

**ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE LEARNING
AREA OF CURRICULUM 2005 AND
ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION**

Ingrid le Roux

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MPHIL in Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management**

**Faculty of Economic and Management Science
University of Pretoria**

**Study Leader: Dr. M. Pretorius
Date submitted: 10 October 2003**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to whom I owe a debt for their assistance in the preparation of this paper.

- I would like to thank Dr. Marius Pretorius for his patience, calm and helpful attitude that guided supported and encouraged me in completion of this script.
- I would like to thank all respondents for the completed questionnaires and Mrs. Elana Mauer and Mr Sollie Millard from the Department of Statistics at the University of Pretoria for assisting in the data processing and analysis.
- To my mother who always believed in me and for her loyal support.
- A final thanks to my family Lourens, Gerhard and Heinrich for giving me the time, freedom and support necessary to complete this paper.

DECLARATION

I, Ingrid le Roux, declare that this dissertation is my own work, unless otherwise indicated. It is being submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree: **Master of Philosophy in Entrepreneurship and Small Business management – University of Pretoria. Furthermore, I declare that it has not been previously submitted to any other Institute or University.**

.....

Ingrid le Roux

.....

Date

ABSTRACT

This study focus on the Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO), Education and Economic and Management Science learning area of curriculum 2005 constructs in order to determine whether EMS education can impact on the entrepreneurial orientation of learners. A brief overview is given to see how the EO construct has been described in academic literature at firm level as well as societal level.

Entrepreneurship and education in schools are discussed with emphasis on what has been reported in the literature. Problems to make comparisons between countries are looked at and why it is important to have entrepreneurial education.

A comparison is made between the enterprising skills, behaviour and attitudes mentioned by Gibb and the five dimensions of EO to determine common ground in teaching for EO.

EO and education is also discussed. Education is seen as the independent variable to improve learners performance because it reaches the youth for many years and a tool to develop EO through a curriculum. The implicit role of culture is referred to and EO is seen as the mediator between the national culture and entrepreneurship.

An attempt is made to develop an understanding of what should be included in EO learning mode to effectively convey the EO dimensions to the learner. Comparisons of the creative steps of Driver, knowledge skills of Fayolle and the business mode of Gibb were compared to teaching for the EO dimensions.

Finally the results of an empirical study that was done to determine if the EO of learners that went through the EMS learning area of curriculum 2005 from grade 7-9 did change compared to a control group that did not go through the EMS learning area of curriculum 2005 from grade 7-9. The results reported that innovativeness and risk taking are affected by the EMS learning area of curriculum 2005.

TABLE OF CONTENT		
CHAPTER	CONTENTS	PAGE
1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	i
2	ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER 1		
1. INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE		
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Background to study.....	1
1.3	Literature	3
1.3.1	Nature of entrepreneurial orientation	4
1.3.1.1	Autonomy	5
1.3.1.2	Risk-taking	6
1.3.1.3	Proactiveness	6
1.3.1.4	Innovativeness	7
1.3.1.5	Competitive aggressiveness	7
1.3.1.6	Critical thinking	8
1.3.2	Entrepreneurship and Education.....	9
1.3.3	Goals for teaching entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial orientation - finding common ground	10
1.3.4	Entrepreneurial orientation and education	14
1.3.5	EO learning mode	15
1.4	Conclusion	19
CHAPTER 2		
2. PROBLEM STATEMENT, HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH		
METHODOLOGY		
2.1	Introduction	20
2.2	Problem statement	20
2.3	Hypothesis statements	21
2.4	Research methodology, data collection and analysis	22
2.4.1	Research methodology	22
2.4.2	Data and sample decision	23

2.4.2.1	Data required	23
2.4.2.2	Method of data collection	24
2.4.3	Data analysis	26
2.4.4	Factor analysis	28
2.4.5	Variance analysis	29
2.5	Objectives and contribution of the research	29
2.5.1	Objectives	29
2.5.2	Contribution of the research	30

CHAPTER 3

3. FINDINGS

3.1	Introduction	31
3.2	Descriptive data of part 1	31
3.3	Demographic information of part 2	32
3.3.1	Grade	33
3.3.2	Gender	33
3.3.3	Language	34
3.3.4	School	34
3.4	Factor analysis	35
3.5	Analysis of variance	38
3.5.1	Innovativeness	38
3.5.2	Risk-taking	39

CHAPTER 4

4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1	Discussion	42
4.1.1	Innovativeness.....	43
4.1.2	Risk-taking	43
4.2	Conclusions	44
4.3	Shortcomings of this study	46
4.4	Recommendations.....	46

REFERENCES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Table 1.1	Comparison of the enterprising skills, behaviour and attitudes from Gibb (1993:14) with the EO dimensions of Lumpkin and Dess (1996:137) – own compilation	13
Table 1.2	Comparison between EO dimension of Lumpkin and Dess (1996:137) and the small business learning mode model of Gibb (1993:19) – own compilation	16
Table 1.3	The proposed pedagogical requirements to impact on EO – own compilation based on Fayolle (1998)	17
Table 1.4	Comparison between Lumpkin and Dess’s EO (1996:137) and Driver’s Creative Steps (2001: 2 – Own Compilation	18
Table 3.1	Grade distribution of the sample	33
Table 3.2	Gender distribution of the sample	33
Table 3.3	Language distribution of the sample	34
Table 3.4	Schools distribution of the sample	34
Table 3.5	Eigenvalues–explained variance in three factor solutions	36
Table 3.6	Rotated factor loading	36
Table 3.7	Factors and Variables contributing to each variable	36
Table 3.8	Variance Analysis results for Factor 1 – Innovativeness	35
Table 3.9	Details for factors of the variance analysis of innovativeness	36
Table 3.10	Schools differences for innovativeness	39
Table 3.11	Variance Analysis results for Factor 2 – Risk Taking	39
Table 3.12	Details for factors of the variance analysis of risk taking	40
Table 3.13	Grade differences between grades for risk taking	40
Table 3.14	Language differences between grades for risk taking	40
Table 3.15	Differences between schools for risk taking	41

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Figure 1.1	Model to depicting the relationship as it relates to entrepreneurship and global competitiveness (Lee and Peterson 2000: 410 with added constructs for education and critical thinking)	9
Figure 3.1	EO dimensions in the EMS learning area of C2005	31
Figure 3.2	Visual presentation of the coverage for the entrepreneurial orientation criteria in the EMS learning area of curriculum 2005.	32