



The Relationship Between Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Meta-Analytic Review

Tae Jun Bae
Shanshan Qian
Chao Miao
James O. Fiet

The research on entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions has yielded mixed results. We meta-analyzed 73 studies with a total sample size of 37,285 individuals and found a significant but a small correlation between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions ($\hat{\rho} = .143$). This correlation is also greater than that of business education and entrepreneurial intentions. However, after controlling for pre-education entrepreneurial intentions, the relationship between entrepreneurship education and post-education entrepreneurial intentions was not significant. We also analyzed moderators, such as the attributes of entrepreneurship education, students' differences, and cultural values. Our results have implications for entrepreneurship education scholars, program evaluators, and policy makers.

Introduction

Evidence-based research is the systematic examination of a phenomena related to a particular research question. One of its most common forms is meta-analysis, which allows researchers to think about and to summarize the results of previous empirical

Please send correspondence to: Shanshan Qian, tel.: +1-502-852-4828; e-mail: shanshan.qian@louisville.edu. Order of Authors: Tae Jun Bae is the first author; Shanshan Qian and Chao Miao are second authors and equally contribute to this paper; James O. Fiet is the last author.

analyses. In effect, meta-analysis as a form of evidence-based research generates a summary measure of the results of research findings across numerous studies of the same phenomenon. It does this by capturing evidence, which is essential to reduce biases inherent in individual studies as well as to fill in the gaps between scientific knowledge and practice (cf. Frese, Bausch, Schmidt, Strauch, & Kabst, 2012; Rauch & Frese, 2006). The current study follows in the tradition of evidence-based entrepreneurship research by examining the impact of entrepreneurship education across numerous studies on a student's entrepreneurial intentions. By *entrepreneurship education*, we are referring to education for entrepreneurial attitudes and skills. *Entrepreneurial intentions* are desires to own or start a business.

Many studies in this research stream have reported inconsistent and ambiguous findings (Lorz, Volery, & Müller, 2011). In response, several researchers have generated comprehensive qualitative and quantitative reviews including meta-analyses of the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship; however, these studies have yet to resolve the remaining ambiguities and questions (Béchard & Grégoire, 2005; Dickson, Solomon, & Weaver, 2008; Martin, McNally, & Kay, 2013; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Pittaway & Cope, 2007). For example, Martin et al. conducted a well-designed meta-analysis from which they concluded that there was a small but positive relationship, which was a weighted correlation of .137; however, it provided little insight into the conditions under which entrepreneurship education is more or less likely to be associated with entrepreneurial intentions.¹

By placing entrepreneurial intentions in the foreground, we not only examined the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions, but also compared it with that of other types of education such as business education and entrepreneurial intentions. We also controlled for the effects of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions. In addition, we included other likely moderators, examples of which are: the specificity of education; the duration of education; as well as gender, family background, and culture. In summary, the inconsistent findings from previous studies, as well as the likely moderators that still remain to be tested, suggest that there is a need for a targeted meta-analytic review, which we undertake.

This research proceeds as follows. We review relevant theories and previous research on the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship, which leads to the generation of 12 hypotheses. Next, we describe the meta-analytic procedures as well as analyze possible publication bias. We then present the results, followed by an interpretation of the results. Finally, we discuss the implications and limitations of this study followed by possible future research directions.

Theory and Hypotheses Development

Entrepreneurial Intentions

As mentioned earlier, entrepreneurial intentions are usually defined as one's desire to own one's own business (Crant, 1996) or to start a business (Krueger, Reilly, & Carsrud,

1. We credit Martin et al.'s (2013) study for acknowledging that the benefits of entrepreneurship education are contingent as they called for the future examination of moderators. Few known reviews for the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions have so far used a contingency approach. In addition, Frese et al. (2012) suggested that searching moderators is highly recommended when a focal relationship varies across individual studies.

2000). Historically, intentions have been used to describe a self-prediction to engage in a behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). That is, once the formation of intentions occurs, actual behavior is expected. Social-psychological studies assume that intention is the single best predictor of actual behavior (Bagozzi, Baumgartner, & Yi, 1989). Many studies have supported the predictive validity of intentions on actual behaviors. For example, according to Sheeran's (2002) meta-analysis covering 422 studies during its previous 10 years, the mean correlation between intentions and behavior was .53, accounting for 28% of the variance in behavior. In entrepreneurship, however, other scholars have cast doubt on whether intentions predict actual entrepreneurial behavior (Douglas & Shepherd, 2002).² Nonetheless, multiple studies still regard entrepreneurial intentions as one of the crucial antecedents of actual entrepreneurial actions (Krueger et al.; Lee, Wong, Foo, & Leung, 2011).

Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education consists of “any pedagogical [program] or process of education for entrepreneurial attitudes and skills” (Fayolle, Gailly, & Lassas-Clerc, 2006b, p. 702). It has a relatively long history and has developed into a widespread phenomenon (Katz, 2003; Kuratko, 2005). However, there are different types of entrepreneurship education targeted toward particular stages of development (Bridge, O’Neill, & Cromie, 1998; Gorman, Hanlon, & King, 1997; McMullan & Long, 1987). Scholars have enumerated various types of entrepreneurship education, which are targeted toward specific audiences (Jamieson, 1984; Liñán, 2004).³ For example, education for awareness is for students who had no experience of starting a business. The purpose of the entrepreneurial awareness education is to allow students to develop entrepreneurial skills, and to assist them in choosing a career (Liñán). Most university-level programs are intended to increase entrepreneurial awareness and to prepare aspiring entrepreneurs (Garavan & O’Cinneide, 1994; cf. Weber, 2011). In this analysis, the arguments that we have developed are based on entrepreneurship education engendering greater awareness for students who had not already decided which career to pursue (e.g., employment versus entrepreneurship) or who had not experienced starting their own businesses prior to enrolling in entrepreneurship courses.

The Main Effects of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Intentions

The literature has identified two theoretical perspectives that argue that entrepreneurship education is positively related to entrepreneurial intentions: (1) human capital theory (Becker, 1975) and (2) entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998).

First, entrepreneurship scholars have viewed human capital as a determinant of entrepreneurial intentions (Davidsson & Honig, 2003). We define it as “the skills and knowledge that individuals acquire through investments in schooling, on-the-job training,

2. For example, Douglas and Shepherd (2002) said that no actual entrepreneurship will occur without sufficient opportunities and required funding even if there are the strongest entrepreneurial intentions.

3. For example, Jamieson (1984) mentioned three types of entrepreneurship education: (1) education for awareness, (2) preparation for aspiring entrepreneurs, and (3) management training for existing entrepreneur. Similarly, Liñán (2004) identified four different types of entrepreneurship education: (1) education for awareness, (2) education for start-up, (3) entrepreneurial dynamism, and (4) continuing education for existing entrepreneurs.

and other types of experience” (Becker; Unger, Rauch, Frese, & Rosenbusch, 2011, p. 343). There may be a positive relationship between performance and human capital investment if it can be deployed to perform tasks (Becker). An entrepreneurship education may cultivate a student’s attitudes and intentions, as well as the founding of a new firm (Liñán, 2008). Martin et al. (2013) found a statistically significant relationship between entrepreneurship education and human capital outcomes, such as entrepreneurship-related knowledge and skills ($r_w = .237$), a positive perception of entrepreneurship ($r_w = .109$), and intentions ($r_w = .137$).

Second, entrepreneurship education is associated with entrepreneurial self-efficacy, which may increase entrepreneurial intentions (Wilson, Kickul, & Marlino, 2007; Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy refers to a belief in one’s ability to successfully perform the various roles and tasks of entrepreneurship (Chen et al., 1998; De Noble, Jung, & Ehrlich, 1999; McGee, Peterson, Mueller, & Sequeira, 2009). It is well known as one of the triggers of entrepreneurial intentions (Chen et al.; De Noble et al.; Douglas, 2013; Fitzsimmons & Douglas, 2011; Krueger et al., 2000; Scott & Twomey, 1988; Segal, Schoenfeld, & Borgia, 2007; Wang, Wong, & Lu, 2002). Also, entrepreneurship education could enhance entrepreneurial self-efficacy because it is associated with four of its determinants, which are (1) enactive mastery, (2) vicarious experience, (3) verbal persuasion, and (4) emotional arousal (Bandura, 1982, 1986). As students enroll in entrepreneurship education, they are exposed to examples of successful business planning or proactive interaction with successful practitioners (e.g., Honig, 2004). These pedagogical elements facilitate coping strategies, which help maintain motivation and interest, leading to greater expectations of success (Stumpf, Brief, & Hartman, 1987) and increased entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Zhao et al.). Recently, Chen (2010) found that entrepreneurial self-efficacy was a positive mediator of the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions, although mediation testing is beyond the scope of this study. The above arguments lead to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1a: Entrepreneurship education is positively associated with entrepreneurial intentions.

The Business Education–Entrepreneurial Intentions Relationship

An understanding of the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship requires an understanding of business education because it could be a more effective driver of entrepreneurial intentions. Entrepreneurship education is assumed to enhance an “awareness of entrepreneurship as an alternative career path to employment” (Slavtchev, Laspita, & Patzelt, 2012, p. 3), whereas business education assists students to work at established companies (Grey, 2002). It is reasonable that entrepreneurship education is more strongly related to entrepreneurial intentions than business education because the former is better adapted for the development of entrepreneurial skills and knowledge. For example, entrepreneurship education offers courses in new business development or business planning, which may promote a student’s employment prospects and propensity for risk taking. In addition, entrepreneurship education is particularly concerned with attitudes, intentions, and the firm creation process (Liñán, 2008). However, business education usually provides technical knowledge for business administration and does not emphasize the creation process of an organization (Liñán), all of which is consistent with entrepreneurship graduates being three times more likely than non-entrepreneurship graduates to start new business ventures (Charney & Libecap,

2000). Davidsson (1995) also demonstrated that although business education is associated with perceived know-how, it does not impact entrepreneurial intentions, which caused him to conclude that its purpose was to train students to be employed by large firms. In light of the different foci of entrepreneurship education and business education, we infer the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1b: The entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship is stronger than the business education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship.

Selection Effect of Pre-Education Entrepreneurial Intentions

There is one further possibility that could be considered in order to understand the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship, which is reverse causation. First, research on entrepreneurship education rests on the assumption that students enrolled in entrepreneurship courses are randomly selected. However, it is possible that a student who desires to be an entrepreneur would purposely enroll in entrepreneurship courses. For example, Kolvereid and Moen (1997) argued that students who want to be entrepreneurs would choose an entrepreneurship major. Many scholars have termed this choice a “self-selection bias” (Liñán, 2004; McMullan & Long, 1987; Noel, 2002). In this case, it is probable that the post-education entrepreneurial intentions are not the outcome of entrepreneurship education.

Second, the possibility of reverse causation is also informed by recent studies arguing that consideration of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions will help us understand the true relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions (Oosterbeek, Van Praag, & IJsselstein, 2010; von Graevenitz, Harhoff, & Weber, 2010). Although entrepreneurship education in our study assumes that students do not have experience starting their own businesses, some scholars have redirected our attention to the role of beliefs prior to enrolling in entrepreneurship education (Oosterbeek et al.; von Graevenitz et al.). For example, von Graevenitz et al. demonstrate that there is a strong and positive correlation between *ex-ante* beliefs and *ex-post* intentions. In addition, changes in intentions during entrepreneurship education are less likely to occur if a student’s perceived, pre-course feasibility of launching a business is strong and consistent (e.g., negative or positive). These empirical findings show that students may not change their initial entrepreneurial intentions due to the entrepreneurship education they receive. They further imply that entrepreneurship education may simply play a selection role. Collectively, prior research implies that a student’s entrepreneurial intentions may not be determined by entrepreneurship education, but rather by prior beliefs before enrolling. Therefore, we expect that if we control for a student’s pre-education entrepreneurial intentions, the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will not remain. Thus, we propose following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1c: When controlling for entrepreneurial intentions prior to enrolling in entrepreneurship education, the positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and post-education entrepreneurial intentions will not be different from zero.

Moderating Hypotheses

Moderators can change the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. Therefore, investigating the effects of moderators is

also required in order to better understand why the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship is inconsistent and ambiguous. We will examine the following groups of potential moderators: (1) the attributes of the education itself, (2) an individual's background, (3) contextual factors, and (4) operationalization of entrepreneurship education.

Different Aspects of Entrepreneurship Education as Moderators

Duration of Entrepreneurship Education. Schools usually offer entrepreneurship education in either a semester or a workshop format, which uses “teaching methods that divide students in groups for a short period of time” (Chiang & Tomimatsu, 2011, p. 47). Education in a semester format typically uses a fixed number of contact hours spread over more than 30 sessions. A workshop offering the same contact hours would need to meet more hours each day, for a number of days, to achieve the same coverage. The main difference is the absorption time between class meetings. Absorption time falls into two categories. First, distributed practice is “interrupting practice or study time with rest intervals of up to 24 hours or longer” (Bloom & Shuell, 1981, p. 245). Second, in massed practice, “a person may spend an hour studying some material, but this hour might occur all at one time or it might occur as three 20-minute study periods on each of three consecutive days” (Bloom & Shuell, p. 245). Entrepreneurship workshops tend to be massed practice, whereas entrepreneurship education in a semester format tends to be distributed practice. Previous research found that distributed practice could help students to remember and retain new materials, and affect learning (Bloom & Shuell; Cepeda, Pashler, Vul, Wixted, & Rohrer, 2006). Thus, students who enroll in entrepreneurship education in a semester format, rather than in a workshop, will have more time between classes to understand and memorize materials. As such, we argue that when entrepreneurship education is taught in a semester format, students will be able to absorb more learning. Consequently, we propose:

Hypothesis 2: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger in entrepreneurship education in a semester format than in an entrepreneurship education workshop.

Specificity of Entrepreneurship Education. Several different pedagogical designs for entrepreneurship education have been used ranging from business plans to venture creation (cf. Kuratko, 2005). In general, business planning is the primary vehicle used by the majority of courses and programs (Honig, 2004). The process of learning how to draft a business plan is intended to instill the knowledge and skills to strengthen one's entrepreneurial intentions (e.g., cf. Becker, 1964; Fayolle, Gailly, & Lassas-Clerc, 2006a; von Graevenitz et al., 2010; Youndt, Subramaniam, & Snell, 2004). In addition, many universities provide entrepreneurship education with a venture creation focus (Lee, Chang, & Lim, 2005). The venture creation courses teach students to take practical steps to create a venture, or a mini company in class (e.g., Rodrigues, Dinis, do Paço, Ferreira, & Raposo, 2012), as well as to develop student skills in a multi-functional implementation process (Liñán, 2007).

Some education scholars argue that formal training by abstraction is of little use unless there is apprenticeship training (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989). David Birch, a business guru, also supports this argument. In his view, critical entrepreneurial skills such

as managing people are not learned through writing business plans.⁴ In academia, Minniti and Bygrave (2001) also point out the importance of learning-by-doing, saying it involves “repetition and experimentation that increases [an] entrepreneur’s confidence in certain actions and improves the content of his stock of knowledge” (p. 7). Viewed as a learning-by-doing experience, entrepreneurship education emphasizing venture creation will provide students with a more practical experience, as well as skills in creating ventures than will one using business planning.⁵ Thus, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 3: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger when entrepreneurship education focuses on venture creation than when it focuses on business planning.

Individual Difference as Moderators

Gender. Men have higher entrepreneurial intentions than women (Chen et al., 1998; Scherer, Brodzinski, & Wiebe, 1990; Zhao et al., 2005); however, the impacts of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions may not be as effective for men as for women. According to social role theory (Eagly, 1987), gender-based expectation leads both men and women to pursue gender-stereotype occupations, which is also consistent with the perspective that “women more likely limit their career aspirations due to the perceived lack of necessary skills” (Bandura, 1992; cf. Weber, 2011, p. 67). Therefore, it is possible that entrepreneurship education will be more helpful for women to strengthen their skills and increase their entrepreneurial intentions relative to men. Wilson et al. (2007) refer to entrepreneurship education as an “equalizer.”

On the other hand, because gender-based expectations attract men to male-typical professions including entrepreneurial careers, we expect that the perceived knowledge gap for entrepreneurship is narrower for men than for women (BarNir, Watson, & Hutchins, 2011; Williams & Subich, 2006).⁶ Thus, entrepreneurship education is less likely to help men form their entrepreneurial intentions via lowering the constraints of knowledge for entrepreneurship. Although there are no universally accepted gender differences for the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship, pertinent research supports the above-mentioned arguments (Chowdhury & Endres, 2005; Cox, Mueller, & Moss, 2002; Wilson et al., 2007). In sum, we expect that there is “lower neediness of entrepreneurial education for men” (Haus, Steinmetz, Isidor, & Kabst, 2013). Thus, we offer the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be weaker in males than in females.

4. He argued that entrepreneurs need to master three skills: (1) selling, (2) managing people, and (3) creating a new product or service.

5. According to Rasmussen and Sørheim (2006), there are many action-oriented programs, emphasizing learning by doing. They review five Swedish universities’ action-based entrepreneurship programs. For example, Chalmars University of Technology in Gothenburg facilitates a program in which students are highly involved in the start-up process, team composition, and venture formation.

6. Although some scholars argue that there is little gender differences in entrepreneurship, other scholars still suggest that substantial differences such as perspectives (Brush, 1992) and psychological traits (Sexton & Bowman-Upton, 1990) still exist. Wilson et al. (2007, p. 402) argue that “entrepreneurship may still be perceived as a ‘male’ field.”

Entrepreneurial Family Background. Entrepreneurial family background refers to those people whose parent(s) or family member(s) is (are) involved in self-employment. Parents, as business owners, can influence their children's entrepreneurial career choices by serving as role models (Aldrich, Renzulli, & Langton, 1998; Hout & Rosen, 1999), providing a chance for their children to acquire human capital (Lentz & Laband, 1990), sharing a similar preference for entrepreneurial activities (Fairlie, 2002), and transferring financial capital (Dunn & Holtz-Eakin, 2000).

Despite the motivational benefits of an entrepreneurial family background for forming a student's career path, Zellweger, Sieger, and Halter (2011) indicated that entrepreneurship education is less likely to enhance the entrepreneurial intentions of students who come from such backgrounds. First, students from an entrepreneurial family are more likely than those without a similar background to access the critical resources and social networks. Because they are more likely to be able to gain access to these valuable inputs, it reduces their necessities of additional inputs from entrepreneurship education. Second, it is possible that students from an entrepreneurial family background could interpret the materials offered by entrepreneurship education more critically than those from a non-entrepreneurial family. This is because early exposure to entrepreneurship provides people from an entrepreneurial family background with indirect experience about the difficulties of being an entrepreneur. Thus, entrepreneurship education may be less effective on entrepreneurial intentions for students from an entrepreneurial family than for students without an entrepreneurial family background. Therefore, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 5: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be weaker in people from an entrepreneurial family background than for those who do not come from one.

Cultural Contexts as Moderators

Beyond educational attributes and individual differences as moderators, we are also interested in investigating the extent to which the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions is influenced by culture, defined as "the values, beliefs and assumptions learned in early childhood that distinguish one group of people from another" (Newman & Nollen, 1996, p. 754). In this section, we examine the impact of four cultural dimensions on the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. These dimensions are (1) power distance, (2) in-group collectivism, (3) gender egalitarianism, and (4) uncertainty avoidance, which are four out of nine dimensions in the GLOBE study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).⁷ We highlight these four cultural dimensions for several theoretical reasons. First, building on social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), we identified the two potential dimensions for entrepreneurship education: (1) the transmission of the information/value from teachers to students (Pekrun, 2000) and (2) the influences of peers (Falck, Heblisch, & Luedemann, 2012). Based on this conceptualization, we believe that power distance and in-group collectivism will moderate the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. For example, differences of social hierarchy between teacher and student due to power distance culture can influence how students accept and incorporate

7. The nine dimensions from the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) Research Project are assertiveness, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, future orientation, gender egalitarianism, humane orientation, performance orientation, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance.

new information about entrepreneurship. In addition, variations on peer relationship in accordance with the level of in-group collectivism also can affect the effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions.

Second, we identified two social dimensions that may shape a student's views of entrepreneurship (Lüthje & Franke, 2003). These views may also determine a student's entrepreneurial intentions before and after enrolling in entrepreneurship courses. These social dimensions are: (1) perception of uncertainty (Campbell, 1992) and (2) societal gender inequality (Wilson, Kickul, Marlino, Barbosa, & Griffiths, 2009). The perception of uncertainty in a certain society serves as a barrier to entrepreneurship (De Noble et al., 1999) that can also generate the variation in entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions relationship. Similarly, gender inequality influences a person's expectations about his or her choice of self-employment, which suggests that students could hold different perceptions about entrepreneurship (Wilson et al.). Hence, we examine the interaction between entrepreneurship education and two cultural dimensions—uncertainty avoidance and gender egalitarianism—on entrepreneurial intentions. Collectively, we selected four cultural dimensions. Those are also similar to ones based on them, which were widely used to understand entrepreneurial intentions (e.g., Busenitz & Lau, 1996; Liñán & Chen, 2009; Mitchell, Smith, Seawright, & Morse, 2000; Shinnar, Giacomin, & Janssen, 2012).⁸

Power Distance. Power distance is the degree to which individuals accept power (House et al., 2004). For example, those with high power distance expect there to be a social hierarchy in relationships. Students in low power distance countries are more likely to engage in discussion and challenge a teacher's authority based on their own experience (Barmeyer, 2004; Holtbrügge & Mohr, 2010). On the other hand, students in a high power distance culture avoid trying to reduce the power distance between teachers and students. In a high power distance society, teachers are ranked higher than students, and lessons are less likely to be arguable because students tend to *avoid being critical of teachers* (Hofstede, 1986, 2001; Joy & Kolb, 2009). Consequently, we can expect that when students in high power distance countries enroll in entrepreneurship education, they will accept the authority of entrepreneurship educators. Thus, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions is stronger when the individuals are in a society with a high power distance culture.

Hypothesis 6a: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger in high power distance countries than in low power distance countries.

In-Group Collectivism. In-group collectivism refers to "the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their organizations or families" (House et al., 2004, p. 12). Brewer and Venaik (2011) interpreted in-group collectivism as "family collectivism" because it is correlated with the strength of family ties and respect for family and friends (p. 440). Building on this relationship perspective, we expect that students in a culture stressing higher in-group collectivism would likely show a higher

8. According to prior research, high power distance (PDI+), high individualism (IDV+), high masculinity (MAS+), and low uncertainty avoidance (UAI-) will prime a favorable climate that leads to entrepreneurial intentions.

level of entrepreneurial intentions than those in a culture with lower in-group collectivism, when they enroll in entrepreneurship education. The main reason is that in-group collectivism can amplify the *consensus with their cohort* because of its association with an accepted social norm (Liñán & Chen, 2009), connectedness, and relationships with others in the cohort (cf. Cousins, 1989; Singelis, 1994). Thus, if entrepreneurship is taught in classrooms, we can expect greater entrepreneurial intentions, especially when a classroom is part of a culture with greater in-group collectivism. Students in a higher in-group collectivistic culture are unlikely to contradict a class consensus, whereas students in a lower in-group collectivistic culture will be more likely to agree with decisions based on their individual understandings (Auyeung & Sands, 1996; Manikutty, Anuradha, & Hansen, 2007). Therefore, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 6b: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger in high in-group collectivistic countries than in low in-group collectivistic countries.

Gender Egalitarianism. Gender egalitarianism is the “degree to which an organization or a society minimizes gender role differences while promoting gender equality” (House et al., 2004, p. 12). Gender egalitarianism can influence the extent to which women are represented equally in the labor force (Emrich, Denmark, & Den Hartog, 2004). In countries with a high gender egalitarian culture, entrepreneurship offers essentially the same perceived career opportunities to both men and women. On the other hand, in countries with a low gender egalitarian culture, there would be socially constructed gender differences in entrepreneurship. We argue that a positive entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions relationship will become stronger in low gender egalitarianism countries than it will in high gender egalitarian countries. We draw this inference based on the supposition that entrepreneurship education can *mitigate students' unequal perceptions* of entrepreneurship, which may be rooted in low gender egalitarian countries. This mitigation can be achieved by helping students to re-conceptualize entrepreneurship as a career choice that is equally available to both genders via entrepreneurship education, especially in low gender egalitarian cultures.

Hypothesis 6c: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger in low gender egalitarianism countries than in high gender egalitarianism countries.

Uncertainty Avoidance. Uncertainty avoidance signifies a lack of tolerance for uncertainty. It is “the extent to which the members of an organization or a society strive to avoid uncertainty by relying on established social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices” (House et al., 2004, p. 11). Low uncertainty avoidance is associated with risk taking and pioneering achievement, whereas high uncertainty avoidance is more relevant to a higher fear of failure, lower levels of ambition, and less willingness to take risks (Hofstede, 1980). When students enroll in entrepreneurship education, they recognize the uncertain nature of entrepreneurship much more than before. Once students *recognize the uncertainty* in entrepreneurship, they could become less interested in entrepreneurship, particularly in high uncertainty avoidance cultures. In such cultures, breaking rules is viewed as dangerous (House et al.), and students are reluctant to perceive ambiguity. Thus, the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship becomes stronger in countries with low uncertainty avoidance than it does in those with high uncertainty avoidance. These arguments lead to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 6d: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger in low uncertainty avoidance countries than in high uncertainty avoidance countries.

Operationalization of Entrepreneurship Education as a Moderator

We use operationalization of entrepreneurship education as a methodological moderator. We noted that some of the primary studies operationalized entrepreneurship education as a binary variable (i.e., providing entrepreneurship education to participants versus not providing it to participants), whereas other primary studies measured it as a continuous variable that is an assessment of effectiveness of entrepreneurship education. For example, participants were asked to evaluate their perceived support of entrepreneurship education (e.g., Lanero, Vázquez, Gutiérrez, & García, 2011).

We anticipate that the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship would be higher when studies asked participants to self-report both entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. We surmise that this would be due to common method variance, which refers to “variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent” (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003, p. 879). Scholars suggested that using self-reports to measure both a predictor and a criterion could inflate the correlations between them due to common method variance (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Morgeson et al., 2007; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). All the primary studies that measured students’ perception on entrepreneurship education’s effectiveness in our meta-analysis used self-report evaluations of both entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions from the same individuals. This *common rater effect* could inflate the correlation between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. Thus:

Hypothesis 7: The positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions will be stronger when entrepreneurship education is an assessment variable than when entrepreneurship education is a binary variable.

Methods

Identifying Samples for Testing

To ensure that our search was exhaustive, we performed a comprehensive survey of the literature using the following approaches. First, we searched using electronic databases including EBSCO host Database (Academic Search Complete and Business Source Complete), JSTOR, ABI/Inform, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Social Science Index Citation, Science Direct, Web of Science, and Google searching. Second, we searched management and entrepreneurship journals, such as *Academy of Management Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, *Management Science*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *Journal of Small Business Management*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and *Journal of Management*. Third, we searched major management and entrepreneurship conference proceedings, such as Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, Academy of Management Proceedings, United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and Southern Management Association. Fourth, we identify unpublished papers and working papers. Fifth, we snowball sampled several key articles (e.g., Bird, 1988; Krueger & Brazeal,

1994; Krueger et al., 2000).⁹ We found that almost all relevant articles searched via snowball sampling were captured by our primary search outlined in the first four steps, which assured us that our search was exhaustive.

Selection and Exclusion Criteria

We specified the following inclusion criteria (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). First, to understand the roles played by entrepreneurship education, we used key words, such as entrepreneurship training, entrepreneurship program, and entrepreneurship curriculum. Because we compared the impact of entrepreneurship education and business education on entrepreneurial intentions, we searched for articles about business education and entrepreneurial intentions. Business education only refers to general majors in business schools, such as economics, accounting, and finance. In addition, we used the same methods to search for key words, such as business training and program. We categorized studies using entrepreneurship education/training/program as entrepreneurship education. We coded business education separately.

Second, to locate articles on entrepreneurial intentions, we searched for ones using key words, such as entrepreneurial intention, or willingness to start a venture in the future. In addition, some articles examined the relationship between entrepreneurship education and perceived feasibility and desirability. Although perceived feasibility and desirability are highly correlated with entrepreneurial intentions (Krueger et al., 2000; Shapero, 1982), these two constructs were actually the antecedents of entrepreneurial intentions. Thus, we excluded studies only using perceived desirability and feasibility, which did not provide a direct correlation between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. In this study, we used a total of 73 studies with 74 samples, resulting in a sample size of 37,285 individuals (Table 1).

Variable Coding Procedures

Entrepreneurship Education Attributes. We differentiated between studies using a semester versus workshop format. In addition, we created two groups based on whether a primary study provided students with a venture creation course or a business planning course.

Gender. We coded gender (the percentage of males) by employing 50% as a cutoff point to divide the studies into male-dominated or female-dominated studies.

Entrepreneurial Family Background. Regarding entrepreneurial family background (the percentage of people who come from entrepreneurial family backgrounds), we used a median split to allocate high and low groups.¹⁰

Cultural Values. We employed GLOBE's societal cultural practices because they measure how things were in a specific country (Hanges & Dickson, 2004). The items assessing the societal cultural practices were based on a 7-point Likert scale (Javidan,

9. For snowball sampling, we reviewed the reference list of selected key articles as well as the papers or books that cited selected key articles in order to identify additional studies.

10. The median split for the percentage of people who have entrepreneurial family background was 38%.

Table 1

List of Studies Included in Meta-Analysis

ID	Author(s) (year)	Entrepreneurship Education					Business Education					
		Sample size	α^+	α^*	Duration	Specificity (% of male)	Gender	Family (% of subjects with an entrepreneurial family)	Country	Author(s) (year)	Sample size	α^8
1	Ahmed et al. (2010)	276	—	—	—	66%	—	—	Pakistan	Bhandari (2006)	100	.930
2	Almobaareek and Manolova (2012)	949	—	—	—	62.84%	—	—	Saudi	Crant (1996)	181	.930
3	Aslam, Awan, and Khan (2012)	197	.870	—	—	63.45%	—	—	Pakistan	Douglas and Shepherd (2002)	300	
4	Athayde (2009)	249	—	—	—	49%	40.16%	UK	Ertuna and Gurel (2011)	917		
5	Azhar, Javaid, Rehman, and Hyder (2011)	320	.880	.850	Semester	61.25%	—	Pakistan	Farrington, Venter, and Louw (2012)	439		
6	Basu (2010)	231	.740	—	—	64.40%	46%	US	Frankie, Haase, and Lautenschliger (2010)	980		
7	Brown, Bowles, and Seibert (2011)	454	.860	Semester	—	—	—	Various countries	Frank and Lathje (2004)	850		
8	Byabashaija and Katono (2011)	167	.720	Semester	—	—	—	Uganda	Gökköl and Aydintan (2011)	175	.923	
9	Chen (2010)	327	.770	.840	—	46.48%	—	China	Hassan and Wafa (2012)	746		
10	De Clercq, Honig, and Martin (2013)	946	.880	Semester	—	38.40%	62.60%	Canada	De Jorge-Moreno, Castillo, and Triguero (2012)	426		
11	Dohse and Walter (2010)	1,949	.810	Semester	Business planning	100%	28%	Spain	Lans, Gulikers, and Batterink (2010)	102		
12	Ekpe and Mat (2012)	120	.630	.710	—	—	0%	Nigeria	Moi, Adeline, and Dyana (2011)	787	.725	
13	Evans (2009)	111	.840	.770	—	—	23%	US	Schwarz, Wdowiak, Almer-Jartz, and Breitenecker (2009)	2,124		
14	Fayolle et al. (2006a)	144	.860	Workshop	Business planning	—	—	France	Wang, Wong, and Lu (2001)	7,144		
15	Fayolle et al. (2006b)	20	.760	Workshop	—	—	—	France				
16	Florin, Kari, and Rossiter (2007)	220	—	Semester	Business planning	—	68.64%	US				
17	Gerba (2012)	156	—	Semester	—	58%	—	Ethiopia				
18	von Graevenitz et al. (2010)	196	—	Semester	Business planning	44.90%	16%	Germany				
						40.30%	40.30%					

Table 1

Continued

ID	Author(s) (year)	Entrepreneurship Education					Business Education				
		Sample size	α^{\dagger}	α^*	Duration	Specificity (% of male)	Family (% of subjects with an entrepreneurial family)	Country	Author(s) (year)	Sample size	α^{\ddagger}
19	Hamidi, Wennberg, and Berglund (2008)	78			Semester	—	54%	49%	Sweden		
20	Hanke, Kisenwether, and Warren (2005)	70			Semester	—	—	—	US		
21	Huber, Stoof, and Van Praag (2012)	2,360			Semester	—	49.70%	22.70%	Dutch		
22	Ismail et al. (2009)	123			Semester	—	22%	28.46%	Malaysia		
23	Kanini, Biemans, Lans, Mulder, and Chizari (2012)	205	.850	.850	Semester	—	42%	—	Iran		
24	Keat, Selvarajah, and Meyer (2011)	417	.811	.802	—	—	32.90%	35.50%	Various countries		
25	Kolvereid and Moen (1997)	278	.750	.750	Semester	Venture creation	62%	—	Norway		
26	Lanero et al. (2011)	800	.732	.713	Semester	—	33.80%	—	Spain		
27	Lee et al. (2005)	160			Semester	Venture creation	—	—	US		
28	Lee, Lim, Pathak, Chang, and Li (2006)	217			Semester	Venture creation	—	—	Korea		
29	Lee, Lim, Pathak, Chang, and Li (2006)	392			Semester	—	—	—	Various countries		
30	Lee, Lim, Lim, Ng, and Wong (2012)	200	.854	.904	—	—	37.50%	43%	Malaysia		
31	Litfin (2004)	166			Semester	—	56.60%	—	Spain		
32	Lorz et al. (2011)	272	.943	.903	Semester	—	35.80%	—	Germany		
33	Malebana (2012)	355			Semester	—	32.20%	—	South Africa		
34	Marques, Ferreira, Gomes, and Rodrigues (2012)	202			Semester	—	—	—	Africa		
35	McStay (2008)	429	.800	.660	Semester	—	—	—	Portugal		
36	Miller, Bell, Palmer, and Gonzalez (2009)	232			Business planning	—	61.15%	—	Australia		
37	Mo (2011)	110			Semester	—	—	—	US		
									China		

38	Moberg (2012)	724	Semester	—	46.96%	25%	Denmark
39	Mohamed, Rezai, Shamsudin, and Mahmud (2012)	410	Semester	—	—	46.70%	Malaysia
40	Muofhe and du Toit (2011)	269	.810	.880	Semester	—	South Africa
41	Noel (2002)	39	Semester	—	55%	—	US
42	Oloni and Sinyamule (2009)	508	Semester	—	59.45%	—	Tanzania
43	Oosterbeek et al. (2010)	250	Semester	—	55.20%	33.20%	Dutch
44	do Paço, Ferreira, Raposo, Rodrigues, and Dimis (2011)	74	.790	—	52.70%	—	Portugal
45	Pruett (2012)	105	Workshop	—	—	55%	US
46	Radu and Loué (2008)	44	Workshop	—	—	—	France
47	Raposo, Ferreira, do Paço, and Rodrigues (2008)	316	Semester	—	47.50%	—	Portugal
48	Rodrigues et al. (2012)	48	Workshop	Venture creation	—	—	Portugal
49	Romero, Petrescu, and Balalia (2011)	191	Semester	Venture creation	32.98%	—	Various countries
50	Sánchez (2011)	864	.750	Semester	Business planning	35.80%	US
51	Sandhu, Jain, and Yusof (2010)	234	—	—	32.50%	—	Malaysia
52	Shariff et al. (2010)	22	.928	Semester	Business planning	—	Malaysia
53	Soutaris, Zerbiniati, and Al-Laham (2007)	250	.750	Semester	Business planning	—	Various countries
54	Turker and Selcuk (2009)	300	—	—	—	40%	Turkey
55	Uddin and Bose (2012)	520	.886	—	—	—	Bangladesh
56	Varamäki, Tornkoski, Vijamaa, and Ristimäki (n.d.)	1,204	.870	—	—	36%	Finland
57	Wilson et al. (2007)	933	Semester	—	56.06%	—	US
58	Wu and Wu (2008)	146	.831	—	63.70%	—	China
59	Zhang, Cheng, Fan, and Chu (2012)	200	.819	.827	Semester	50%	28%
60	Zhao et al. (2005)	265	.790	.880	Semester	66%	—
						US	

Note: 59 studies (60 independent samples) are entrepreneurship education and 14 studies are business education. Regarding reliability of entrepreneurship education as 1, we do not report it in the table.

[†] Reliability for entrepreneurship education.

16 studies assessed effectiveness of entrepreneurship education. Among them, 12 studies reported the reliability for entrepreneurship education. Regarding samples missing reliability of entrepreneurship education (i.e., Lee et al., 2005; Moberg, 2012; Turker & Selcuk, 2009), we imputed it by using the mean reliability of other studies providing reliabilities of entrepreneurship education.

Imputed missing reliability = .813.

[‡] Reliability for entrepreneurial intentions.

29 studies reported reliability for entrepreneurial intentions. Regarding missing reliabilities of entrepreneurial intentions, we imputed it by using the mean reliability of other studies providing reliabilities of entrepreneurial intentions. Imputed missing reliability = .813.

[§] Reliability for entrepreneurial intentions in the business education studies. Regarding missing reliabilities of entrepreneurial intentions, we imputed it by using the mean reliability of other studies providing reliabilities of entrepreneurial intentions. Imputed missing reliability = .859.

House, & Dorfman, 2004). We coded the primary studies using a median split to divide the studies into two groups.¹¹ Those above the median were the high-level group and those below median were the low-level group.¹²

Operationalization of Entrepreneurship Education. We found that some primary studies used entrepreneurship education as a binary variable, whereas other primary studies assessed the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education. Consequently, we divided the studies into these two groups.

Study Quality. We used two other moderators for study quality.¹³ The first was *study design*. In general, the primary studies of entrepreneurial intentions used either a longitudinal¹⁴ or a cross-sectional approach.¹⁵ Thus, we divided the studies into two groups, a longitudinal group and a cross-sectional group. Second, we suspected that the *measurement of entrepreneurial intentions* could influence the quality of the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. We found that two measures were commonly used for primary studies: one was Kolvereid (1996a, 1996b), and the other was Liñán and Chen's (2006, 2009) entrepreneurial intention questionnaire.¹⁶ We coded studies using either the Kolvereid scale group or the Liñán and Chen scale group.

Publication Bias.¹⁷ We investigated whether the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship differs for published studies and unpublished studies. The difference between the published and unpublished studies could be due to a publication bias. We coded those published in journals as the published group. We coded conference papers, working paper, and dissertations as the unpublished group.

Meta-Analytic Procedures

Primary Analysis. We performed a primary analysis following Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) approach to meta-analysis. Meta-analysis provides two possible options for the calculation of effect sizes: the *correlation coefficient effect size* (i.e., r) and the *standardized mean difference effect size* (i.e., d) (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). We found that most of

11. Power distance: median split = 5.02. In-group collectivism: median split = 4.66. Gender egalitarianism: median split = 3.36. Uncertainty avoidance: median split = 4.35.

12. This approach is consistent with previous research. "This approach appears appropriate since our comparison focuses on relative differences between countries rather than absolute levels of uncertainty avoidance" (Brinckmann, Grichnik, & Kapsa, 2010, p. 32).

13. We computed intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) (2) for inter-rater reliability for coding the articles (McGraw & Wong, 1996; Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). The reason why we chose to report ICC (2) is that we had two consistent raters code all the articles. In addition, we have a sample of raters rather than a population of raters. Two raters had perfect agreement in coding the articles and the ICC (2) statistic equaled 1.00 across all study quality variables.

14. Measuring entrepreneurial intentions before and after participants enrolled in entrepreneurship education.

15. Measuring entrepreneurial intentions once and only after participants enrolled in entrepreneurship education.

16. Kolvereid (1996a, 1996b) introduced three items to measure entrepreneurial intentions, whereas the entrepreneurial intentions questionnaire consists of six items to measure entrepreneurial intentions.

17. Publication bias refers to "the possibility that not all completed studies on a topic are published in the literature and that [those that are not published] are systematically different from published studies" (McDaniel, Rothstein, & Whetzel, 2006, p. 927). It will lead to an overestimation of effect sizes, posing a great challenge to the validity of meta-analytic reviews (Banks, Kepes, & McDaniel, 2012; Banks & McDaniel, 2011; Dickersin, 2005; McDaniel et al.; Rothstein, Sutton, & Borenstein, 2005).

the studies to be meta-analyzed used continuous entrepreneurial intentions measures and dichotomous or ordinal entrepreneurship education and business education measures. However, many recent studies conceptualized both entrepreneurship education and business education as constructs along a continuum (e.g., Azhar et al., 2011; Chen, 2010; Douglas & Shepherd, 2002; Shariff et al., 2010; Turker & Selcuk, 2009; Zhao et al., 2005). We chose r rather than d (Lipsey & Wilson). We used the effect size and the r correlation coefficient interchangeably. We converted d to r by following the procedures developed by Lipsey and Wilson.

Psychometric meta-analysis allows for the correction of artifacts that can lead to attenuation in the effect sizes (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). One of the artifacts is measurement error. We corrected for measurement errors in both the independent and the dependent variables for each correlation. However, not all of the primary studies we located provided a reliability estimate (i.e., coefficient alpha) that would permit us to correct for measurement errors. Therefore, consistent with the approaches suggested by Hunter and Schmidt, we imputed the missing reliability for both independent and dependent variables by using the mean of the reliabilities in other studies included in our meta-analysis that reported reliabilities.¹⁸ This allowed us to correct for measurement errors for each primary correlation and to calculate the corrected sample size-weighted mean correlation (\hat{p}) as our estimate of the population correlation. With regard to the statistical significance of the effect sizes for the overall relationship and each subgroup, we computed a corrected 95% confidence interval for the statistical significance. The effect sizes were statistically significant when the corrected 95% confidence intervals did not include a zero.

To gauge the presence of moderators, we reported both the I^2 and the credibility intervals. This approach is consistent with Geyskens, Krishnan, Steenkamp, and Cunha's (2009) recommendations, which suggested that it is desirable to adopt multiple approaches to test for heterogeneity. The I^2 (Higgins, Thompson, Deeks, & Altman, 2003), which ranges from zero to one, is the percent of the variance that is not due to statistical artifacts. Once the I^2 is large, we can speculate about the reasons for the variance and conduct subgroup analysis to search for moderators (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009).¹⁹ If the I^2 exceeds the threshold value .25 (25%), it justifies the search for moderators (Higgins et al.). We also computed a corrected 80% credibility interval to justify the presence of moderators. Whitener (1990) pointed out that a wide 80% credibility interval suggests the possible presence of moderating effects. We performed subgroup analysis²⁰ to test the moderator effects.

Some researchers have suggested that pre-education entrepreneurial intentions may account for some of the variance in post-education entrepreneurial intentions (Sánchez,

18. Regarding the use of entrepreneurship education as a binary variable in primary studies, we keep reliability at 1.00. However, for those studies which assessed effectiveness of entrepreneurship education and did not provide reliability, we imputed a missing reliability by using the mean of the reliabilities in other studies that also assessed effectiveness of entrepreneurship education.

19. Subgroup analysis is synonymous with moderator analysis. It is used for testing the statistical significance of differences in effect sizes.

20. Subgroup analysis tests the between-group significance of the differences in effect sizes (Borenstein et al., 2009). We employed Hunter and Schmidt's (1990) approach (i.e., z-test) to evaluate the statistical significance of the categorical and dichotomized moderator variables (i.e., the statistical significance of the between-group uncorrected effect size difference). Utilizing subgroup analysis to test moderator effects requires a sample to be divided into subsamples, which means that continuous moderator variables must be dichotomized so that we can test for the moderator effects by examining the significance of the differences in effect sizes between the subsamples (Hunter & Schmidt). We used a median split method to dichotomize the continuous moderator variables (Hunter & Schmidt; Steel & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2002).

2011; Zhao et al., 2005). To address this concern, we chose the following approaches. First, we constructed a meta-analytically derived correlation matrix. Second, in view of the fact that sample sizes differ across the cells in the correlation matrix, we calculated the harmonic mean sample size (Viswesvaran & Ones, 1995). Usage of a harmonic mean sample size yields more conservative estimates because less weight is given to large samples (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007). Third, we performed hierarchical multiple regression analyses based on the statistical information attained in the first two steps to investigate how entrepreneurship education influences post-education entrepreneurial intentions after partialing out the effect of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions on post-education entrepreneurial intentions.

Results

Primary Analyses

Overall Relationship. We tabulated the results in Table 2. They were based on 73 studies, 74 samples, and a sample size of 37,285 respondents.²¹ The overall analysis found that entrepreneurship education is positively associated with entrepreneurial intentions. The correlation after correction for measurement error was .143. Moreover, it was statistically significant as the corrected 95% confidence interval did not include zero. Thus, this result supports hypothesis 1a. We note that two of the sampled studies had large sample sizes and could have biased our meta-analytic results. Thus, we excluded these two outliers.²²

To examine hypothesis 1b, our results indicated a corrected correlation of .051 between business education and entrepreneurial intentions. We performed a z-test to compare the effect size difference between the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship and the business education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. The difference in effect sizes was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Therefore, hypothesis 1b was supported.

Hypothesis 1c investigated whether the relationship between entrepreneurship education and post-education entrepreneurial intentions would not be different from zero after partialing out the effect of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions on post-education entrepreneurial intentions. Table 3 displays the corrected correlation matrix. Table 4 contains the results of the hierarchical multiple regression. Entrepreneurship education was not a significant predictor of post-entrepreneurial intentions ($\beta = .043$) after controlling the effect of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions on post-education entrepreneurial intentions. To be specific, after pre-education entrepreneurial intentions were controlled, the part correlation (i.e., semipartial correlation) between entrepreneurship education and post-education entrepreneurial intentions became .042. Overall, this analysis shows that accounting for the effect of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions on post-education entrepreneurial intentions reduces the relationship between entrepreneurship

21. For the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship, we used 59 studies, 60 samples, and a sample size of 22,014 individuals. On the other hand, 14 studies, 14 samples, and a sample size of 15,271 individuals were used for the business education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship.

22. Albornoz, Amorós, and Pérez-Carrón (2011) had 22,165 samples, and Laspiña, Breugst, Hebllich, and Patzelt (2012) had 43,764 samples. We performed a series of analyses to examine whether the inclusion or exclusion of these two outliers influenced the results of our meta-analysis and publication bias analyses. We found that outliers significantly altered the effect sizes of some subgroups, influenced moderator analysis, and affected the results of the publication bias analyses. In light of the undue impact caused by the outliers, we decided to remove them from our analysis.

Table 2

Psychometric Meta-Analysis Results[†]

	K	N	\bar{r}_o	SD_r	$\hat{\rho}$	SD_p	I^2	Corrected 95% CI	Corrected 80% CR	Sig. test for between group difference
Education—entrepreneurial intentions	60	22,014	.129	.147	.143	.159	88.09	.101 to .186	-.060 to .346	$p < .05$
Entrepreneurship education	14	15,271	.047	.147	.051	.156	95.78	-.032 to .135	-.149 to .251	
Business education										
Entrepreneurship education duration	5	361	.089	.129	.097	.058	16.58	-.028 to .221	.023 to .171	
Workshop	40	16,321	.123	.156	.136	.170	90.39	.081 to .191	-.081 to .353	
Semester										
Entrepreneurship education specificity	5	894	.234	.129	.269	.137	73.02	.159 to .380	.094 to .444	
Venture creation	8	3,877	.138	.095	.153	.098	79.02	.132 to .174	.027 to .278	
Business planning										
Gender (% of male) [‡]										
Male dominated	20	7,567	.139	.131	.154	.139	85.63	.089 to .220	-.023 to .332	
Female dominated	19	9,010	.079	.135	.085	.149	89.03	.013 to .156	-.106 to .275	
Entrepreneurial family (% of subjects with an entrepreneurial family) [§]										
High	10	2,859	.081	.181	.084	.193	89.71	-.042 to .210	-.163 to .331	
Low	10	8,247	.069	.111	.077	.120	90.36	-.001 to .155	-.077 to .230	
Culture (GLOBE dimensions)										
Power distance [¶]										
High	22	7,310	.140	.095	.155	.094	70.12	.108 to .202	.035 to .275	
Low	19	8,864	.087	.161	.094	.175	91.96	.012 to .176	-.130 to .318	
In-group collectivism ^{††}										
High	21	6,588	.152	.107	.173	.111	75.03	.118 to .228	.031 to .316	$p < .05$
Low	21	10,161	.087	.145	.094	.155	90.41	.024 to .164	-.104 to .293	
Gender egalitarianism ^{‡‡}										
High	17	7,712	.048	.144	.053	.151	89.31	-.023 to .129	-.140 to .245	
Low	17	5,792	.143	.098	.162	.102	73.08	.105 to .218	.031 to .292	
Uncertainty avoidance ^{§§}										
High	22	8,688	.057	.138	.063	.143	86.73	-.001 to .127	-.120 to .246	$p < .01$
Low	21	7,645	.162	.102	.184	.110	77.34	.130 to .237	.044 to .324	

Table 2

Continued

	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}_o	SD_r	$\hat{\rho}$	SD_{ρ}	I^2	Corrected 95% CI	Corrected 80% CR	Sig. test for between group difference
Operationalization of entrepreneurship education [¶]										
Binary	44	17,042	.105	.143	.115	.149	.87.72	.068 to .162	-.076 to .306	<i>p</i> < .01
Assessment	16	4,972	.212	.130	.264	.141	.81.42	.188 to .341	.084 to .445	
Study design										
Longitudinal design	18	7,434	.095	.132	.104	.138	.86.55	.035 to .173	-.073 to .281	
Cross-sectional design	42	14,580	.147	.151	.165	.165	.88.23	.112 to .218	-.046 to .375	
Entrepreneurial intentions measurement										
Lilien and Chen scale	8	1,423	.218	.145	.240	.146	.76.81	.125 to .355	.054 to .426	
Kolvereid scale	10	4,213	.142	.110	.158	.115	.81.81	.079 to .236	.011 to .305	
Publication bias										
Published	46	13,154	.167	.161	.187	.177	.87.72	.146 to .227	-.039 to .413	
Unpublished	14	8,860	.074	.100	.083	.102	.84.33	.026 to .139	-.048 to .214	<i>p</i> < .01

Note: *K* = number of samples; *N* = sample size; \bar{r}_o = uncorrected sample-size-weighted mean correlation; SD_r = sample-size-weighted standard deviation of uncorrected mean correlations; ρ = sample-size-weighted mean correlation; SD_{ρ} = sample-size-weighted standard deviation of corrected mean correlations; I^2 = indicator of moderation; Corrected 95% CI = corrected 95% confidence interval; Corrected 80% CR = corrected 80% credibility interval; Sig. Test for Between Group Difference = the z-test for the statistical significance of moderating effect.

[†] All of the meta-analytic distributions of effect sizes for subgroups and the results of moderator analysis in Table 2 refer to the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions.

Cutoff point:

[‡] The percentage of male above 50% is male-dominated, and below 50% is female dominated.

[§] % of subjects with an entrepreneurial family: median split = 38%.

[¶] Power distance: median split = 5.02.

^{**} In-group collectivism: median split = 4.66.

^{**} Gender egalitarianism: median split = 3.36.

^{§§} Uncertainty avoidance: median split = 4.35.

^{¶¶} Binary means education versus no-education; assessment means entrepreneurship education is evaluated by respondents in primary studies.

Table 3

Corrected Meta-Analytic Correlation Matrix

	Pre-education entrepreneurial intentions	Entrepreneurship education	Post-education entrepreneurial intentions
Pre-education entrepreneurial intentions	—		
Entrepreneurship education	.175 (2, 515)	—	
Post-education entrepreneurial intentions	.579 (7, 2,228)	.143 (60, 22,014)	—

Note: N (harmonic mean sample size) = 1,232; the number of independent samples (k) and sample size (N) are shown in parentheses.

Table 4

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

	Post-education entrepreneurial intentions	
	Step 1	Step 2
	β	β
Pre-education entrepreneurial intentions	.579***	.571***
Entrepreneurship education		.043
R^2	.335***	.337***
ΔR^2		.002

Note: N (harmonic mean sample size) = 1,232; β = standardized regression weights; R^2 = coefficient of determination; ΔR^2 = incremental change in R^2 ; *** $p < .001$.

education and post-education entrepreneurial intentions. Moreover, this relationship was not significantly different from zero. Therefore, hypothesis 1c was supported.

The I^2 for the overall relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions was 88.09%. The I^2 values were large and far exceeded the threshold value of 25%, which means that we were justified in conducting a moderator analysis. The corrected 80% credibility interval for the overall relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions was wide, which further confirms the need to conduct the moderator analysis.

Moderator Analyses. We investigated 12 potential moderators in our study. The far right column in Table 2 displays the statistical significance of the moderating effects based on z-tests. In Table 5, we tabulated all the hypotheses based on their main effects, moderator effects, methods to test the hypotheses, and whether there was supportive evidence.

Table 5**Summary of Results**

Entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions	Hypotheses	Methods used	Results
Main effect:			
Overall positive	Hypothesis 1a	Meta-analysis	Support
Stronger than business education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship	Hypothesis 1b	z-test comparison	Support
Zero after controlling for pre-intentions	Hypothesis 1c	Hierarchical multiple regression	Support
Moderator: attributes of education			
Semester > workshop	Hypothesis 2	Subgroup (Category)	No support
Venture creation > business planning	Hypothesis 3	Subgroup (Category)	No support
Moderator: individual differences			
Male < female	Hypothesis 4	Subgroup (50% split)	No support
Family background < nonfamily background	Hypothesis 5	Subgroup (Median split)	No support
Moderator: cultural contexts			
High power distance > low power distance	Hypothesis 6a	Subgroup (Median split)	No support
High in-group collectivism > low in-group collectivism	Hypothesis 6b	Subgroup (Median split)	Support
Low gender egalitarianism > high gender egalitarianism	Hypothesis 6c	Subgroup (Median split)	Support
Low uncertainty avoidance > high uncertainty avoidance	Hypothesis 6d	Subgroup (Median split)	Support
Moderator: operationalization of entrepreneurship education			
Assessment > binary	Hypothesis 7	Subgroup (Category)	Support
Un-hypothesized moderators			
Study design		Subgroup (Category)	n.s.
Entrepreneurial intentions measurement		Subgroup (Category)	n.s.
Publication bias		Subgroup (Category)	sig.

n.s., not statistically significant; sig., statistically significant.

Discussion

We investigated whether entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurial intentions.

Overall, entrepreneurship education has a statistically significant but small positive relationship with entrepreneurial intentions. The meta-analysis indicated that the correlation between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions was $\hat{\rho} = .143$. In addition, we conducted another analysis to confirm that the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship ($\hat{\rho} = .143$) was greater than the business education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship ($\hat{\rho} = .051$). The difference was statistically significant. Thus, we concluded that entrepreneurship education was related more positively to a participant's entrepreneurial intentions than was business education.

To examine the possibility of reversed causal influence of entrepreneurial intention on entrepreneurship education, we hypothesized that if pre-education entrepreneurial intentions are controlled, we are not able to find the significant relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. Based on this result, we can infer that reverse causation can explain why the effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions are not strong. Although one cannot prove a null hypothesis to be true from a statistical point of view, it is important to know that the often-referenced relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention is most likely due

to a selection effect from a theoretical and a practical perspective. Hence, the null hypothesis (our Hypothesis 1c) has a theoretical meaning in this case.

We tested a total of 12 potential moderators of the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship based on five categories: (1) attributes of entrepreneurship education, (2) individual differences, (3) the cultural context, (4) operationalization of entrepreneurship education, and (5) the quality of the study (un-hypothesized). The first set of moderators, possible attributes of entrepreneurship education (i.e., the duration of entrepreneurship education and the specificity of entrepreneurship education), had no significant impact on the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. We inferred that the educational format, whether it was delivered in a semester format or in a workshop format, or whether its focus was business planning or venture creation, had little impact on changing the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. Nor did individual student differences have significant effects on the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. Regarding cultural context, however, the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship becomes more positively associated in (1) high in-group collectivistic countries, (2) low gender egalitarianism countries, and (3) low uncertainty avoidance countries. Last, the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship was stronger when entrepreneurship education was assessed than when it was a binary variable. It was also stronger in published papers compared with unpublished papers.

Implications

We have conducted a meta-analysis as one form of evidence-based entrepreneurship in order to produce *good evidence* about whether entrepreneurship education was positively related to entrepreneurial intentions and under what conditions the focal relationship would be more or less effective. Evidence generated from this study not only plays a role in summarizing and highlighting the results of studying the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions across different research projects, but it also magnifies the power of the findings by creating massive databases with multiples of statistical power that researchers can use to tease out previously undetected relationships.

Theoretical Implications. Despite the prolific amount of research on the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship, theoretical and empirical disagreements still remain (Honig, 2004). By conducting a meta-analytic review, we provided support for the conventional wisdom that there is a *small but positive* entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. The main finding of this study is largely consistent with Martin et al.’s (2013) meta-analysis.²³

However, we extended the findings from Martin et al.’s (2013) in three ways. First, we have highlighted evidence that entrepreneurship education is a comparatively more effective pedagogical tool for enhancing a student’s entrepreneurial intentions than is business education. Second, our research demonstrated that entrepreneurship education was not

23. Martin et al.’s (2013) meta-analysis produced a correlation of .137 between entrepreneurship education and training and entrepreneurial intention based on 19 samples. Our meta-analysis, which was based on 60 samples, yielded an uncorrected correlation of .129 and a corrected correlation of .143. The correction for measurement errors does not substantially improve the effect size, which is only enhanced by .014. In fact, regardless of this correction, the effect sizes remain nearly identical between the Martin et al.’s study and ours.

significantly associated with post-course entrepreneurial intentions if we considered a student's pre-course entrepreneurial intentions. This result was important and consistent with prior research that has suggested that pre-education entrepreneurial intentions might account for some of the variance in post-education entrepreneurial intentions (Sánchez, 2011; Zhao et al., 2005). It also indicated that pre-course entrepreneurial intentions appeared to be a major source of inconsistent results in previous research. This result also allowed us to offer *selection-based explanations*. Although *treatment-based explanations* argued that some features of entrepreneurship education could change a student's entrepreneurial intentions, selection-based explanations suggested that post-course entrepreneurial intentions could result from the process of sorting students by pre-course entrepreneurial intentions.

Third, both Martin et al.'s (2013) study and ours indicated that after accounting for sampling error and statistical artifacts, a residual variance still remains.²⁴ This indicates that there is a substantial variation across effect sizes, which may be attributed to moderators. Consequently, we examined further the moderators of the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention.

We tested two modes of entrepreneurship education: (1) a semester versus workshop format and (2) a business planning versus venture creation format, which we considered as possible moderators; however, we did not find significant moderating effects from these two educational attributes of the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. We also found non-significant effects for two individual differences: (1) gender and (2) entrepreneurial family background. In our study, the format of entrepreneurship education and individual demographic differences neither enhanced nor diminished a student's entrepreneurial intentions, perhaps due to the complex nature of the entrepreneurial intentions construct (Douglas, 2013).

In contrast, we found that three cultural dimensions played a significantly positive role in the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. A high in-group collectivistic culture, a low gender egalitarianism, and a low uncertainty avoidance culture reinforced the effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions. These findings demonstrated that the effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions could vary across national cultures. It also lent support to the idea that the inconsistent effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions across the individual studies might have come from the moderators.

Regarding the significant subgroup effect size difference, which was due to differences in the operationalization of entrepreneurship education, we found that the increased correlation between entrepreneurship education (the assessment of entrepreneurship education's effectiveness) and entrepreneurial intentions was likely due to common method variance. The correlation between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions was inflated by a *common rater effect*.

We also found that the publication bias in the meta-analysis was due to a significant effect size difference between the published studies and the unpublished studies, with a stronger entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship reported in the published studies than the unpublished studies. These results suggested that some scholars might not have wanted to publish their results, especially (1) if they were statistically insignificant and/or they had a small effect size; (2) if they were contrary to theory and/or the trend of past research (Banks & McDaniel, 2011); and (3) if they went

24. Martin et al.'s (2013) study only accounted for sampling error and ours considered both sampling error and measurement error.

against the common biases of professors from business schools who wanted to maintain their place in entrepreneurship education. Publication bias was cited as an “antagonist of effective policymaking” (Banks, Kepes, & Banks, 2012) and the “kryptonite of evidence-based practice” (Banks & McDaniel). It has required substantial effort and collaboration from the scientific community to deal with it. Recent literature has proposed a number of recommendations to address the issue of publication bias (Banks & McDaniel; Kepes, Banks, McDaniel, & Whetzel, 2012).

Practical Implications. The evidence-informed knowledge in this study also had important practical implications. Despite the overall *small but positive* effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions, educators, policy makers, and program evaluators should pay attention to the fact that we found no significant effects for entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions when we controlled for pre-course entrepreneurial intentions. Our finding suggested the importance of carefully controlling the influence of any variable that could impact the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education prior to testing its effect. Otherwise, these factors could condition the result to suggest greater variance in the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education than actually exists.

Pre-education entrepreneurial intentions also have important implications for a student’s post-education entrepreneurial intentions. From our results, intentions may be much more stable than previously thought. According to Table 4, there is high correlation between pre- and post-education entrepreneurial intentions. This relationship does not change much with the addition of entrepreneurship education. This suggests that entrepreneurship education needs to be improved and much more targeted if the goal is to change entrepreneurial intentions.

From an evaluation standpoint (Mark, Donaldson, & Campbell, 2011; Scriven, 1991), entrepreneurial intentions might not be a valid construct to evaluate the true merit, worth, or significance of entrepreneurship education programs.²⁵ We found that there was little effect of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions. Except for cultural contexts, many other moderators did not account for the problem of a very small relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions, which suggest that policy makers or program evaluators ought to identify other criteria for evaluating the effects of entrepreneurship education. For example, entrepreneurial knowledge and skills, real behavior, or performance would be better constructs rather than entrepreneurial intentions.

Limitations

The primary limitation of this research was that unlike the Martin et al.’s (2013) study, it did not examine a dependent variable related to venture performance. It would have been preferable to study venture performance or the actual number of start-ups as the dependent variable. This would have been a truer measure of the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education. Using such variables was outside the scope of this research. Instead, we used entrepreneurial intentions.

Second, we focused exclusively on entrepreneurial intentions. However, entrepreneurial intentions are also influenced by other antecedents. For example, many studies

25. Evaluation is defined as “the systematic determination of the merit, worth, or significance of something” (Mark et al., 2011, p. 7; Scriven, 1991).

investigating the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions have adopted the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1985; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) or Krueger et al.'s (2000) two-factor model, which postulates that entrepreneurial intentions are influenced by a combination of three major factors: (1) attitude toward outcomes, (2) perceived social norms, and (3) perceived behavioral control (Ajzen; Ajzen & Fishbein), or two factors: perceived feasibility and desirability (Krueger et al.). The differential impacts of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions arise through (i.e., can be mediated by) those factors.

A third limitation was the insufficient number of samples in a few subgroups, such as the workshop and venture creation subgroups. An inadequate number of samples in the subgroups reduced the power of the analysis resulting in second-order sampling error (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). This limitation also addresses the partialing out of the effect of pre-education entrepreneurial intentions on post-education entrepreneurial intentions. It is obvious that we had an insufficient number of samples to test the relationship between pre-education entrepreneurial intentions and entrepreneurship education as well as the relationship between pre-education entrepreneurial intentions and post-entrepreneurial intentions. Thus, we call for more primary studies to contribute to these research areas so that more accurate conclusions can be drawn.

Future Research

This study raises possibilities for future research to advance our knowledge of the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship. First, research could extend current efforts to sort through and identify those perspectives that can be the most informative. For example, future studies could measure entrepreneurial intentions by specifically investigating growth- and independence-oriented intentions, as suggested by Douglas (2013).

Second, future research could carefully investigate the “selection hypothesis” of entrepreneurship education for entrepreneurial intentions as a reverse causation explanation. Elfenbein, Hamilton, and Zenger (2010) suggested that there are two types of selection mechanisms in entrepreneurship: (1) a preference selection and (2) an ability selection. Either students whose preference toward entrepreneurship is high or those whose ability is high could deliberately enroll in entrepreneurship education. However, these types of hypotheses have so far not received rigorous analysis.

Third, future evidence-based entrepreneurship can extend our knowledge about the effects of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions by investigating mediation effects. As mentioned in the limitation section, we suggest that future meta-analysis can include the possible predictors of entrepreneurial intentions such as perceived desirability and feasibility that can mediate the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship.

Fourth, the large I^2 value signals the potential presence of moderators. In the present study, the I^2 value remains large in all except the workshop subgroup, which means that our results may be from distributions with substantial variation. Also, there could be other moderators in addition to those identified in the present study. These possibilities provide avenues for researchers to conduct studies on subgroups with large I^2 values, as shown in Table 2.

Last, related to the previous suggestion, future research could identify new types of moderators that prior research has not addressed. For example, we were not able to find any studies examining the differences among entrepreneurship teachers. Future research could investigate whether an instructor's attributes such as passion, enthusiasm, or

emotion (Frenzel, Goetz, Lüdtke, Pekrun, & Sutton, 2009) could moderate the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. Furthermore, scholars have recently become interested in the effects of peers in the classroom as well as the competitions between schools on entrepreneurial intentions (Falck et al., 2012; Falck & Woessmann, 2013). Thus, future research could use these factors as potential moderators on the entrepreneurship education–entrepreneurial intentions relationship.

REFERENCES

Studies included in the meta-analysis are marked with an asterisk (*).

- *Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M.M., Ahmad, Z., Shaukat, M.Z., Usman, A., Rehman, W., et al. (2010). Determinants of students' entrepreneurial career intentions: Evidence from business graduates. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(2), 14–22.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). *From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior*. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11–39). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(5), 888–918.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Albornoz, C.A., Amorós, J.E., & Pérez-Carrón, M. (2011). *Is it enough just to educate? An international analysis of education and training for entrepreneurship*. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Research Conference, Cartagena de Indias, Colombia.
- Aldrich, H., Renzulli, L.A., & Langton, N. (1998). Passing on privilege: Resources provided by self-employed parents to their self-employed children. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 16, 291–318.
- *Almobaireek, W.N., Manolova, T.S. (2012). Who wants to be an entrepreneur? Entrepreneurial intentions among Saudi university students. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(11), 4029–4040.
- *Aslam, T.M., Awan, A.S., & Khan, T.M. (2012). Entrepreneurial intentions among university students of Punjab, a province of Pakistan. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(14), 114–120.
- *Athayde, R. (2009). Measuring enterprise potential in young people. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2), 481–500.
- Auyeung, P. & Sands, J. (1996). A cross cultural study of the learning style of accounting students. *Accounting and Finance*, 36(2), 261–274.
- *Azhar, A., Javaid, A., Rehman, M., Hyder, A. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions among business students in Pakistan. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics*, 5(2), 13–21.
- Bagozzi, R.P., Baumgartner, J., & Yi, Y. (1989). An investigation into the role of intentions as mediators of the attitude-behavior relationship. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 10(1), 35–62.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147.

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4(3), 359–373.

Bandura, A. (1992). Exercise of personal agency through the self-efficacy mechanism. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action* (pp. 3–38). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Banks, G.C., Kepes, S., & Banks, K.P. (2012). Publication bias: The antagonist of meta-analytic reviews and effective policymaking. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34, 259–277.

Banks, G.C., Kepes, S., & McDaniel, M.A. (2012). Publication bias: A call for improved metaanalytic practice in the organizational sciences. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20, 182–196.

Banks, G.C. & McDaniel, M.A. (2011). The kryptonite of evidence-based I-O psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4(1), 40–44.

Barmeyer, C.I. (2004). Learning styles and their impact on cross-cultural training: An international comparison in France, Germany and Quebec. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(6), 577–594.

BarNir, A., Watson, W.E., & Hutchins, H.M. (2011). Mediation and moderated mediation in the relationship among role models, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial career intention, and gender. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(2), 270–297.

*Basu, A. (2010). Comparing entrepreneurial intentions among students: The role of education and ethnic origin. *AIMS International Journal of Management*, 4(3), 163–176.

Béchard, J.P. & Grégoire, D. (2005). Entrepreneurship education research revisited: The case of higher education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(1), 22–43.

Becker, G.S. (1964). *Human capital*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, G.S. (1975). *Human capital* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

*Bhandari, N.C. (2006). Intention for entrepreneurship among students in India. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 15(2), 169–179.

Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442–453.

Bloom, K.C. & Shuell, T.J. (1981). Effects of massed and distributed practice on the learning and retention of second-language vocabulary. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74, 245–248.

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L.V., Higgins, J.P.T., & Rothstein, H.R. (2009). *Introduction to meta analysis*. West Sussex, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Brewer, P. & Venaik, S. (2011). Individualism–collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(3), 436–445.

Bridge, S., O'Neill, K., & Cromie, S. (1998). *Understanding enterprise, entrepreneurship and small firms*. London: Macmillan.

Brinckmann, J., Grichnik, D., & Kapsa, D. (2010). Should entrepreneurs plan or just storm the castle? A meta-analysis on contextual factors impacting the business planning-performance relationship in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 24–40.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32–42.

*Brown, K.G., Bowlus, D., & Seibert, S. (2011). Online entrepreneurship curriculum for high school students: Impact on knowledge, self-efficacy, and attitudes. *USASBE Proceedings*, 1351–1364.

Brush, C.G. (1992). Research on women business owners: Past trends, a new perspective and future directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(4), 5–30.

Busenitz, L.W. & Lau, C.M. (1996). A cross-cultural cognitive model of new venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20, 25–40.

*Byabashaija, W. & Katono, I. (2011). The impact of college entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention to start a business in Uganda. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 16(1), 127–144.

Campbell, C.A. (1992). A decision theory model for entrepreneurial acts. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 17, 21–21.

Campbell, D.T. & Fiske, D.W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81–105.

Cepeda, N.J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J.T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 354–380.

Charney, A. & Libecap, G. (2000). *Impact of entrepreneurship education*. Kansas City, MO: Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.

Chen, C.C., Greene, P.G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(4), 295–316.

*Chen, Y. (2010). *Does entrepreneurship education matter to students' entrepreneurial intention? A Chinese perspective*. Paper presented at second International Conference on Information Science and Engineering. China, December 4–6.

Chiang, C.-W. & Tomimatsu, K. (2011). Interaction design teaching method design. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 6761, 45–53.

Chowdhury, S. & Endres, M.L. (2005). Gender difference and the formation of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Entrepreneurship in a Diverse World, 8.

Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A., & LePine, J.A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 909–927.

Cousins, S. (1989). Culture and selfhood in Japan and the US. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(January), 124–131.

Cox, L.W., Mueller, S.L., & Moss, S.E. (2002). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1(2), 229–245.

*Crant, J.M. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34(3), 42–49.

Davidsson, P. (1995). *Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions*. Working paper. Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.

Davidsson, P. & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(3), 301–331.

*De Clercq, D., Honig, B., & Martin, B. (2013). The roles of learning orientation and passion for work in the formation of entrepreneurial intention. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(6), 652–676.

*De Jorge-Moreno, J., Castillo, L.L., & Triguero, M.S. (2012). The effect of business and economics education programs on students' entrepreneurial intention. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(4), 409–425.

De Noble, A.F., Jung, D., & Ehrlich, S.B. (1999). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: The development of a measure and its relationship to entrepreneurial action. In P. Reynolds, W. Bygrave, S. Manigart, C. Mason, G. Meyer, H. Sapienza, & K. Shaver (Eds.), *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research* (pp. 73–87). Wellesley, MA: Babson College.

Dickersin, K. (2005). Recognizing the problem, understanding its origins and scope, and preventing harm. In H.R. Rothstein & A.J. Sutton (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta analysis: Prevention, assessment and adjustments* (pp. 11–34). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley.

Dickson, P.H., Solomon, G.T., & Weaver, K.M. (2008). Entrepreneurial selection and success: Does education matter? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(2), 239–258.

*Do Paço, A.M.F., Ferreira, J.M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R.G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviours and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 20–38.

*Dohse, D. & Walter, S.G. (2010). *The role of entrepreneurship education and regional context in forming entrepreneurial intentions*. Working paper. Barcelona, Spain: Institut d'Economia de Barcelona (IEB).

Douglas, E.J. (2013). Reconstructing entrepreneurial intentions to identify predisposition for growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(5), 633–651.

*Douglas, E.J. & Shepherd, D.A. (2002). Self-employment as a career choice: Attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(3), 81–90.

Dunn, T. & Holtz-Eakin, D. (2000). *Financial capital, human capital, and the transition to self-employment: Evidence from intergenerational links*. NBER Working Paper No. 5622. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

*Ekpe, I. & Mat, N. (2012). The moderating effect of social environment on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and entrepreneurial intentions of female students at Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, 1(4), 1–16.

Elfenbein, D.W., Hamilton, B.H., & Zenger, T.R. (2010). The small firm effect and the entrepreneurial spawning of scientists and engineers. *Management Science*, 56(4), 659–681.

Emrich, C., Denmark, F., & Den Hartog, D. (2004). Cross-cultural differences in gender egalitarianism. In R. House, P. Hanges, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 343–394). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

*Ertuna, Z.I. & Gurel, E. (2011). The moderating role of higher education on entrepreneurship. *Education + Training*, 53(5), 387–402.

*Evans, T. (2009). *The psychology of entrepreneurial intention in black adolescents: Racial identity, role models and self-efficacy*. San Francisco: Alliant International University, California School of Professional Psychology.

Fairlie, R.W. (2002). Drug dealing and legitimate self-employment. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20(3), 538–567.

Falck, O., Heblich, S., & Luedemann, E. (2012). Identity and entrepreneurship: Do school peers shape entrepreneurial intentions? *Small Business Economics*, 39(1), 39–59.

Falck, O. & Woessmann, L. (2013). School competition and students' entrepreneurial intentions: International evidence using historical Catholic roots of private schooling. *Small Business Economics*, 40(2), 459–478.

*Farrington, S.M., Venter, D.J.L., & Louw, M.J. (2012). Entrepreneurial intentions: Demographic perspectives of South African business students. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 43(3), 41–49.

*Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006a). Effect and counter-effect of entrepreneurship education and social context on student's intentions. *Estudios De Economia Aplicada*, 24(2), 509–523.

*Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006b). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: A new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701–720.

Fitzsimmons, J.R. & Douglas, E.J. (2011). Interaction between feasibility and desirability in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(4), 431–440.

*Florin, J., Karri, R., & Rossiter, N. (2007). Fostering entrepreneurial diversity in business education: An attitudinal approach. *Journal of Management Education*, 31(1), 17–42.

*Franco, M., Haase, H., & Lautenschläger, A. (2010). Students' entrepreneurial intentions: An interregional comparison. *Education + Training*, 52(4), 260–275.

*Franke, N. & Lüthje, C. (2004). Entrepreneurial intentions of business students—A benchmarking study. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 1(03), 269–288.

Frenzel, A.C., Goetz, T., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Sutton, R.E. (2009). Emotional transmission in the classroom: Exploring the relationship between teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 705–716.

Frese, M., Bausch, A., Schmidt, P., Strauch, A., & Kabst, R. (2012). Evidence-based entrepreneurship: Cumulative science, action principles, and bridging the gap between science and practice. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 1–62.

Garavan, T.N. & O'Cinneide, B. (1994). Entrepreneurship education and training programmes: A review and evaluation—Part 1. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 18(8), 3–12.

*Gerba, D.T. (2012). Impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions of business and engineering students in Ethiopia. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 3(2), 258–277.

Geyskens, I., Krishnan, R., Steenkamp, J.B.E., & Cunha, P.V. (2009). A review and evaluation of meta-analytic practices in management research. *Journal of Management*, 35, 393–419.

*Göksel, A. & Aydintan, B. (2011). Gender, business education, family background and personal traits: A multi dimensional analysis of their affects on entrepreneurial propensity: Findings from Turkey. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(13), 35–48.

Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., & King, W. (1997). Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: A ten-year literature review. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 56–77.

Grey, C. (2002). What are business schools for? On silence and voice in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 26(5), 496–511.

*Hamidi, D.Y., Wennberg, K., & Berglund, H. (2008). Creativity in entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(2), 304–320.

Hanges, P.J. & Dickson, M.W. (2004). The development and validation of the GLOBE culture and leadership scales. In R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Cultures, leadership and organizations: A 62 nation GLOBE study* (pp. 122–151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Hanke, R., Kisenwether, E., & Warren, A. (2005). A scalable problem-based learning system for entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2005, E1–E6.

*Hassan, R.A. & Wafa, S.A. (2012). Predictors towards entrepreneurial intention: A Malaysian case study. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 1(11), 1–10.

Haus, I., Steinmetz, H., Isidor, R., & Kabst, R. (2013). Gender effects on entrepreneurial intention: A meta-analytical structural equation model. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 130–156.

Higgins, J.P., Thompson, S.G., Deeks, J.J., & Altman, D.G. (2003). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *British Medical Journal*, 327, 557–560.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. London: Sage.

Hofstede, G.H. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(3), 301–320.

Hofstede, G.H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Holtbrügge, D. & Mohr, A.T. (2010). Cultural determinants of learning style preferences. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 9(4), 622–637.

Honig, B. (2004). Entrepreneurship education: Toward a model of contingency-based business planning. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(3), 258–273.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hout, M. & Rosen, H.S. (1999). *Self-employment, family background, and race*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

*Huber, L.R., Sloof, R., & Van Praag, M. (2012). *The effect of early entrepreneurship education: Evidence from a randomized field experiment*. Tinbergen Institute. IZA Discussion Paper, April. Bonn: IZA.

Hunter, J.E. & Schmidt, F.L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hunter, J.E. & Schmidt, F.L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

*Ismail, M., Khalid, S.A., Othman, M., Jusoff, H.K., Rahman, N.A., Kassim, K.M., et al. (2009). Entrepreneurial intention among Malaysian undergraduates. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10), 54–60.

Jamieson, I. (1984). Schools and enterprise. *Education for Enterprise*, 1(1), 7–18.

Javidan, M., House, R.J., & Dorfman, P.W. (2004). A nontechnical summary of GLOBE findings. In R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Cultures, leadership and organizations: A 62 nation GLOBE study* (pp. 29–48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Joy, S. & Kolb, D.A. (2009). Are there cultural differences in learning style? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(1), 69–85.

*Karimi, S., Biemans, H., Lans, T., Mulder, M., & Chizari, M. (2012). The role of entrepreneurship education in developing students' entrepreneurial intentions. Available at SSRN 2152944.

Katz, J.A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education: 1876–1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283–300.

*Keat, O.Y., Selvarajah, C., & Meyer, D. (2011). Inclination towards entrepreneurship among university students: An empirical study of Malaysian university students. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(4), 206–220.

Kepes, S., Banks, G.C., McDaniel, M., & Whetzel, D.L. (2012). Publication bias in the organizational sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15, 624–662.

Kolvereid, L. (1996a). Organizational employment versus self-employment: Reasons for career choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20(3), 23–31.

Kolvereid, L. (1996b). Prediction of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 21(1), 47–56.

*Kolvereid, L. & Moen, Ø. (1997). Entrepreneurship among business graduates: Does a major in entrepreneurship make a difference? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 21(4), 154–160.

Krueger, N.F. & Brazeal, D.V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18, 91–104.

Krueger, N.F., Reilly, M.D., & Carsrud, A.L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5), 411–432.

Kuratko, D.F. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577–598.

*Lanero, A., Vázquez, J.L., Gutiérrez, P., & García, M.P. (2011). The impact of entrepreneurship education in European universities: An intention-based approach analyzed in the Spanish area. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 8(2), 111–130.

*Lans, T., Gulikers, J., & Batterink, M. (2010). Moving beyond traditional measures of entrepreneurial intentions in a study among life-sciences students in the Netherlands. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(3), 259–274.

Laspita, S., Breugst, N., Hebllich, S., & Patzelt, H. (2012). Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27, 414–435.

Lee, L., Wong, P.K., Foo, M.D., & Leung, A. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions: The influence of organizational and individual factors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 124–136.

*Lee, S.M., Chang, D., & Lim, S.-B. (2005). Impact of entrepreneurship education: A comparative study of the U.S. and Korea. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1, 27–43.

*Lee, S.M., Lim, S.-B., Pathak, R.D., Chang, D., Li, W. (2006). Influences on students attitudes toward entrepreneurship: A multi-country study. *Entrepreneurship Management*, 2, 351–366.

*Lee, W.N., Lim, B.P., Lim, L.Y., Ng, H.S., & Wong, J.L. (2012). *Entrepreneurial intention: A study among students of higher learning institution*. UTAR. Available at <http://eprints.utar.edu.my/691/>, accessed 15 January 2014.

Lentz, B.F. & Laband, D.N. (1990). Entrepreneurial success and occupational inheritance among proprietors. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 23(3), 563–579.

*Liñán, F. (2004). Intention-based models of entrepreneurship education. *Piccola Impresa/Small Business*, 3, 11–35.

Liñán, F. (2007). The role of entrepreneurship education in the entrepreneurial process. In A. Fayolle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education* (pp. 230–247). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Liñán, F. (2008). Skill and value perceptions: How do they affect entrepreneurial intentions? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4(3), 257–272.

Liñán, F. & Chen, Y.W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593–617.

Liñán, F. & Chen, Y.-W. (2006). Testing the entrepreneurial intention model on a two-country sample. Working paper. Barcelona, Spain: University of Barcelona.

Lipsey, M.W. & Wilson, D.B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

*Lorz, M., Volery, T., & Müller, C.A. (2011). *The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intention*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of St. Gallen.

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(2), 135–147.

*Malebana, M.J. (2012). *Entrepreneurial intent of final-year commerce students in the rural provinces of South Africa*. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa.

Manikutty, S., Anuradha, N.S., & Hansen, K. (2007). Does culture influence learning styles in higher education? *International Journal of Learning and Change*, 2(1), 70–87.

Mark, M.M., Donaldson, S.I., & Campbell, B. (2011). *Social psychology and program/policy evaluation*. New York: Guilford.

*Marques, C.S., Ferreira, J.J., Gomes, D.N., & Rodrigues, R.G. (2012). Entrepreneurship education: How psychological, demographic and behavioural factors predict the entrepreneurial intention. *Education + Training*, 54(8/9), 657–672.

Martin, B.C., McNally, J.J., & Kay, M.J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28, 211–224.

McDaniel, M.A., Rothstein, H.R., & Whetzel, D.L. (2006). Publication bias: A case study of four test vendors. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 927–953.

McGee, J.E., Peterson, M., Mueller, S.L., & Sequeira, J.M. (2009). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: Refining the measure. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(4), 965–988.

McGraw, K.O. & Wong, S.P. (1996). Forming inferences about some intraclass correlation coefficients. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 30–46.

McMullan, W. & Long, W.A. (1987). Entrepreneurship education in the nineties. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2(3), 261–275.

*McStay, D. (2008). *An investigation of undergraduate student self-employment intention and the impact of entrepreneurship education and previous entrepreneurial experience*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Business, Bond University, Australia.

*Miller, B.K., Bell, J.D., Palmer, M., & Gonzalez, A. (2009). Predictors of entrepreneurial intentions: A quasi-experiment comparing students enrolled in introductory management and entrepreneurship classes. *Journal of Businesses and Entrepreneurship*, 21(2), 39–62.

Minniti, M. & Bygrave, W. (2001). A dynamic model of entrepreneurial learning. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(3), 5–16.

Mitchell, R.K., Smith, B., Seawright, K.W., & Morse, E.A. (2000). Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 974–993.

*Mo, H. (2011). A research on entrepreneurial education affects entrepreneurial intention. *The Modern Education Journal*, 5, 7–11.

*Moberg, K. (2012). The impact of entrepreneurship education and project-based education on students' personal development and entrepreneurial intentions at the lower levels of the educational system: Too much of two good things? Available at SSRN 2147622.

*Mohamed, Z., Rezai, G., Shamsudin, M.N., & Mahmud, M.M. (2012). Enhancing young graduates' intention towards entrepreneurship development in Malaysia. *Education + Training*, 54(7), 605–618.

*Moi, T., Adeline, Y.L., Dyana, M.L. (2011). Young adult responses to entrepreneurial intent. *Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce*, 2(3), 37–52.

Morgeson, F.P., Campion, M.A., Dipboye, R.L., Hollenbeck, J.R., Murphy, K., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Reconsidering the use of personality tests in personnel selection contexts. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 683–729.

*Muofhe, N.J. & du Toit, W.F. (2011). Entrepreneurial education's and entrepreneurial role models' influence on career choice. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(1), 243–257.

Mwasalwiba, E.S. (2010). Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. *Education + Training*, 52(1), 20–47.

Newman, K.L. & Nollen, S.D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(4), 753–779.

*Noel, T.W. (2002). Effects of entrepreneurial education on intent to open a business: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 5, 3–13.

*Olomi, D.R. & Sinyamule, R.S. (2009). Entrepreneurial inclinations of vocational education students: A comparative study of male and female trainees in Iringa region, Tanzania. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 17(1), 103–125.

*Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442–454.

Pekrun, R. (2000). A social-cognitive, control-value theory of achievement emotions. *Advances in Psychology*, 131, 143–163.

Pittaway, L. & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479–510.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879–903.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–569.

*Pruett, M. (2012). Entrepreneurship education: Workshops and entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Education for Business*, 87, 94–101.

*Radu, M. & Loué, C. (2008). Motivational impact of role models as moderated by ideal vs. ought self-guides identifications. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 16(4), 441–465.

*Raposo, M.L.B., Ferreira, J.J.M., do Paço, A.M.F., & Rodrigues, R.J.G. (2008). Propensity to firm creation: Empirical research using structural equations. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4(4), 485–504.

Rasmussen, E. & Sørheim, R. (2006). Action-based entrepreneurship education. *Technovation*, 26(2), 185–194.

Rauch, A. & Frese, M. (2006). Meta-analysis as a tool for developing entrepreneurship research and theory. In J. Wiklund, D. Dimov, J.A. Katz, & D. Shephard (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship: Frameworks and empirical investigations from forthcoming leaders of European research. Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth* (pp. 29–51). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

*Rodrigues, R.G., Dinis, A., do Paço, A., Ferreira, J., & Raposo, M. (2012). The effect of an entrepreneurial training programme on entrepreneurial traits and intention of secondary students. In T. Burger-Helmche (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship—Born, made and educated* (pp. 77–92). Rijeka, Croatia: InTech.

*Romero, I., Petrescu, R.M., & Balalia, A.E. (2011). Universities as suppliers of entrepreneurship education services. The cases of the university of Seville and the academy of economic studies in Bucharest. *The Knowledge Based Economy: Implications for Higher Education in Economics and Business*, 8(30), 347–361.

Rothstein, H.R., Sutton, A.J., & Borenstein, M. (2005). Publication bias in meta-analysis. In H.R. Rothstein, A.J. Sutton, & M. Borenstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis: Prevention, assessment and adjustments* (pp. 1–7). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley.

*Sánchez, J.C. (2011). University training for entrepreneurial competencies: Its impact on intention of venture creation. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(2), 239–254.

*Sandhu, M.S., Jain, K.K., & Yusof, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial inclination of students at a private university in Malaysia. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 13(1), 61–72.

Scherer, R.F., Brodzinski, J.D., & Wiebe, F.A. (1990). Entrepreneur career selection and gender: A socialization approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 28(2), 37–44.

*Schwarz, E.J., Wdowiak, M.A., Almer-Jarz, D.A., & Breitenecker, R.J. (2009). The effects of attitudes and perceived environment conditions on students' entrepreneurial intent: An Austrian perspective. *Education + Training*, 51(4), 272–291.

Scott, M.G. & Twomey, D.F. (1988). The long-term supply of entrepreneurs: Students' career aspirations in relation to entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 26(4), 5–13.

Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Segal, G., Schoenfeld, J., & Borgia, D. (2007). Using social cognitive career theory to enhance students' entrepreneurial interests and goals. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 13, 69–73.

Sexton, D.L. & Bowman-Upton, N. (1990). Female and male entrepreneurs: Psychological characteristics and their role in gender-related discrimination. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5(1), 29–36.

Shapero, A. (1982). Social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In C. Kent, D. Sexton, & K. Vesper (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 72–90). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

*Shariff, A.M., Hasan, N.F.H.N., Mohamad, Z., & Jusoff, K. (2010). The relationship between active teaching and learning with graduate's entrepreneurial intention and interest. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(1), 283–294.

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention–behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 1–36.

Shinnar, R.S., Giacomin, O., & Janssen, F. (2012). Entrepreneurial perceptions and intentions: The role of gender and culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 465–493.

Shrout, P.E. & Fleiss, J.L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 420–428.

Singelis, T. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(October), 580–591.

Slavtchev, V., Laspić, S., & Patzelt, H. (2012). Effects of entrepreneurship education at universities. *Jena Economic Research Papers*, 25, 1–33.

*Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 566–591.

Steel, P.D. & Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D. (2002). Comparing meta-analytic moderator estimation techniques under realistic conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 96–111.

Stumpf, S.A., Brief, A.P., & Hartman, K. (1987). Self-efficacy expectations and coping with career-related events. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(1), 91–108.

*Turker, D. & Selcuk, S.S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(2), 142–159.

*Uddin, M.R. & Bose, T.K. (2012). Determinants of entrepreneurial intention of business students in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(24), 128–137.

Unger, J.M., Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Rosenbusch, N. (2011). Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(3), 341–358.

*Varamäki, E., Tornikoski, E., Viljamaa, A., & Ristimäki, K. (n.d.). *Entrepreneurial intentions of higher education students in Finland—A longitudinal study*. Working Paper.

Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D.S. (1995). Theory testing: Combining psychometric meta-analysis and structural equations modeling. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 865–885.

*von Graevenitz, G., Harhoff, D., & Weber, R. (2010). The effects of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 76(1), 90–112.

*Wang, C.K., Wong, P.K., & Lu, Q. (2001). *Entrepreneurial intentions and tertiary education*. Paper presented at the Conference on Technological Entrepreneurship in the Emerging Regions of the New Millennium, Singapore, June.

Wang, C.K., Wong, P.K., & Lu, Q. (2002). Tertiary education and entrepreneurial intentions. In P. Phan (Ed.), *Technological entrepreneurship* (pp. 55–82). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Weber, R. (2011). *Evaluating entrepreneurship education*. Munich: Springer.

Whitener, E.M. (1990). Confusion of confidence intervals and credibility intervals in meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 315–321.

Williams, C.M. & Subich, L.M. (2006). The gendered nature of career related learning experiences: A social cognitive career theory perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(2), 262–275.

*Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 387–406.

Wilson, F., Kickul, J., Marlino, D., Barbosa, S.D., & Griffiths, M.D. (2009). An analysis of the role of gender and self-efficacy in developing female entrepreneurial interest and behavior. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 14(2), 105–119.

*Wu, S. & Wu, L. (2008). The impact of higher education on entrepreneurial intentions of university students in China. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(4), 752–774.

Youndt, M.A., Subramaniam, M., & Snell, S.A. (2004). Intellectual capital profiles: An examination of investment and returns. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(2), 335–361.

Zellweger, T., Sieger, P., & Halter, F. (2011). Should I stay or should I go? Career choice intentions of students with family business background. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(5), 521–536.

*Zhang, G., Cheng, P., Fan, L., & Chu, Z. (2012). An empirical study on impact of college carve-out education on entrepreneur intention. Available at SSRN <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2034168> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2034168>, accessed June 2012.

*Zhao, H., Seibert, S.E., & Hills, G.E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1265–1272.

Tae Jun Bae is a PhD candidate in the College of Business, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA.

Shanshan Qian is a PhD candidate in the College of Business, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA.

Chao Miao is a PhD student in the School of Business, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284, USA.

James O. Fiet is a Professor, Brown Forman Chair in Entrepreneurship, College of Business, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA.

We thank Professor Michael Frese, the special issue editor, and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback to improve this paper. We are also thankful to Professor David Dubofsky for his helpful comments.