vision* (2007).
- Timmons, J.A., (1999). *New Venture Creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st Century* (5th Ed.), Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Urban, B., (2006). *Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurship Intentions: a prospect for Higher Education?*
- Walter, T., Balunywa, W., Rosa, P., Sserwanga, A., Barabas, S., & Namatovu, R. (2003). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitoring, Uganda Executive Report*.