

University's Entrepreneurship Education: Creating Meaningful Impression for New Generation

Muhammad Nizam Zainuddin
*Multimedia University
Malaysia*

1. Introduction

For the past three decades, the world experienced the impact of entrepreneurship in the creation of creative and innovative new ventures. Who would have thought that as the world becomes connected through the internet, as precisely predicted by Friedman (2005); products like Facebook revolutionise social networking to another level. Who would have thought that Facebook, which originated from a college room to cater connection amongst college's students, has become the most used social networking site in the world! Amongst other successful entrepreneurship ventures like Microsoft Corporation, Google Inc., Apple, Virgin Group and Wal-mart; Facebook is a fine example of how entrepreneurship can bring positive impacts to the world.

Behind every successful business venture, there is an entrepreneur who visualises and transforms an unpolished idea into commercial success. Becoming an entrepreneur is never easy. It requires a unique blend of creativity, innovation, self-confidence, leadership, and multi-skills, all of which determines the success and failure of a new venture. There are many intertwining factors that determine an individual's plight to become an entrepreneur. These so-called antecedents can be both natural and circumstantial. Various research projects have been undertaken to establish and reaffirm the ideas of what makes an entrepreneur; i.e. whether they are born (natural-tendency), or made and educated to become one (circumstantial-tendency). In another interesting development, many business schools took the initiative to offer entrepreneurship education to the public.

In this chapter, the author's perspective of entrepreneurship education in universities is discussed in detail. The chapter is arranged according to sub-topics of:

1. The background of entrepreneurship,
2. Definitions of entrepreneurship,
3. Entrepreneurial trajectories,
4. The nature of entrepreneurial intention,
5. The relationship of graduate career-making and entrepreneurship education,
6. Entrepreneurship education issues, and
7. Integrated Strategic Entrepreneurship Education Delivery (ISEED).

1.1 Entrepreneurship background

Until today, there is no single agreement amongst scholars in the entrepreneurship academia pertaining to the actual definition of an entrepreneur and entrepreneurship due to its complex multi-facets nature (Sexton & Bowman, 1984; J.L. Thompson, 2004). Earlier, Vesper (1980) proposed that in order to manage any potential confusion; the definitions of 'entrepreneurship' and 'an entrepreneur' need to be treated differently altogether depending on which perspectives an individual subscribed to (e.g. academician, economist, psychologist, business persons and politicians). For that logical reason, the definition of an entrepreneur and entrepreneurship need to be addressed and corresponded as according to the situation, audience and its user respectively.

According to Praag & Versloot (2007), the study of entrepreneurship is still evolving and those working in the field continue to be engaged in conceptual and methodological debates. Various issues such as whether entrepreneurship can be taught to others (Henry, Hill, & Leitch, 2005); and if yes, what is the potential outcome (Matlay, 2008) dominated discussions amongst entrepreneurship academia in the past few years. Meanwhile, taking into consideration the recent economic crisis, an issue of whether the nature of entrepreneurship can respond to social and cultural movements in the new economic era especially after the latest economic crisis in 2008 (Rae, 2010) became the latest viewpoint.

2. Definition of entrepreneur

As an individual who is centred in any entrepreneurship endeavour, entrepreneur is someone that is regarded as a chosen one who possessed special abilities to spot and exploit commercial opportunity (D. F. Kuratko, Morris, & Covin, 2011). Shane (2003) described an entrepreneur as a key unit of analysis of an entrepreneurial organisation.

In this regard, there are two schools of thoughts regarding the definition of entrepreneur. The former revolves around the economic concept and the latter revolves around the social psychology concept.

The definition of an entrepreneur according to economists mainly focuses on an entrepreneur as one of the factors of production of economy. They further explained an entrepreneur's position, roles and functions in the economic landscape as compared to other employment positions. The compilations of entrepreneur definitions based on economic scholars are as follows:-

- An individual who undertakes the risk of new ventures by investing, transforming and making profits after the resale stages. Sources from Richard Cantillon (Schaper & Volery, 2004)
- A person who forms an organisation for commercial purpose (Smith, 1776)
- An assembler of the other factors of production (labour, land and capital) and act as an agent to further bring in an economic change to the society. (Menger, 1871; Mills, 1848)
- An act of 'creative destruction' by an individual (innovator) that develops untried technology and at the same time manages the risk involved. (Schumpeter, 1934)

Meanwhile, the latter entrepreneur definition comes from the social psychologist scholars. They look at personality dimensions of an entrepreneur. The compilation of psychology-driven entrepreneur's definition is as follows:-

- As a process where an energetic person (entrepreneur) with high locus of control but a moderate risk taker, who also has strong need for achievement, maximises opportunities, takes initiative, and organises some social and economic mechanisms and at the same time accepting risks of failure (Drucker, 1964; McClelland, 1961, 1965; Rotter, 1966; A. Shapero, 1975).
- A person cognitively recognises opportunity through his or her psychosocial traits (Katz, 1992).
- The action taken by the individual or firm in order to cash-in the opportunity by the ability to create and build something from practicality nothing (Timmons, 1989).
- An act of opportunity exploitation by an individual as a necessary step in creating a successful business in the entrepreneurial process (Choi & Shepherd, 2004).

Nonetheless, an effort to come up with a comprehensive definition of entrepreneur was provided by Shane (2003), whereby he defines entrepreneur as “an individual who involves in an activity of discovery, evaluation and exploitation of opportunities to introduce new goods and services, ways of organising markets, processes, and raw materials through organisation efforts that previously had not existed.” His definition was based on five assumptions namely;

- Entrepreneurship requires opportunities, where it expresses the effect upon which individual take action on an opportunity, therefore intention can be regarded as a catalyst to action;
- Entrepreneurship requires variance amongst individuals; this is better explained through the demonstrations of an individual’s ability to recognise an opportunity, either through experience, access to resources or information, as well as through volition of individuals to champion an opportunity through the entrepreneurial process;
- Risk bearing decision is made to act on opportunity that is unknown and uncertain (whether profit or loss);
- Formation of an organisation, whereby the entrepreneurial process requires organising and / or creating of a new way of exploiting the opportunity and;
- Innovation activity was held, either Schumpeterian or Kirznerian.

Despite of various entrepreneur typologies amongst the scholars, there is a single beneficial value that an entrepreneur cans offers. Many scholars acknowledge that entrepreneurship plays a prominent role as a social adjuster (Jack & Anderson, 1999) within a domestic economy that can bring economic development worldwide (Dana, 2001; Garavan & O’Cinneide, 1994; Ibrahim & Soufani, 2002).

In the light of dynamic economic changes, the interest on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs are becoming very noticeable. Many studies were performed to understand the dimensions of an entrepreneur in the form of; (1) effect of family characteristics (Djankov, Qian , Roland, & Zhuravskaya, 2005) , (2) gender effects (Gupta, Turban, Wasti, & Sikdar, 2009) and (3) motivation to become an entrepreneur (Segal, Borgia, & Schoenfeld, 2005)

Perhaps, this phenomenal is an answer to many socio-economic issues. However, the entrepreneur as an individual who is a centre of entrepreneurship is likely to consider as a rare breed. In this chapter, issues of whether entrepreneur is born, made or educated will be discussed in detail.

3. The trajectories of an entrepreneur's

Based on literature, there are six types of entrepreneurial trajectories identified in explaining the action of an individual choosing to become entrepreneur. The six trajectories factors are namely; (1) traits & characteristics, (2) cognition, (3) career-selection, (4) push-pull factors, (5) demographic and (6) economic.

All these trajectory variables can later be divided into 2 main groups of; (1) natural tendency (born) and (2) circumstantial tendency (made and educated)

Natural Tendency Variables	Circumstantial Tendency Variables
Demographic	Cognition
Traits & Characteristics	Push-pull factors
Career-selection	Economic

Table 1.1. Compilations of Tendency Variable

3.1 Natural tendency to become an entrepreneur

In recent years, natural or biological variables (e.g. demographic, traits and characteristics and career-selection) deemed to be too deterministic and often results in small explanatory power (N. F. Krueger, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000) and these exogenous factors cannot work in isolation (Prediger & Vansickle, 1992). Thus, eventually these variables were held in reserve list by scholars for quite a period of time. However, these variables gained new perspectives along with the advancement of biological science when several pieces of research confirmed that these variables genetically influenced entrepreneurial behaviour (Shane, Nicolaou, Cherkas, & Spector, 2010; Zhang et al., 2009).

Amongst others, Nikolaou et al., (2008) suggests that it is important to consider genetic factors to explain why people engage in entrepreneurial activities because they have found evidence that indicates relatively high heritabilities for entrepreneurship in genes, with little effect of family environment and upbringing. With this indication, we can argue that the natural tendency variables are somehow still important to explain entrepreneurial behaviour.

- *Demographic Variable*

Based on literature, there are three prominent models of natural tendency variables:

This model proposes that demographic factors like age, gender, race and others impacts the entrepreneurial decision of an individual (R.D Hisrich & Brush, 1985; Light & Rosenstein, 1995; Ronstadt, 1987). An example of push factors can be found in Hisrich and Brush (1985), where they found out that female entrepreneurs, especially married women, were influenced by push factor such as job dissatisfactions to be a common catalyst to their entrepreneurial activity.

- *Traits and Characteristics Variable*

This model theorises that an individual becomes an entrepreneur because of his or her unique personality traits and personal characteristics such as need of achievement, high internal locus-of-control, risk-taking propensity, and personal values of independence (Brockhaus, 1982).

- *Career-selection Variable*

This model points out that the decision to become an entrepreneur is actually derived from the development of career anchors and the fits between the individual skills sets

and jobs requirements such as dynamic career typology (Holland, 1959) and Career Anchor theory (E.H. Schein, 1978). The approach was explored as early as the late 1950s. Holland (1959) came up with dynamic career typology by setting out the theory of an individual seeking vocational satisfaction by matching their specific personalities and traits to one of six career types: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising and Conventional (RIASEC Model). In addition, Schein (1978), then introduced the Career Anchor theory where he theorised that a person's career self-concept revolves around eight career anchors consisting of; (1) autonomy, (2) security, (3) technical, (4) creativity, (5) managerial, (6) basic values, (7) motives, and (8) needs. These anchors were then categorised and paired under categories of basic values, motives and needs, technical competence, autonomy or independence, security or stability.

3.2 Circumstantial tendency to become an entrepreneur

Meanwhile, circumstantial tendency factors explained that an entrepreneur is made from the socio-economic system where he or she experienced several stimulant factors that derived from social and economic setting. These factors will then trigger the tendency to become an entrepreneur. The variables from circumstantial tendency (e.g. cognition, push-pull factors and economic model) are amongst topics that extensively research prior to the emergence of socio-psychological models of Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen, 1987), Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and Entrepreneurial Event Model (A. Shapero & Sokol, 1982). The socio-psychological models were found to be more in parsimony yet robust and were capable to explained both natural and circumstantial trajectories into a single research framework.

Based on literature, there are three models that represent natural tendency trajectories namely:-

- *Cognition Model*
This model described entrepreneurial action as derived from the unique cognitive processes, (Baron, 1998), effectuation-oriented (Sarasvathy, 1998) and cognized as a series of 'interesting projects' by an individual (Meyer, 2004). The Cognition Model describes an entrepreneurial action as derived from the human cognitive process. These antecedents then predispose them to an entrepreneurial activity. Firstly, Baron (1998) stated that an entrepreneur possesses unique cognitive processes (mind sets, biases and habitual heuristics). Then, Sarasvathy (1998) found out that an entrepreneur is more often effectuation-oriented whereas a non-entrepreneur tends to be more causal-oriented. In addition, Meyer (2004) found out that entrepreneurial venture cognized as a series of 'interesting projects' by an individual. Finally, Lee & Venkataraman (2006) proposed that every individual has two different opportunities; entrepreneurial that is defined as uncertain opportunities and non-entrepreneurial that is defined as less uncertain opportunities. The market for non-entrepreneurial options generally operates more efficiently than the market for entrepreneurial options. They held that people, who have higher level of Individual Aspiration Vector (IAV), tend to search for entrepreneurial opportunities.
- *Push-pull Factors Model*
This model theorised the powerful motivations of perceived opportunity and the powerful force of necessity leading an individual to become entrepreneur (Alstete, 2002;

Birley & Westhead, 1994; Cooper & Dunkelberg, 1981; Denison & Alexander, 1986; Orhan & Scott, 2001; P Reynolds et al., 2004; Shane, Kolvareid, & Westhead, 1991). For an example, in one of the study, Hisrich and Brush (1985) found out that female entrepreneurs, especially married women, were influenced by push factors to be a common catalyst to their entrepreneurial activity

- *Economic Model*

This model proposes that a rational individual will perform subjective utility analyses to evaluate the benefits of career options. Therefore, if the result of the analyses shows that the entrepreneurial related career will bring more economic benefit to the individual, he or she will choose to be an entrepreneur (Kirzner, 1973).

4. Entrepreneurial intention: Bridge of entrepreneurial tendency to entrepreneurial action

The emergence of the socio-psychological perspective in explaining action of individuals to become entrepreneur has encourage more related research determining the effect of both natural and circumstantial effects towards entrepreneurial behaviour (Kolvareid & Isaksen, 2006; Lin, 2006).

One of the prominent independent variable introduced from the socio-psychological model is Entrepreneurial Intention variable introduced in Entrepreneurial Intention Model (N. F. Krueger, et al., 2000).

This variable is indeed a very important finding because firstly, according to Bird (1988), intention actually can capture and explained of how an individual thinks as it is structurally rational and intuitive resulting from: (1) social, (2) political, (3) economic, (4) personal history, (5) personality and (6) personal ability factors. Interestingly, she (Bird) argued that entrepreneurial intention is something that is unique for an individual, yet it can also be cultured and nurtured through the aforementioned variables. Secondly, Learned (1992) proposed that the formation of intentions is the result of the interaction of psychological traits and background experiences of the individual with situations that are favourable to entrepreneurship. Intention to found assumes that some individuals will encounter situations that will interact with their traits and backgrounds that cause the intention to become self-employed. Intentioned individuals will ultimately make the decision to start a business or abandon the attempt to start the business depending upon the sense made of the attempt. This variable reflects the missing link between entrepreneurial recognition and entrepreneurial action.

It can explain here whereby, the entrepreneurial intentions process may begin with the individual's personal needs, values, wants, habits, and beliefs (Bird, 1988). Along the process, there are a lot of natural and circumstantial factors that interact with each other's (e.g. demographic, traits and characteristics, career-selection, cognition, push and pull and economic factors) that may affect individual's intentions to become an entrepreneur or to start a business.

Furthermore, according to Ajzen (1991), an opportunity recognition activity (behaviour) would not translate into an action if the individual does not purposely think about it in the first place (intention) because human action is guided by certain considerations. He further

argued that in its simplest form, intentions predict behaviour, while in turn, certain specific variables predict intention. Thus, intention serves as a conduit to better understanding the act itself. Prior to that, (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) proved that there is a relationship between an opportunity and intention as they found out that opportunity perceptions reflect an intentional process; in short, intentions are driven by perceptions of controllability and by perceptions of desirability. Later, Shapero (1982) established research frameworks that test the relationship of an entrepreneurial intention and opportunity-exploitation. He found out that an entrepreneurial intention is basically formed when someone perceives there is a potential and opportunity that needs to be exploited.

It can be described by Kuratko (2005) that the opportunity-spotting itself does not permeate an individual as an entrepreneur if he or she did not act on it. The entrepreneurial-act involves the initiative and exploitative traits (Blawatt, 1998; Bridge, O'Neill, & Cromie, 1998; A. Gibb, 1987; Hamilton & Harper, 1994; J.L Thompson, 1999) and planning to achieve the outcome because he or she possesses high internal locus of control (Cromie, 1998; Cromie & Johns, 1983; Rotter, 1966).

There is much literature on why people start their own businesses. However as stated by Reynolds (1995), little is known about why people create new businesses or what antecedents factors support the start-up decision. Scholars have come up with various reasons like businesses are created as a result of the purposeful intent and resolute action of courageous individuals (Learned, 1992; E.H. Schein, 1983). The common motives that were proposed by previous scholars were classic profit motivation (Drucker, 1953; McClelland, 1961; Penrose, 1959); opportunistic profit seekers (Williamson, 1975); autonomy and creativity (E.H. Schein, 1978); individual attributes and environmental factors (Gartner, 1985); and wealth creation (Scheinberg, 1988).

This leads to a comprehension that entrepreneurial intentions are actually central to the understanding of the entrepreneurship process because entrepreneurial intentions form the footing for the founding of new organisations (N.F. Krueger, 1993). The logical explanations are that individuals can come up with various reasons why he or she wants to be self-employed and start new business ventures (e.g. Drucker, 1953, Penrose, 1959, McClelland, 1961, Liechenstein, 1966, Williamson, 1975, Schein, 1978, Gartner, 1985, Scheinberg and MacMillan, 1988, Venkataraman, 1994) but without intention, action is unlikely. Therefore, entrepreneurial intentions are crucial to understand the overall process of entrepreneurship as they serve as the key initial instrument for subsequent actions and events that are related to opportunity recognition, organisational founding and self-employment (B.J. Bird, 1988; 1992; Boyd & Vozikis, 1994; Crant, 1996; N.F. Krueger, 1993).

5. Graduate-career making theories & entrepreneurship education

5.1 Relationship of career-choice models and university's setting

Socio-psychological model (i.e. Entrepreneurial Intention Model) verifies that by combining natural and circumstantial trajectories, entrepreneurial intention of its receiver will be significantly increased (Liñán & Chen, 2006; M.N. Zainuddin & Mohd Rejab, 2010). There is a sense of realisation by policy makers and scholars who are looking for the best avenue to apply entrepreneurial intention model in the university confinement. This move is based upon belief that potential students who will receive entrepreneurship education may

possess a natural tendency to become an entrepreneur (born) and universities may be able to generate the situation that exposes the students to become an entrepreneur (made); and these move will be execute through entrepreneurship education (educated entrepreneur).

This move seems to be an ideal win-win situation, where the supply and demand of entrepreneurship programme in the higher education market were met. According to Mwasalwiba (2010), this relationship exists through mutual perspective that policy makers, on the demand side believed that entrepreneurship education can create new ventures and job creation to the economy; and potential students can pursue their vocational interest to become self-employed or to assume family business traditions; while on the supply side, ambitious universities together with their academicians that seek academic advancement can provide innovative entrepreneurship education to cater to the needs at the opposite end.

Over time, universities have been seen as platforms to cultivate entrepreneurial behaviour and activities in many part of the globe especially in promoting self-employment (Basu & Virick, 2008; Kolvereid, 1996; M. N. Zainuddin & Ismail, 2011). Perhaps, this activity seems to be consistent with career-choice models that being proposed by scholars namely: (1) Savickas's (2002) Career Construction Theory, (2) Gottfredson's (2002) Circumscription, Compromise and Self Creation Theory (3) Krumboltz et al.(1976) Social Learning Theory and (4) Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory. Amongst others, Savickas argued that the vital stage of students' engagement with entrepreneurship came at the stage of "exploration," whereby their personality traits were explored rigorously with the education process. In this stage, students through "social learning" will observe and influenced by positive and consistent reinforcement from observing significant occupational role models (e.g. family, close friends, idols) and being exposed to images related to specific career. In addition, their perception about their career will be eventually taking shape through their "expectancy" instrumentality and valence. Once they discovered their potential, they will proceed with what they believed their good at and abandon unacceptable alternatives or "circumscription" as proposed by Gottfredson.

6. Entrepreneurship education issues: Creating meaningful impression for new generation

As entrepreneurship education paved its way into university syllabi, there were both supports and critics regarding its implementation.

6.1 Supports

Accordingly, there were many studies conducted in universities in determining the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education towards the students. Lüthje & Franke (2003) found the importance of contextual factors in the university environment which then (1) play a role in facilitating the occurrence and the intensity of entrepreneurial behaviours and (2) providing orientations to the behaviours of students through internal and external factors. Varela & Jimenez (2001) study has confirmed that the more universities invest in entrepreneurship education, the higher the entrepreneurship rates. Souitaris et al.,(2007) conceptualized good entrepreneurship programmes by suggesting balanced, 'good practice' programme grouped under four components namely (1) a taught component, (2) a business

planning component, (3) an interaction practice component, and (4) university support component.

Amongst others, studies established the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial self-efficacy. This is due to the fact that education directly affects self-efficacy (Per Davidsson, 1995; N. Krueger & Brazeal, 1994) because educational settings appear to be the fertile ground for the development of perceived self-efficacy. Krueger & Carsrud (1993) found out that training programmes can have an impact on the antecedents of intention identified, which includes entrepreneurial self-efficacy. They found that perceived self-efficacy is influenced by the acquisition of management tools and exposure to entrepreneurial situations. In addition, other scholars e.g.(Ehrlich, De Noble, Jung, & Pearson, 2000; Hansemark, 1998; Wilson, Kickul, & Marlino, 2007) found that entrepreneurship education had a positive impact, enhancing variables such as need of achievements, locus of control and self-efficacy and the likelihood of action at some point in the future. Moreover, Noel (2001) found out that entrepreneurship education affects propensity to act as an entrepreneur, entrepreneurial intention and entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

6.2 Critics

In contrast, scholars criticised limitations of entrepreneurship education programmes. Firstly, Dilts & Fowler (1999) argued that only certain teaching methods (i.e. traineeships and field learning) are more successful than others at preparing students for an entrepreneurial career. Therefore, if the educators and practitioners lack pedagogical knowledge and skills, it might affect the delivery of entrepreneurship education to the students thus affect their self-efficacy. It was confirmed when firstly Ooi & Ali (2004) found out that the lecturers without prior business experience and or involvement in family running businesses had low level of inclination to teach entrepreneurship and later Bennett (2006) found out that lecturers' definitions of entrepreneurship were indeed influenced by their backgrounds and by the number of years they had worked in the business sector. Therefore, if lecturers lacked experience in enterprise ownership and management, they were unable to precisely illustrate the entrepreneurship environment; and worst still, they would provide the wrong perceptions of entrepreneurship to students. The level of efficacy transferred to students from lecturers was less substantial.

In addition, empirical researches carried out by Davidsson (1989) and Storey (1994) found out that the relationship between education and entrepreneurship were mixed especially on the status of education. Othman et al., (2006) found out that there was not much difference in terms of personality traits including self-efficacy between the graduate and non-graduate entrepreneurs in urban Malaysia.

Pittaway & Cope (2007) through their systematic review of entrepreneurship education came out with the pressing problem statement that what is unclear is the extent to which such education impacts graduate entrepreneurship or whether it enables graduates to become more effective entrepreneurs.

In addition, the location of entrepreneurship education being situated also became an issue. Hindle (2007) argued whether business school is the right place to teach entrepreneurship

due to tendency of educators synonymising entrepreneurship with management practises (Binks, Starkey, & Mahon, 2006; A. Gibb, 1987).

Perhaps some of the above issues are limiting the potential of entrepreneurship education to its prime receiver. Collectively, all these issue can lead into a bigger issue of whether the positive entrepreneurial intention that is derived from entrepreneurial self-efficacy (from entrepreneurship education) can be translated further into solid entrepreneurial action? Bridging the gap between classroom's theories and real world's practical experiences became a major issue that inviting creative intervention by all stakeholders. Furthermore, the new generation of undergraduates who are exposed to many knowledge and information through new information technology available; altering their learning recognition process that demands fresh approaches to become relevant as one of the deciding factor in creating a new venture.

Again, perhaps all the supports and critics received pertaining to entrepreneurship education can be considered and addressed in a more integrated manner.

Based on above discussion, there is obvious gap between motive of and the delivery of entrepreneurship education. Considering the issues affecting entrepreneurship education; an author suggested that implementation of Integrated Strategic Entrepreneurship Education Delivery (ISEED) concept that comprises of two-tier holistic and specific approaches operated synergistically should be seriously considered.

6.3 Integrated Strategic Entrepreneurship Education Delivery (ISEED) implementation concept

This implementation concept will be a direct effect in integrating both holistic and specific approaches of entrepreneurship education that consists of 4Ps elements of Philosophy, Policy, Pedagogy and Practice (please refer to Figure 1.1)




Fig. 1.1. Integrated Strategic Entrepreneurship Education Delivery (ISEED)

The discussion of all four components are organised into two sections. Firstly, each component will be reviewed and secondly, the suggestions on how to improve each component will be proposed respectively.

6.3.1 Philosophy

In general, scholars found that the current entrepreneurship education philosophy embraced by universities were inconclusive. As a multidisciplinary subject, the major challenges facing by university's academicians amongst others are; (1) an urgent need to shift their paradigm from providing instructions (the teaching paradigm) to providing learning (the learning paradigm) and emphasises on educational processes which actively engages students in the learning and a learning environment which cares for the learners (Fink, 2003); (2) difficulty to integrate and explain fully the different traditional social science disciplinary perspectives; economic, sociological, psychological and anthropological to the students effectively into a single platform (A. Gibb, 2005); (3) there were lack efforts in reviewing at the philosophical, theoretical and normative links that linked entrepreneurship education and education science as part of entrepreneurial culture. As a result, three education preoccupations remain under addressed namely social cognitive, psychocognitive and ethical theories (Bechard & Gregoire, 2005); and (4) there was a dominant pattern that entrepreneurship education has been based on an individual-centred mindset, that resulted in a strategy that aims to give general education to individuals on how to become entrepreneurs, missing the other ingredient of know-who element completely (Laukkanen, 2000). As a result, the tasks of academicians extracting suitable theories, designing syllabi and later deliver entrepreneurship education to the students becoming very enormous indeed.

In relation to inconclusive philosophy, the relevant strategic actions should be considered:

- In order to expedite the transition from the teaching paradigm to learning paradigm, universities need to transform their role of being a real incubator for students by gathering resources to provide experienced entrepreneurship education's academicians from both the industry and academia that are capable to expose students with what they can expect from the world of entrepreneurship.
- It is vital to change the current intellectual learning philosophy in the university from "produce" and "perform," to "pause" and "reflect" (Cherwitz & Sullivan, 2002). Universities need to make space for students to contemplate their personal, professional and intellectual identities based on the experience they acquire; the kind of reflection that can yield sustained productivity and satisfaction in the long run. By doing so, universities can simulate the real entrepreneur world of tacit knowledge and heuristics judgment.
- In addition, universities need to introduce trajectory of "discovery-ownership-accountability" (Cherwitz & Hurtado, 2007; Shaver & Scott, 1991). From the outset, students are encouraged to discover their personal, intellectual, and professional interests and to make explicit and thoughtful connections amongst these goals. Perhaps the adult learning philosophy (P. D. Hannon, 2005) that provides the foundation for reflection and analysis of current approaches against philosophical beliefs, through discussion about the potential contrasts and conflicts, between underpinning foundations and purpose-in-action can be a good blueprint.

6.3.2 Policy

Meanwhile, the most obvious critic singled out to universities regarding entrepreneurship education is pertaining to the choice of location to deliver its entrepreneurship education (Birch, 2004; McMullan & Long, 1987; Solomon, 2007).

Not only are business school profoundly associated with entrepreneurship education but according to Gibb (2007), what is more challenging is that business schools have been urged by many of universities to actually capture the entrepreneurship education phenomenon and attempt to deal with it within the conventional (and largely corporate business) ways to organise this explicit knowledge. In fact, this viewed already echoed before by Birch (2004) as :-

“Quite a few business schools teach you exactly the opposite of entrepreneurship. They teach you to do the quarterly numbers for Wall Street, teach you to conserve, teach all the wrong motivations for being an entrepreneur, teach you to take something that is there and make certain that it does well on Wall Street. Basically, business schools teach you to work for somebody”

The initial policy of placing entrepreneurship education in business schools has resulted the teaching of entrepreneurship to be essentially derived from a corporate model which values order, formality, transparency, control, accountability, information processing, planning, rational decision making, clear demarcation, responsibilities and definitions (A. Gibb, 2005). By adopting business organisation style of learning, limited enterprise culture is created because such a culture will have to embrace all types of organisations that should include stakeholders and wider social community. The ideal policy should revolve in Wider contextual relevance stimulation of an ‘enterprise culture’ in society wide variety of different initiatives and programmes covering such diverse areas as financial literacy, industrial understanding, economic awareness, business education, small business education, business start up and personal transferable skills (A. Gibb & Cotton, 1998).

Based on various issue discovered, some related strategies are suggested:

- A radical yet practical approach is to separate entrepreneurship education initiatives from business schools by creating a unique entrepreneurship centre parked under a strategic division that oversees the entrepreneurship development activities at faculties, including Engineering, IT, Humanity, Arts and others (Hindle, 2007).
- In addition, adaptation to changes in a multidisciplinary area, requires continuous and frequent adjustments to what people do and how people do it (Lüsher & Lewis, 2008) and this requires the university management to embrace the Learning Organisation policies.
- There needs to be less emphasis on organisational structure and concurrently emphasis on systems for facilitating and implementing change. By having a flexible, organic structure and system, a university’s management will be more receptive to adopt and manage new technologies, especially ICT, due to less cumbersome procedures and rules that they have to adhere to (Gephart, Marsick, Van Buren, & Spiro, 1996) and it is considered as the primary condition influencing a university’s ability to acquire new knowledge (Kang & Snell, 2009).
- Take attention and action of growing literature that emphasises on the effectiveness and the roles of mentors and professional people that influence students (Turker & Selcuk,

2009), thus university management should practise flexible staffing and appointment policies (A. Gibb, 2005). This can be done by including professorships of practice, adjunct professors, fellowship secondments for members of the stakeholder community, and visiting entrepreneur teaching fellowships to increase the pool of experts. Students will become more respectful and interested to acquire knowledge from well known experts. Next, educators should be allowed to take sabbatical leave and attend industrial attachment to oversee the development of entrepreneurship practices in the industry and for the educators (Omar & Mohamed, 2009) to adapt and upgrade themselves to become specialist mentors. Besides, educators should be given time flexibility to serve three pillars of academic enterprise of teaching, research and outreach, therefore they will become mutually complementary with students' expectations (Carayannis, 2009).

- There should be more research and development with small firms, larger corporations and government agencies. These parties can contribute grants for entrepreneurship practicum and students' consulting project. At the same time, they can absorb successful student entrepreneurs into their organisation as intrapreneurs.

6.3.3 Pedagogy

In terms of entrepreneurship education's pedagogy, it can be argued that currently it will be minimal issue of whether entrepreneurship can be taught or not, since it was proven it can (Henry, et al., 2005; D.F. Kuratko, 2005). However there are three pressing issues involving pedagogy; (1) How should the academician teach entrepreneurship? (2) Does the conventional business style works in exposing students to entrepreneurship? And (3) How the perception of academicians regarding the nature of entrepreneurship can influence their pedagogy style?

In the first issue, earlier on, Davies and Gibb (1991) argued that adoption of traditional education methods which focus mainly on theory and didactic approach were not significant in teaching entrepreneurship. Gibb (2007) cautioned that in most entrepreneurship educations, it seems like the dominant teaching methods are lectures, cases, projects and entrepreneur/stakeholder presentations, which may or may not be delivered in a manner designed to stimulate entrepreneurial behaviour; these teaching methods can be an anti-entrepreneurial mode because usually it was delivered in the confinement of classroom (Shepherd & Douglas, 1996). Earlier, Gibb (1993), classified what are the major differences between business school learning focus and entrepreneurship education/learning focus (Refer Table 1.2 below). Later, according to Hisrich and Peters (1998) there are three components of skills to be cover in entrepreneurship education pedagogical aspects namely technical, business management and personal entrepreneurial skills.

Meanwhile, in relation to second issue, most entrepreneurship courses are focused upon business and business concepts. According to Gibb (2005; 2007), the concepts are hard to resist that even when they are applied to non-business situations, for example, medical practitioners, schools, health services, social and community services, and even local government, it is generally business principles that are taught. Most business school programmes embrace the conventional project piece of work, usually towards the end of a core plus modular course. This may be undertaken on a group or individual basis and may

take the form of a case study, a somewhat disguised consultancy (with academic references) or the exploration of an academic concept in a small (often growing) business context. The context is dominantly that of business, the culture is that of corporate business, the pedagogical range used is narrow and over-focused upon cases.

A fine example is the usage of business plan as the central learning tool in entrepreneurship education (Hills, 1988; Solomon, 2007). What can be transpiring here is that yet there is little evidence that the notion of a plan is derived from entrepreneurial practice (invented by entrepreneurs). The overall problem therefore in giving the business plan a central place is that it creates the wrong metaphor for entrepreneurship. As with all instruments, however, it depends upon how it is used: but it cannot be a substitute for, and indeed should not form a barrier to, plunging into the waters of customer/stakeholder needs and demands and learning to adapt quickly to this experience (A. Gibb, 2007).

Finally, According to Bennett (2006), there was a positive relationship between the types pedagogy subscribed by academicians and their perception of the nature of entrepreneurship. Thus, it leads to different styles of pedagogy employed by academicians in delivering entrepreneurship education. As an example, for academicians with business experience prior to joining universities, he or she may employ more real business approaches pedagogy and for those who are not, then learning may be focused more on case studies and problem solving the classroom.

University/Business School Learning Focus	Entrepreneurial Education/ Training Learning Focus
Critical judgement after analysis of large amounts of information	“Gut feel” decision making with limited information
Understanding and recalling the information itself	Understanding the values of those who transmit and filter information
Assuming goals away	Recognise the widely varied goals of others
Seeking (impersonally) to verify absolute truth by study of information	Making decisions on the basis of judgement of trust and competence of people
Understanding basic principles of society in the metaphysical sense	Seeking to apply and adjust in practise to basic principles of society
Seeking the correct answer with time to do it.	Developing the most appropriate solution under pressure
Learning in the classroom	Learning while and through doing
Gleaning information from experts and authoritative sources	Gleaning information personally from any and everywhere, and weighting it
Evaluation through written assessment	Evaluation by judgement of people and events through direct feedback
Success in learning measured by knowledge-based examination pass	Success in learning by solving problems and learning from failure.

Table 1.2. (1993) University Business School versus Entrepreneurial Education/Training Focus

From all the issues above, we can observe that current entrepreneurship education's pedagogy is a functional rather than a relationship/development stage organisation of the knowledge base. There is little evidence overall that project work is specifically designed to enhance the entrepreneurial capacity and disposition of students rather than to follow the business techniques (know-how). Therefore, amongst the suggestions are:

- Academicians should teach entrepreneurship through learning focus that is upon 'know how' and 'need to know' rather than functional expertise. The 'need to know' stems from the development problems and opportunities of the business. The challenge to academician is therefore to organise knowledge around organisation development processes, radically different from the conventional functional paradigms. In guiding them to the survival of a business in the early years, the target might, for example, be to anticipate the problems that lead to business failure and 'bring forward' the knowledge in such a way as to enable entrepreneurs to anticipate development problems before they occur and take remedial action. Bear in mind that such a problem-centered approach does not mean that conceptual analysis is sacrificed but only that concept is led by problem. Teaching focus should include action learning, problem-based learning and discovery teaching to develop entrepreneurial-focused students (Richardson & Hynes, 2008)
- Furthermore, one of the way to instil entrepreneurship knowledge is through non-conventional way of students' consulting project (Heriot, Cook, Jones, & Simpson, 2008) through social enterprise chapters like Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE) www.sife.org . This approach will somehow provide macro experiential learning (Wani, Garg, & Sharma, 2004) that not just affects their cognitive learning but also affective learning too. According to Kolb and Kolb (2005), by engaging students through experiential learning students can learn through feedback, conflict, differences, and disagreements that draw out their beliefs and ideas about a topic through holistic process that encompasses a person's cognition, thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving.
- In addition, there is a need to shift academic roles from "the sage on stage" to "a guide on the side," (P. D. Hannon, 2005). Anderson (2003) proposed entrepreneurship education and meaningful formal learning, supporting one of the three forms of interaction (i.e. student-teacher; student-student; student-content interactions) at a high level. The other two may be offered at minimal levels, or even eliminated, without degrading the educational experience. High levels of more than one of these three modes will likely provide a more satisfying educational experience, though these experiences may not be as cost or timely effective as less interactive learning sequences.

6.3.4 Practices

According to Gibb (2007), much of entrepreneurial learning takes place by processes of trial and error and subsequent incremental improvement. However, there seems little room in much of the academic curriculum of universities' for learning to do (and about) something by a process of repeated practice. This is due to the fact that entrepreneurs seek knowledge on a "need to know," "know how" and "know who" basis rather than just merely the "know how" basis. All these three element of knowledge will bring forwards recognisable

contextual experience to them and helps them to conceptualise and give broader meaning to their existing problems and opportunities. Therefore, there is a need to distinguish teaching concerning the phenomenon itself (the vocational domain) from teaching *about* the phenomenon (its meta aspects; its theory and the way that this phenomenon impacts on other phenomena). In addition, entrepreneurship practice coalesce a variety of roles, each demanding different skills, knowledge and capabilities (A. R. Anderson & Jack, 2008), thus there is a requirement to enable that process through some sort of integration. Thus, the author suggested the following:

- An increased focus on the context and learning by doing implies greater student involvement during the study. Involving the students in working on real business cases could range from case-based teaching, to involving the students in real start-ups and finally by letting the students start their own company. In addition to the degree of individual involvement from the students, the nature of the opportunity or business idea is important in entrepreneurship (Shane, 2003). The students could work on projects ranging from practical exercises which do not have any business potential, to real business projects with limited potential (e.g. regional scope), and finally high-potential global business ideas. Erikson and Gjellan, 2003;Johannisson et al., 2001




Fig. 1.2. Summary of ISEED Implementation

7. Conclusion

This chapter tackles the issue of entrepreneurship education phenomenon in universities. Subject to whether an entrepreneur is born, made and educated were discussed in details. Amongst others, the chapter discuss background of entrepreneurship, definition of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial trajectories, nature of entrepreneurial intention, relationship of graduate career-making and entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship education issues and finally Integrated Strategic Entrepreneurship Education Delivery (ISEED).

8. References

- Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, Traits, and Actions: Dispositional Prediction of Behavior in Personality and Social Psychology *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. Volume 20, pp. 1-63): Academic Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alstete, J. W. (2002). On becoming an entrepreneur: an evolving typology. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 8(4), 222-234.
- Anderson, A. R., & Jack, S. L. (2008). Role typologies for enterprising education: the professional artisan? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(2), 259-273.
- Anderson, T. (2003). Getting the Mix Right Again: An updated and theoretical rationale for interaction. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 4(2).
- Baron, R. A. (1998). Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 275-294.
- Basu, A., & Virick, M. (2008, 20-22 March 2008). *Assessing Entrepreneurial Intentions Amongst Students: A Comparative Study Paper* presented at the National Collegiate Investors and Innovators Alliance (NCIIA) Conference 200, Getting to the point:ideas, process, products, Dallas, Texas.
- Bechard, J.-P., & Gregoire, D. (2005). Entrepreneurship education research re-visited: the case of higher education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(1), 22-43.
- Bennett, R. (2006). Business lecturers' perceptions of the nature of entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 12(165-188).
- Binks, M., Starkey, K., & Mahon, C. (2006). Entrepreneurship education and the business school. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 18(1), 1-18.
- Birch, D. (2004). Education Matters - But Does Entrepreneurship Education? *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(3), 289-229.
- Bird, B. J. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442-453.
- Bird, B. J. (1992). The Operation of Intentions in Time: The Emergence of the New Venture. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 11-20.
- Birley, S., & Westhead, P. (1994). A taxonomy of business start-up reasons and their impact on firm growth and size. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(1), 7-31.
- Blawatt, K. R. (1998). *Entrepreneurship: process and management*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Boyd, N. G., & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Summer.
- Bridge, S., O'Neill, K., & Cromie, S. (1998). *Understanding Enterprise, Entrepreneurship & Small Business*. London: Macmillan Publishing.

- Brockhaus, R. H. (1982). The psychology of the entrepreneur. In D. L. S. C.A. Kent, & K.H. Vesper (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 39-56). Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Carayannis, E. G. (2009). *Role of universities in developing first-class entrepreneurs*. Putrajaya, Malaysia: National Higher Education Academy of Leadership
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Hurtado, A. L. (2007). Interns as Intellectual Entrepreneurs. *American Association of University Professors (AAUP): Academe*.
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Sullivan, C. A. (2002). Intellectual Entrepreneurship A Vision for Graduate Education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 34(6), 22-27.
- Choi, Y. R., & Shepherd, D. A. (2004). Entrepreneurs' Decisions to Exploit Opportunities *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(3), 377-395.
- Cooper, A. C., & Dunkelberg, W. C. (1981). *A new look at business entry Experiences of 1,805 entrepreneurs*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Crant, J. M. (1996). The Proactive Personality Scale as a Predictor of Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34.
- Cromie, S. (1998). *Understanding Enterprise, Entrepreneurship and Small Business*: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Cromie, S., & Johns, S. (1983). Irish entrepreneurs Some personal characteristics. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour* 4, 317-324.
- Dana, L. P. (2001). The education and training of entrepreneurs in Asia *Education + Training*, 43(8), 405-416(412).
- Davidsson, P. (1989). Continued entrepreneurship: Ability , Need and Opportunity as determinants of small growth firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 4, 251-261.
- Davidsson, P. (1995). *Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intentions*. Paper presented at the RENT IX Workshop.
- Davies, L. G., & Gibb, A. A. (1991). *Recent research in entrepreneurship*. Paper presented at the 3rd International EIASM Workshop, Gower, London.
- Denison, D. R., & Alexander, J. M. (1986). *Patterns and profiles of entrepreneurs: Data from entrepreneurship forums*. MA: Babson College.
- Dilts, J. C., & Fowler, S. M. (1999). Internships; preparing students for an entrepreneurial career. *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 11(1), 51-63.
- Djankov, S., Qian , Y., Roland, G., & Zhuravskaya, E. (2005). Who are Russia's Entrepreneurs? *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 3(2-3), 1-11.
- Drucker, P. F. (1953). The Liberal Discovers Big Business. *Yale Review*.
- Drucker, P. F. (1964). *Managing for Results*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ehrlich, S. B., De Noble, A. F., Jung, D. I., & Pearson, D. (2000). *The impact of entrepreneurship in training programs on an individual's entrepreneurial self-efficacy*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Fink, L. D. (2003). *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses* () San Francisco, CA: Josse Bass Higher and Adult Education.
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The World Is Flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Garavan, T., & O'Connell, B. (1994). Entrepreneurship and Education Training Programmes; a review and evaluation-part 1. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 18(8), 3-12.
- Gartner, W. B. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 696-706.
- Gephart, M., Marsick, V., Van Buren, M., & Spiro, M. (1996). Learning organisations come alive. *Training and Development*, 50(1), 35-44.
- Gibb, A. (1987). Enterprise Culture - Its Meaning and Implications for Education and Training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 11(2), 2-38.
- Gibb, A. (1993). Enterprise culture and education: understanding enterprise education and its links with small business entrepreneurship and wider educational goals. *International Small Business Journal*, 11(3), 11-34.
- Gibb, A. (2005). *Towards the Entrepreneurial University : Entrepreneurship Education as a lever for change* National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE) UK.
- Gibb, A. (2007). Creating the entrepreneurial university worldwide : Do we need a wholly different model of entrepreneurship. In A. Fayolle (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education: A general perspective*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gibb, A., & Cotton, J. (1998). *Background paper of Work Futures and the role of Entrepreneurship and Enterprise in Schools and Further Education*. Paper presented at the Creating the Leading Edge Conference.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (2002). Theory of Circumscription, Compromise and Self Creation. In D. Brown (Ed.), *Career Choice and Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gupta, V. K., Turban, D. B., Wasti, S. A., & Sikdar, A. (2009). The Role of Gender Stereotypes in Perceptions of Entrepreneurs and Intentions to Become an Entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2), 397-417.
- Hamilton, R. T., & Harper, D. A. (1994). The Entrepreneur in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 21(6), 3-18.
- Hannon, P. D. (2005). *Graduate entrepreneurship in the UK: defining a research and education policy framework*. Paper presented at the 28th ISBE National Conference "Illuminating Entrepreneurship".
- Hannon, P. D. (2005). Philosophies of enterprise and entrepreneurship education and challenges for higher education in the UK. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(2), 105-114.
- Hansemark, O. C. (1998). The effects of an entrepreneurship programme on need for achievement and locus of control of reinforcement. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 4(1), 28-50.
- Henry, C., Hill, F., & Leitch, C. (2005). Entrepreneurship education and training: can entrepreneurship be taught? Part I. *Education + Training*, 47(2), 98-111.
- Heriot, K. C., Cook, R., Jones, R. C., & Simpson, L. (2008). The Use of Student Consulting Projects as an Active Learning Pedagogy: A Case Study in a Production/Operations Management Course. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 6, 463-481.


- Hills, G. E. (1988). Variations in university entrepreneurship education: An empirical study of an evolving field *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3, 109-122.
- Hindle, K. (2007). *Teaching entrepreneurship at university : from the wrong building to the right philosophy*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hisrich, R. D., & Brush, C. G. (1985). *Women and minority entrepreneurs: A comparative analysis*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Hisrich, R. D., & Peters, M. P. (1998). *Entrepreneurship*. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 6, 35-44.
- Ibrahim, A., & Soufani, K. (2002). Entrepreneurship education and training in Canada: a critical assessment. *Education + Training*, 44(8/9), 421-430.
- Jack, S. L., & Anderson, A. R. (1999). Entrepreneurship education within the enterprise culture: Producing reflective practitioners. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 5, 110-125.
- Kang, S., & Snell, S. (2009). Intellectual Capital Architectures and Ambidextrous Learning: A Framework for Human Resource Management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(1), 65-92.
- Katz, J. (1992). A psychological cognitive model of employment status choice. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 17(1), 29-37.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Higher Education*, 4(2), 193-212.
- Kolvereid, L. (1996). Prediction of self-employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 21(47-57).
- Kolvereid, L., & Isaksen, E. (2006). New business start-up and subsequent entry into self-employment. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(6), 866-885.
- Krueger, N., & Brazeal, D. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 18(3), 91-104.
- Krueger, N., & Carsrud, A. (1993). Entrepreneurial Intention: Applying the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Entrepreneurial and Regional Development*, 5, 315-330.
- Krueger, N. F. (1993). The Impact of Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure on Perceptions of New Venture Feasibility and Desirability. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 18.
- Krueger, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5-6), 411-432.
- Krumboltz, J. D., Mitchell, A. M., & Jones, G. B. (1976). A social learning theory of career selection. *Counseling Psychologist*, 6(71-81).
- Kuratko, D. F. (2005). The Emergence of Entrepreneurship Education: Development, Trends, and Challenges *Journal of Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*.
- Kuratko, D. F., Morris, M. H., & Covin, J. G. (2011). *Corporate Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western.
- Laukkanen, M. (2000). Exploring alternative approaches in high-level entrepreneurship education: creating micromechanisms for endogenous regional growth. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 12(1), 25-47.

- Learned, K. E. (1992). What happened before the organization? A model of organization formation. *Entrepreneurship Theory Practise*, 17, 39-48.
- Lee, J.-H., & Venkataraman, S. (2006). Aspirations, market offerings. and the pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(1), 107-123.
- Light, I., & Rosenstein, C. (1995). *Race, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship in Urban America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lin, W. B. (2006). A comparative study on the trends of entrepreneurial behaviors of enterprises in different strategies: Application of the social cognition theory. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 31(2), 207-220.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y.-W. (2006). *Testing the Entrepreneurial Intention Model on a Two-Country sample*: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Lüsher, L., & Lewis, M. (2008). Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: working through paradoxes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 221-240.
- Lüthje, C., & Franke, N. (2003). The 'Making' of an Entrepreneur: Testing a Model of Entrepreneurial Intent among Engineering Students at MIT. *R&D Management*, 33, 135-147.
- Matlay, H. (2008). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(2), 382 - 396
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- McClelland, D. C. (1965). Achievement Motivation can be developed. *Harvard Business Review*(November-December), 6-24.
- McMullan, W. E., & Long, W. A. (1987). Entrepreneurship education in the nineties. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2, 261-275.
- Menger, C. (1871). *Principles of Economics* (J. Dingwall & B. F. Hoselitz, Trans. 1976 ed.). Auburn, ALABAMA: Ludwig Von Mises Institute.
- Meyer, M. (2004). *Individual Inventors, Entrepreneurial Activity and Public Support Measures*. Espoo: Institute of Strategy and International Business. Helsinki University of Technology.
- Mills, J. S. (1848). *Principles of Political Economy with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy* (Seventh ed.). London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Mwasalwiba, E. S. (2010). Entrepreneurship education: a review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. *Education + Training*, 52(1), 20-47.
- Nicolaou, N., Shane, S., Cherkas, L., Hunkin, J., & Spector, T. D. (2008). Is the Tendency to Engage in Entrepreneurship Genetic? *Management Science*, 54(1), 167-179.
- Noel, T. W. (2001). *Effects of entrepreneurial education on intent to open a business*. Paper presented at the Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research.
- Omar, I. C., & Mohamed, Z. (2009). *Current practises, challenges and the future of entrepreneurship education at Universiti Malaysia Kelantan*. Paper presented at the National Leadership Research Conference 2009: Entrepreneurship in Higher Education.
- Ooi, Y. K., & Ali, H. (2004). *How Inclined Are Lecturers to Teach Entrepreneurship at University?* Paper presented at the International Conference on Management Education.
- Orhan, M., & Scott, D. (2001). Why women enter into entrepreneurship: an explanatory model. *Women in Management Review*, 16(5), 232-243.

- Othman, M. N., Ghazali, E., & Sung, Y. S. (2006). Graduate versus non-graduate entrepreneurs in urban Malaysia: some insights into entrepreneurial personality, company and family background differences. *International Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship Development*, 3(1/2), 57-76.
- Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship Education: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25, 479-510.
- Praag, C. M. v., & Versloot, P. H. (2007). What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research *Journal Small Business Economics* 29(4), 351-382.
- Prediger, D. J., & Vansickle, T. R. (1992). Locating occupations on Holland's hexagon: Beyond RIASEC. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40, 111-128.
- Rae, D. (2010). Universities and enterprise education: responding to the challenges of the new era. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17(4), 591-606.
- Reynolds, P. (1995). *The National Study of U.S. Business StartUps: Background and Progress Report*. Paper presented at the Conference on Dynamics of Employment and Industry Evolution, Mannheim, Germany: University of Mannheim.
- Reynolds, P., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., Arenius, P., Fitsimmons, P., Minniti, M., et al. (2004). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2003 Global Report)*.
- Richardson, I., & Hynes, B. (2008). Entrepreneurship education: towards an industry sector approach. *Education + Training*, 50(3), 188-198.
- Ronstadt, R. (1987). The educated entrepreneurs: A new era of entrepreneurial education is beginning. *American Journal of Small Business*, 11(4), 37-53.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs* 609(80), 1.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (1998). *How do firms come to be? Towards a theory of the prefirm*: Carnegie Mellon University.
- Savickas, M. L. (2002). Career construction: A developmental theory of vocational behavior. In D. Brown (Ed.), *Career choice and development* (Vol. 4th edition, pp. 149-205). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schaper, M., & Volery, T. (2004). *Entrepreneurship and Small Business: A pacific rim perspectives*. Milton, Qld: Australia: John Wiley & Sons Australia Ltd.
- Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: matching individual and organizational needs*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(1), 13-28.
- Scheinberg, S., & MacMillan, I. . (1988). *An eleven-country study of the motivation to start a business*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Segal, G., Borgia, D., & Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motivation to become an entrepreneur. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 11(1), 42-57.
- Sexton, D. L., & Bowman, N. B. (1984). Entrepreneurship Education: Suggestions for increasing effectiveness. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 22(4), 18-25.

- Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus*. Northampton, MA.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Shane, S., Kolvereid, L., & Westhead, P. (1991). An exploratory examination of the reasons leading to new firm formation across country and gender. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6, 431-446.
- Shane, S., Nicolaou, N., Cherkas, L., & Spector, T. D. (2010). Genetics, the Big Five, and the tendency to be self-employed. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1154-1162.
- Shapiro, A. (1975). The displaced, uncomfortable entrepreneur. *Psychology Today*, 8, 83-88.
- Shapiro, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. . . In D. L. S. C. A. Kent, & K. H. Vesper (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 72-88). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Shaver, K. G., & Scott, L. R. (1991). Person, process, choice: the psychology of new venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16, 23-45.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Douglas, E. J. (1996). *Is Management Education Developing or Killing the Entrepreneurial Spirit*. Paper presented at the Internationalising Entrepreneurship Education and Training, Arnhem.
- Smith, A. (1776). *Wealth of Nations* (2005 ed.): Hayes Barton Press.
- Solomon, G. (2007). An examination of entrepreneurship education in the United States. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(2), 168-182.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al Laham, A. (2007). Do Entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial Intention of Science and Engineering Students? The Effects of Learnig, Inspiration and Resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 566-591.
- Storey, D. J. (1994). *Understanding the Small Business Sector*. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, J. L. (1999). A strategic perspective of entrepreneurship. *International Journal. of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 5, 279-296.
- Thompson, J. L. (2004). The facets of the entrepreneur: identifying entrepreneurial potential. *Management Decision*, 42(2), 243-258.
- Timmons, J. A. (1989). *The Entrepreneurial Mind*. Andover, MA Brick House Publishing
- Turker, D., & Selcuk, S. S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(2), 142-159.
- Varela, R., & Jimenez, J. E. (2001). *The effect of entrepreneurship education in the universities of Cali*. Paper presented at the Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, Babson Conference Proceedings.
- Vesper, K. H. (1980). *New venture strategies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wani, V. P., Garg, T. K., & Sharma, S. K. (2004). Effective Industry/Intistute Interaction for Developing Entrepreneurial Vision amongst Engineers for the Sustainable Development of SMEs in India. *International Journal of Technology Transfer & Commercialisation*, 3(1), 272-281.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and anti-trust implications*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications of entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 31(3), 387-406.

- Zainuddin, M. N., & Ismail, H. (2011). Push and pull factor in an entry into an employment route: a study of nurtured entrepreneurship students. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 13(4), 469-498.
- Zainuddin, M. N., & Mohd Rejab, M. R. (2010). Assessing “ME generation's” entrepreneurship degree programmes in Malaysia. *Education + Training*, 52(6/7), 508-527.
- Zhang, Z., Zyphur, M. J., Narayanan, J., Arvey, R. D., Chaturvedi, S., Avolio, B. J., et al. (2009). The genetic basis of entrepreneurship: Effects of gender and personality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110(2), 93-107.



Entrepreneurship - Born, Made and Educated

Edited by Prof. Thierry Burger-Helmchen

ISBN 978-953-51-0210-6

Hard cover, 336 pages

Publisher InTech

Published online 14, March, 2012

Published in print edition March, 2012

Entrepreneurship has a tremendous impact on the economic development of a country. As can be expected, many public policies foster the development of self- entrepreneurship in times of unemployment, praise the creation of firms and consider the willingness to start new ventures as a sign of good fortune. Are those behaviours inherent to a human being, to his genetic code, his psychology or can students, younger children or even adults be taught to become entrepreneurs? What should be the position of universities, of policy makers and how much does it matter for a country? This book presents several articles, following different research approaches to answer those difficult questions. The researchers explore in particular the psychology of entrepreneurship, the role of academia and the macroeconomic impact of entrepreneurship.

How to reference

In order to correctly reference this scholarly work, feel free to copy and paste the following:

Muhammad Nizam Zainuddin (2012). University's Entrepreneurship Education: Creating Meaningful Impression for New Generation, Entrepreneurship - Born, Made and Educated, Prof. Thierry Burger-Helmchen (Ed.), ISBN: 978-953-51-0210-6, InTech, Available from: <http://www.intechopen.com/books/entrepreneurship-born-made-and-educated/university-s-entrepreneurship-education-creating-meaningful-impression-for-new-generation>

INTECH

open science | open minds

InTech Europe

University Campus STeP Ri
Slavka Krautzeka 83/A
51000 Rijeka, Croatia
Phone: +385 (51) 770 447
Fax: +385 (51) 686 166
www.intechopen.com

InTech China

Unit 405, Office Block, Hotel Equatorial Shanghai
No.65, Yan An Road (West), Shanghai, 200040, China
中国上海市延安西路65号上海国际贵都大饭店办公楼405单元
Phone: +86-21-62489820
Fax: +86-21-62489821

© 2012 The Author(s). Licensee IntechOpen. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.