

Mental Triggers and Youth Entrepreneurship in South Africa and Uganda: A Conceptual Overview

Ignatius Odongo

ABSTRACT

This review explores and identifies mental triggers that influence youth to pursue entrepreneurship in South Africa and Uganda. These triggers have been grouped into three categories: the environment, entrepreneurship education and personal characteristics. Triggering factors and some salient features under these three categories have been explored and highlighted. Nevertheless, several gaps have been identified, particularly pertaining to how these mental triggers, individually or in conjunction, produce a series of entrepreneurial milestones among young people in South Africa and Uganda. These countries have struggled to scale up youth entrepreneurship despite putting in place elaborate legislative, institutional and strategic frameworks. The reasons put forth to explain this phenomenon include; economic structures, negative mind-sets and poor attitudes of the youth. It is believed that unpacking how mental triggers actually transform young people into successful entrepreneurs, will equip stakeholders responsible for youth entrepreneurship to positively influence mind-sets, decisions and the actions of young people, through creation of environments that promote triggering factors. This will ultimately result in a critical mass of aspiring youth turning into successful entrepreneurs.

Keywords: *mental triggers, entrepreneurship, youth entrepreneurship, environment, entrepreneurship education, personal characteristics*

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of mental triggers is believed to have its roots in mental health, particularly in the psychology of traumatic stress reactions where it is understood to be “events” that remind victims of their past traumatic experiences (Royle, 2012). Sato, Drennan and Lings, (2017) opine that mental triggers are antecedents to help-seeking behaviour in instances where external influences like peers or family encourage a person to identify their needs and subsequently seek necessary help. According to Clapp-Smith and Wernsing (2014), a transformational learning process is triggered by international “experiences” that people get exposed to when they travel abroad. These new “experiences” challenge their beliefs and assumptions about life and work, hence, making them acquire a new frame of reference from which they construct new meanings (Clapp-Smith and Wernsing, 2014). From a marketing standpoint, Roos and Gustafsson (2011) suggest that “triggers” are “events” that incite customers’ cognitive processes

Ignatius Odongo is a Doctor of Philosophy Candidate in Youth Entrepreneurship at the Graduate School of Management, Monarch University, Zug, Switzerland. He works as a strategy consultant at Pretoria, South Africa. E-mail: ignatius.odongo@strategicanalyticsmx.co.za

to switch brands. These triggers have been categorised into; reactional, situational and influential triggers, which induce a deliberate and conscious process of switching brands (Roos and Gustafsson, 2011). Perhaps a more relevant rendition of “triggers” is that of Teitelbaum (2002) who uses the word “triggering” to explain how athletes get spurred to success by envisioning themselves standing on the medal podium. Teitelbaum (2002) defines triggers as “things” or “events” that “redefine your life, be tremendously exciting or increase your self-image”. Other than in sports, Teitelbaum (2002) claims that triggering is a technique that has been effectively used by executives, sales persons, and leading advisors to guide people towards successful outcomes. From an entrepreneurship perspective, Morrison (2000) argues that entrepreneurship lies deep inside individual members of society, in their very spirits, akin to some form of mental programming which is triggered by the environment.

Irrespective of the perspective or discipline from which “mental triggers” are conceived, they can be perceived as events, experiences, occurrences, things, or circumstances that are external or internal to one’s environment, which condition one’s mind to take certain actions. Building on the phenomenon of mental triggers, this conceptual work utilises meta-synthesis of extant literature to deepen understanding of how mental triggers influence youth to pursue entrepreneurship (Sandelowski, Docherty, and Emden, 1997). This understanding is critical in that it will clarify the decision-making and subsequent processes that are involved in the choice and pursuit of entrepreneurship as a career (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990).

Before delving into the influence of mental triggers, it is important to appreciate why there is an increased focus on youth entrepreneurship, particularly from developing countries.

Youth Entrepreneurship

The discourse on youth entrepreneurship has been precipitated by a number of factors, including: the realisation that youth are a source of sustainable labour supply (Adewale, 2009); recognition of their innovative capabilities (Bettina, Nienstedt, Proner, Yalazi, and Mauch, 2012); as a major economic force for the future (Gatune and Najam, 2011); and as a means of integrating youth into economic environment to alleviate unemployment, underemployment and poverty (Beeka and Rimmington, 2011). Noteworthy is the seminal work of Francis Chigunta, who pioneered the categorisation of youth entrepreneurship, into three main groupings that correspond to three types of youth entrepreneurs: pre-entrepreneurs, budding entrepreneurs, and emergent entrepreneurs (Chigunta, 2002). Pre-entrepreneurs are those within the age of 15-19 years, teenagers. This group are novices that have none or very limited experience in business ownership. They often live at home or are still in school, while some are working part time. They tend to experiment with various activities before setting up their own businesses. Budding entrepreneurs are young adults who are in their mid-20s. Unlike the pre-entrepreneurs, this category of youth entrepreneurs has acquired

some business experience, skills and capital to start or run their own businesses. The last category is the emergent entrepreneurs, who are in their late 20s (from 26 to 29 years). Categorising youth entrepreneurship in this manner facilitates a deeper understanding of how youth progress into entrepreneurship, and guides policy decisions towards sustainable youth entrepreneurship programmes. To shed light on what a youth entrepreneur is, this study adopts the perspective of Oseifuah (2010) who believes that a youth entrepreneur is a young person aged between 15 and 35 years, who recognises and exploits an opportunity to create value or wealth in an existing or new enterprise, irrespective of the sector.

With jobs becoming less and scarce, there is greater likelihood that youth will be three and a half times more likely than adults to be unemployed, thus making youth entrepreneurship an important strategy for integrating youth into the labour markets and the economy (Schoof, 2006). Youth that engage in self-employment and entrepreneurship are better positioned to increase their self-esteem and confidence, which enables them to exercise greater control over their lives in social and economic spheres (Ndedi, 2013). Indeed, developing the entrepreneurial capacity of young people in Africa, is said to be key to turning the continent into a powerful economic force (Gatune and Najam, 2011). Similarly, youth entrepreneurship is believed to offer an indigenous solution to the economically disadvantaged, helping them to improve their economic wellbeing and livelihood (Capelleras, Mole, Greene and Storey, 2008; De Clercq and Honig, 2011). Since 2000, the role of youth in economic development was deemed so important that the millennium development goal (MDG) number 16 was devoted to developing and implementing strategies for decent and productive work for youth (Adewale, 2009).

That notwithstanding, youth entrepreneurship poses additional challenges unlike other kinds of entrepreneurship. Although young people may be amenable to self-employment, they have limited access to resources and have inadequate life and work experience (Schoof, 2006). It is said that youths suffer from local perceptions that they should not run their own businesses; they lack information, knowledge, appropriate premises, and confidence; and they do not have adequate support networks (Khumalo and Mutobola, 2014). Because of these and other limitations, young people are more likely to face greater risks and barriers to entrepreneurship than adults (Schoof, 2006). In addition, African youths, like their counterparts in other developing countries, tend to choose entrepreneurship or self-employment out of necessity or as a last resort, rather than being attracted by potentially viable opportunities; they would rather prefer formal employment (Okojie, 2003). This is believed to constitute an unhealthy entrepreneurial culture, which is not likely to lead to successful outcomes (Khumalo and Mutobola, 2014). To respond to the challenges of youth entrepreneurship, several countries have developed what they believe to be supportive legislative frameworks and programmes that seek to create an environment where youth entrepreneurs can thrive. This study focuses on South Africa and Uganda.

Youth Entrepreneurship in South Africa

The South African government has put in place elaborate legislative, institutional, strategic and programmatic frameworks to promote youth entrepreneurship and development. These interventions are summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1: *Interventions to Promote Youth Entrepreneurship and Development in South Africa*

Interventions	Some of the Instruments Put in Place
Legislative Frameworks (laws and policies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) · The National Youth Development Agency Act (2008) · The Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act (2003) · Skills Development Act of 1998 (as amended) · The National Youth Policy (2015-2020) · The National Youth Service Development Policy (2002)
Plans/Strategic Documents/Programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Development Plan and the Vision 2030 · The New Growth Plan (2011) · The Department of Trade and Industry Policy Action Plan · The Youth Employment Accord (2013) · The Skills Accord (2011) · Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) Strategy · Integrated Strategy on the Promotion of Entrepreneurship and Small Enterprises
Institutional Frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Youth Development Agency (NYDA) · Training and Development Practices Sector Education and Training Authority (ETDP SETA) · 21 Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs) · The National Advisory Council on Innovation (NACI) · Technology Innovation Agency (TIA)
Funding Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Khula Enterprise Finance· The Apex Fund · The Youth Empowerment Fund · Innovation Fund

Source: Adapted from NYDA (2014) and RSA (2015)

Despite all the efforts outlined in Table 1, the Government of South Africa acknowledges that youth entrepreneurship has not thrived as expected (RSA, 2015). The interventions that have been implemented to open opportunities for young people have not yielded desired results (Maluleke, 2016). Marcelle (2010) admit that although the South African government has put in place very sophisticated support systems for entrepreneurship, the real impact of these policies and systems in terms of small, medium and micro enterprises (SMME) development has not been realised. Undeniably, South Africa continues to perform poorly on the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) rankings. In 2009, the country was ranked 35th out of 54 GEM countries with a Total Early Stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) rate, a measure for enterprise creation, of only 5.9 per cent instead of the expected rate of 13 per cent, which is amongst the lowest in sub-Saharan Africa and the world (Cassim, Soni and Karodia, 2014).



Several reasons have been advanced to explain why youth entrepreneurship has dismally performed in South Africa. These reasons can be categorised into two; those of a structural nature, and the ones that pertain to the youth themselves. Structural reasons include: (a) failure of the mandated institutions to involve the private sector (RSA, 2015); (b) inadequate efforts of civil society to develop the youth (RSA, 2015); (c) failure of the government internship programmes to expose interns to entrepreneurial opportunities (NYDA, 2014); (d) poor entrepreneurial focus of internship and learnership programmes (Dhliwayo, 2008); (e) poor alignment of internship programmes with host organisations' human resource strategies, pointing to poor collaboration between NYDA and the employers (Co and Mitchell, 2006); and (f) uncoordinated / unstructured mentorship of interns, making it difficult to track progress and the skills that the interns are acquiring (NYDA, 2014).

Conversely, the reasons that are attributable to the youth themselves include: (a) limited appreciation of entrepreneurship as a career and employment generating venture (Dhliwayo, 2008); (b) viewing business ventures as the last resort, resulting into very few new business start-ups among graduates (Tshikovhi and Shambare, 2012); (c) the tendency or orientation towards job seeking than job creation (Louw, van Eeden, Bosch and Venter, 2003); (d) little realisation that entrepreneurs are the main vehicle for economic development (Naudé, 2010); (e) dependency on government and the private sector for jobs (Kew, 2012); and (f) choosing entrepreneurship or self-employment out of necessity rather than being attracted by potentially viable opportunities (Okojie, 2003). These reasons seem to point at negative mind-sets among South African youths which could be dampening their desire to voluntarily venture into entrepreneurship, leading to unsuccessful entrepreneurial outcomes (Khumalo and Mutobola, 2014).

Youth Entrepreneurship in Uganda

Like South Africa, the Government of Uganda (GoU) has put in place wide-ranging legislative and institutional frameworks that seek to promote youth entrepreneurship and development (GoU, 2016). These interventions are summarised in Table 2. Like South Africa, Uganda's wide-ranging legislative and institutional frameworks have not significantly improved youth entrepreneurship. Nascent youth entrepreneurs continue to suffer from low quality education, lack entrepreneurial skills, have limited access to affordable financial services, and demonstrate biased attitudes towards formal employment as opposed to entrepreneurship careers (GoU, 2016). Moreover, BTVET institutions suffer from poor collaboration with the private sector and lack resources and equipment for imparting practical and contemporary skills required by the labour market (IYF, 2011). The key sectors identified for potential youth development like agriculture, ecotourism, telecommunications, information and communication technology (ICT), and the financial and oil sectors, all require sophisticated and practical skills that most youths do not possess or have limited access to acquire these skills (IYF, 2011).

Table 2: Interventions to Promote Youth Entrepreneurship and Development in Uganda

Interventions	Some of the Instruments Put in Place
Legislative Frameworks (laws and policies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· The 1995 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda· The National Youth Council Act, Cap 319· The Local Government Act of 1997· The Business, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (BTJET) institutions Act of 2008· National Youth Council Statute 1993· The Ugandan National Youth Policy (2016)
Plans/Strategic Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· The National Development Plan 2016-2020 (NDP II)
Institutional Frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD)· 110 BTJET institutions· Uganda National and District Youth Councils
Funding Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Youth Venture Capital Fund (UYVCF)· Youth Livelihood Programme (YLP)

Source: Adapted from EPRC (2015); GoU (2016) and IYF (2011)

In 2014, Uganda was ranked the second most entrepreneurial economy after Cameroon among the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) participating countries with a TEA rate of 35.5 percent, up from a Total Early Stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) rate of 31.3 per cent in 2010 (GEM, 2014). These statistics seem to show that at least one in every three Ugandans is engaged in an entrepreneurial activity, with youth aged between 18-35 years edging the adult population (EPRC, 2015). However, these enterprising youth are not necessarily opportunity driven entrepreneurs who have sought and exploited business opportunities, but rather are entrepreneurs out of necessity due to lack of jobs (EPRC, 2015).

Evidence has shown that opportunity driven entrepreneurs are more successful than those who are driven by necessity (Cardon, Zietsma, Saporito, Matherne and Davis, 2005; Acs, 2006; Chen, Yao and Kotha, 2009; Hytti, 2010). Suffice to say, successful entrepreneurs are believed to be those who are driven by passion and opportunity (Cardon et al; 2005; Acs, 2006; Chen et al.; 2009; Hytti, 2010). Additionally, success is said to come to entrepreneurs who have the right mindsets and determination to succeed (Louw et al.; 2003; Khumalo and Mutobola, 2014). Though it would appear that several structural factors have constrained the success of youth entrepreneurship in South Africa and Uganda, one cannot underestimate the contribution of negative mindsets and lack of ambition among the youth (Tshikovhi and Shambare, 2012; Kew, 2012).

UNDERSTANDING ENTREPRENEURSHIP

As a phenomenon that evolves and changes with the development of each entrepreneur's career, theorists have found it difficult to precisely define entrepreneurship (Gartner, 1988). Nevertheless, several theories have illuminated the discourse on entrepreneurship

to the extent that it is now severally construed as an economic function (Knight, 1921 as cited by Ahmad and Hoffmann (2008); as innovation (Schumpeter, 1934, 2008); as organising (Gartner, 2001; 2008); as value creation (Bruyat and Julien, 2000); as opportunity recognition (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000); or in behavioural terms (Carland J. W., Hoy and Carland J. A., 1988). Within the entrepreneurship discourse, four theories stand out, which are of particular interest to this study. First, is the theory expounded by Joseph Alois Schumpeter where entrepreneurship was construed as innovation based on craftsmanship (Tzeng, 2009). From this perspective, an entrepreneur is seen as a visionary person who exploits affective identification and evaluation as preconditions for innovation to come up with a new or significantly improved product (good or service), process, new marketing or organisational methods in business practices, workplace organisation or external relations (Mintzberg, 1987; OECD, 1997; Tripsas and Gavetti, 2000; Stern, 2004; Kaplan and Tripsas, 2008; Tzeng, 2009;). Innovation is considered a key source of competitive advantage for firms and nations alike (Xie, Wu and Zeng, 2016).

The second theory was spearheaded by Israel Meir Kirzner, a British-born American economist, whose views were anchored on the Austrian opportunity theories where an entrepreneur is said to be someone who sees an opportunity in the market and exploits it by providing an appropriate product or service (Kirzner, 1979; 1982; 1997; Maija, Rodney and Shrader, 2012). The third theory is based on entrepreneurial intentionality built on Neoclassical theories of entrepreneurial behaviour, where it is claimed that entrepreneurial behaviours are motivated by profit seeking intentions because such people are believed to have a stable attitude towards risk and are capable of exploiting known opportunities (Endres and Woods, 2006). Neoclassic theories believe that all entrepreneurs are the same; the difference lies in their alertness and ability to recognise and exploit opportunities (Shane, 2000). Bird (1988) further elaborates on the role of intentionality toward entrepreneurship, suggesting that intentions develop from both rational and intuitive thinking, which in turn are affected by the entrepreneur's social, political, and economic context and his/her perceived history, current personality, and abilities. Building on Bird's (1988) intentionality model, Boyd and Vozikis (1994) add that individual self-efficacy explains the development of entrepreneurial intentions.

Fourth, is the effectuation theory based on the work of Saras Sarasvathy where opportunities are deemed not to be necessarily found (causation) by a prospective entrepreneur but rather are in fact created (effectuation) (Sarasvathy, 2001; 2003). The underlying belief behind "effectual logic" is that individuals are said to be the ones who make the future happen and shape the creation of firms, products, markets, services as well as ideas using the resources at their disposal. These theories are invaluable to the entrepreneurship discourse in that they facilitate a deeper understanding on how people become entrepreneurs and how they take different pathways to entrepreneurial success.

Aside from the above theoretical perspectives, Audretsch, Kuratko and Link (2015) posit that three strands provide a better understanding of entrepreneurship. The first strand is on the *status* of a firm, an individual, or team of individuals based on *a measure of organisational status*, such as self-employment, business ownership, or new-firm start-ups (Audretsch, 2012; Morris, Kuratko and Schindehutte, 2012; Parker and van Praag, 2012; Svaleryd, 2015). The second strand focuses on *behaviour* (Audretsch, et al., 2015). The unit of analysis for this strand is typically an individual or organisation (Audretsch, et al., 2015).

The main distinction between status and behaviour is that in the later view, organisational status does not bestow the classification of “entrepreneurial”. Rather, classification of being “entrepreneurial” only comes from observing or inferring a certain type of behaviour, which is defined as being entrepreneurial (Brandstetter, 1997). The behavioural view is proposed by Shane and Venkataraman (2000) who consider entrepreneurship as the discovery and exploitation of profitable opportunities. According to this definition, the discovery and exploitation of profitable opportunities revolve around the identification or creation of opportunities, evaluation of those opportunities, and ultimately commercialising or exploiting them. This view is similar to the Kirznerian perspective described above (Kirzner, 1979; 1982; 1997).

While the *status* view focuses on specific characteristics of the individual or business to classify it as being entrepreneurial, by contrast, the behavioural view is concerned exclusively with the behaviour of the decision-making entity (Naffziger, Hornsby and Kuratko, 1994; Aldrich and Martinez, 2001). Thus, this view tries to explain why some businesses or individuals engage in entrepreneurial behaviour, while others do not (Dew, Velamuri and Venkataraman, 2004). It should be emphasised that entrepreneurial behaviour is context-free; it can occur across different types of organisations, ranging from small businesses to large corporations, and even in governments.

The third strand revolves around the performance of the organisation or firm. This strand classifies a firm or organisation as being entrepreneurial based on certain performance criteria (McKelvie and Wiklund, 2010). Growth is one of such criterion (Clarysse, Bruneel and Wright, 2011). Innovation or innovative activity is another criterion for performance. The idea behind this strand is to identify factors and characteristics that lead some firms to generate stronger innovative performance than others (Kuratko, Ireland and Hornsby, 2001; Kuratko, Morris and Schindehutte, 2005; Ireland, Covin and Kuratko, 2009). The third criterion for performance is social entrepreneurship (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2006; Mair and Marti, 2006). Social entrepreneurship is considered a performance criterion because the outcomes from the activities and operations of the firm are evaluated in terms of not just monetary returns, but also, the positive impact on society (Kuratko et al., 2005).

Entrepreneurs are believed to be not only limited to business owners only. Even salary earners who identify and exploit new products, processes or markets are considered as entrepreneurs (Ahmad and Hoffmann, 2008). Similarly, entrepreneurship

is not only limited to small businesses or to the self-employed; but it also includes big companies that are involved in value creation. Furthermore, not all businesses are considered entrepreneurial. Entrepreneurs set themselves apart from other businesses by doing something new; creating and/or identifying new processes, products or markets (OECD, 2007). In addition, entrepreneurship is not necessarily measured in terms of success only; even those who failed were entrepreneurial and are indeed considered entrepreneurs (Ahmad and Hoffmann, 2008). Value is not limited to monetary value only – but could also include contribution to a country’s economic growth (e.g. through job creation, poverty alleviation and the formalisation of the informal sector), solving environmental problems or contributing to social inclusion. Owing to the disparate definitions of entrepreneurship, Eckhardt and Shane (2003) argue that this lack of an agreed definition of entrepreneurship has hampered the development of the field.

This study, however, does not seek to harmonise the meanings of entrepreneurship. Rather, the different meanings of entrepreneurship are provided hereto to demonstrate different perspectives from which the phenomenon is understood. Nevertheless, it acknowledges that two ingredients are critical to entrepreneurial success, irrespective of the size and nature of the venture: innovation and identification, evaluation and appropriate and timely exploitation of opportunities (Zahra, 2008). However, to locate this study within the African context, a more appropriate meaning of entrepreneurship is that prescribed by Cope (2005) as a phenomenon that goes beyond establishing a business, but to actually ensure its survival, growth and expansion over time.

The Influence of Mental Triggers on Youth Entrepreneurship

Given that youth entrepreneurship in South Africa and Uganda has been largely unsuccessful, owing in part to negative mind-sets and lack of ambition among youth (Tshikovhi and Shambare, 2012; Kew, 2012; Khumalo and Mutobola, 2014), the insights from this study will equip stakeholders (responsible for youth entrepreneurship) to create environments that will engender triggering factors for the benefit of many young people. Entrepreneurship is believed to be a function of one’s psychological disposition and is dependent upon possession of the right perceptions and attitudes which are formed at a young age (Krueger and Carsrud, 1993; Urban and Teise, 2015). One’s mind-set is said to create the motivation to venture into entrepreneurship and is influenced by the belief that one can start and succeed in business, while belief is understood to fuel self-confidence as well as the desire and intention to start a business (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990; Ajzen, 1991; Orford, Wood, Fischer, Herrington and Segal, 2003; Pihie, 2009; Ilayaraja, 2015). The extant literature identifies several factors that are said to drive youth towards entrepreneurship. These triggers can be categorised into the following thematic areas: environment or context under which youth grow up; entrepreneurship education that youth receive; and their personal characteristics that predispose them towards entrepreneurship. Each of these factors is discussed in detail and the salient features that are believed to trigger entrepreneurship are highlighted.

The Environment: The environment or context refers to the situation that the youth are exposed to: at home, at school/work, in the community, as well as in the society in general (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990). Sharma (2014) suggests that mobilisation for youth entrepreneurship should target families. This is because families provide income for their children's education and in some cases, give start-up capital for their businesses. Families also influence career choices of young people. Todoroviæ, Komazec, Jevtiæ, Obradoviæ and Mariè (2016) advise that the aspirations of children towards self-employment are better built much early in life, as it is difficult to develop such ambitions later in life. In their research to determine the drivers of entrepreneurial activity among youth and young adults in the V4 countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Poland), Holienka, Pilková and Janèovièová (2016) found that household income was one of the factors driving youth entrepreneurial activity. Family income was seen to attract youngsters to entrepreneurship because of availability of start-up capital.

According to Hamilton (2011), a family business provides a situated learning environment for entrepreneurship where a young person learns by doing, and as such, is able to accumulate the desire and critical skills and abilities that can enable them to start, join or grow a business. Cetindamar, Gupta, Karadeniz and Egrican (2012) suggest that young people who come from larger families are more likely to get into entrepreneurship. This is associated with two reasons; one, there will not be enough money for everyone to advance in education, so the older children decide to leave home to earn a living by themselves; and the other, there will be pressure for some family members to support the parents in taking care of the big family (Alemayehu, 2014). Furthermore, people who have previously been self-employed or those who grew up with self-employed/entrepreneurial parents are likely to venture into entrepreneurship (Krueger and Carsrud, 1993; Davidsson and Honig, 2003; Johnson, Parker and Wijbenga, 2006; Wang, Lu and Millington, 2011). The influence of peers has also been identified as one of the factors that influence young people to join entrepreneurship (Nanda and Sørensen, 2010). Young people who have friends or work mates who are entrepreneurs are likely to follow suit. According to Nanda and Sørensen (2010), this factor is common among those who have had no prior exposure to entrepreneurship.

In India, socio-cultural factors are said to drive young people into entrepreneurship, including: social norms, family values, one's networks and the social value placed on entrepreneurship in the community (Alemayehu, 2014). People who live in communities where people trust each other, are more likely to be self-employed than those who live in places where there is no trust (Kwon, Heflin and Ruef, 2013). Similarly, people who belong to networks or associations that are close to communities are more likely to be self-employed than those who are associated with networks that are distant from the community (Kwon et al., 2013). During hard economic times, more people are likely to venture into entrepreneurship, according to Fairlie (2013). In such times, jobs are difficult to come by, thus economic conditions become tough, especially for those who rely on one source of income (Fairlie, 2013). Even if jobs

become available, they are risky and less reliable (Fairlie, 2013). As such, people decide in favour of entrepreneurship as a more reliable and less risky form of earning income (Hytti, 2010). Young people who grow up in societies where qualities such as self-sufficiency, individualism and autonomy are valued are likely to develop positive perceptions about entrepreneurship and consequently, pursue entrepreneurship as a career (Ilayaraja, 2015).

Table 3: *Environmental Aspects that Trigger Youth Entrepreneurship*

Thematic Area: Context or environment under which youth grow up	
Triggers Towards Entrepreneurship	Sample Reference
Experience gained from work	Corbett (2005)
Knowledge of the industry, prior knowledge of markets and customer problems	Corbett (2005)
Access to entrepreneurial networks	Holienka et al. (2016)
Family/household income	Holienka et al. (2016)
Nature of the industry – opportunities and barriers presented	Grieco (2007)
The influence of peers	Nanda and Sørensen (2010)
Not having a paying job	Aligba (2013); Alemayehu (2014)
The desire to look after one’s family	Alemayehu (2014)
Previously being in self-employment	Johnson et al. (2006)
Growing up with self-employed/entrepreneurial parents (family business)	Krueger and Carsrud (1993); Davidsson and Honig (2003); Wang et al. (2011); Hamilton (2011)
Growing up in a larger family	Cetindamar et al. (2012)
Socio-cultural factors such as: social norms, family values, one’s networks and the social value placed on entrepreneurship	Alemayehu (2014)
Living in communities where people trust each other	Kwon et al. (2013)
Belonging to networks or associations that are close to communities	Kwon et al. (2013)
Hard economic times	Hytti (2010); Fairlie (2013)
Growing up in communities that emphasise qualities such as self-sufficiency, individualism and autonomy	Ilayaraja (2015)

According to the resource base theory of entrepreneurship, people are attracted to entrepreneurship if they have proximity to resources (Alvarez and Busenitz, 2001; Barney, 2001). These resources fall into four categories. The first is financial capital, the funds that the business has or can easily access to support its operations (Schweinbacher, 2007). The second form of capital is the family capital, where families are important sources of venture capital (Parcel and Menaghan, 1993). The third form of capital is the human capital, which constitutes the skills or expertise that the business

possesses for additional value (Hitt, Biermant, Shimizu and Kochhar, 2001; Cetindamar et al., 2012). The fourth form of capital is the social capital, which constitutes beneficial social networks that the entrepreneur is part of (Chiles, Bluedon and Gupta, 2007; Davidsson and Honig, 2003). When the budding entrepreneur has access to these forms of capital, it means that he or she will not only be able to manage the value adding processes of the business but will also exploit the opportunities that social capital provides (Lin, Ensel and Vaughn, 1981; Bhagvatula, Elfring, van Tilburg and van de Bunt, 2010). Table 3 summaries the environmental factors that are said to trigger youth entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship Education: Education can be considered as a double-barrelled trigger towards entrepreneurship. On one hand, it provides the human capital that is required to succeed in entrepreneurship (Holienska et al., 2016) and know-how of entrepreneurship. On the other hand, entrepreneurship education prepares students to become job creators (Dhliwayo, 2008; Kew, 2012), generates interest and perceived feasibility of entrepreneurship and inculcates an entrepreneurial culture (Brijlal, 2008), shapes the mind-set and creates motivation for entrepreneurship (Ilayaraja, 2015), and gives young people the opportunity to practice how to start and run a business before actually venturing into it (Neck and Greene, 2011). Similarly, The European Commission (2008) regards education as an important means to stimulate entrepreneurial intentions among young people and asserts that promoting entrepreneurial skills and attitudes provides benefits to society even beyond their application to new business ventures. For these reasons, Gibb (1997) recommends that entrepreneurship training should be incorporated at all levels of education; from primary, secondary to higher institutions of learning. To that end, the former South African Department of Education (DoE), now referred to as the Department of Basic Education (DBE) did that in 2000 by making sure that entrepreneurship is incorporated into the primary and high school curricula as part of economic and management sciences (EMS) (DoE, 2002). Similarly, entrepreneurship was also incorporated into the curricula of business studies in 2003 (DoE , 2003).

Several criticisms have been labelled on the way entrepreneurship is taught, particularly in developing countries. In South Africa for example, studies have shown that entrepreneurship was not adequately taught because teachers were not appropriately prepared (Shay and Wood, 2004; Isaacs, Visser, Friedrich and Brijlal, 2007). At the higher education level, Co and Mitchell (2006) note that although teachers were enthusiastic about teaching entrepreneurship, the field lacked specialisation as it was still at infancy. Brijlal (2008) also contends that tertiary institutions do not inculcate an entrepreneurial culture; instead they churn out potential bureaucrats rather than calculated risk takers. Benson (1989) and Antoncic, Scarlat and Erzetec (2004) question the so called “experiential” methods used in entrepreneurship education that involve use of case studies, speeches by entrepreneurs, computer simulations and group exercises as far from adequate. Their criticism is that these methods of teaching tie the apprentice

entrepreneur to the four walls of the classroom, depriving him/her of the experiential, authentic real-life learning experience. Indeed, Tan and Ng (2006) explain that the entrepreneurship curricula in top business schools such as Babson College, Stanford School of Business, MIT Sloan School of Management, The London Business School, and The National University of Singapore involve strong “learning-by-doing”, outside the classroom, involving activities such as internships with start-ups, creating and running small ventures on campus and working on small consulting jobs. Students also develop business plans that are presented for actual funding (Tan and Ng, 2006). End of course examinations do not feature prominently in the assessment of these programmes, rather the focus is on acquiring practical entrepreneurial skills (Tan and Ng, 2006). According to Kew (2012), this type of entrepreneurship education is the one that prepares students to become potential job-creators rather than job-seekers.

To address gaps in entrepreneurship training, a conducive environment should be provided at the early stages of child development so that children can be exposed to entrepreneurship earlier in their lives, and as they progress through formative schools and tertiary institutions, it will be possible to have a huge supply of entrepreneurs (Todorovici et al., 2016). Such an endeavour encourages positive and self-enabling perceptions of potential entrepreneurs. Universities will then be in position to unleash a pool that will supply future entrepreneurs. Using the analogy of nursing education, Dhliwayo (2008) suggests that experiential education should be adopted where learning is conceptualised and conducted in a work setting. To that end, Dhilwayo (2008) proposes a Work Integrated Learning (WIL) model that incorporates the student entrepreneur, government agencies, private sector, communities, SMEs, the university, and the entrepreneurs. Through this model, Dhilwayo (2008) argues that universities and colleges that offer entrepreneurship training, will deliver experienced entrepreneurs in the same way that nurses training institutions produce fully qualified and experienced nurses who are ready to provide nursing services in health facilities.

Entrepreneurship training should be conducted in such a way that students learn by coping, experimenting, problem solving, opportunity taking, and from their mistakes (Gibb, 1997; Dhliwayo, 2008). In this way, students get to learn about themselves, the business, the environment and entrepreneurial networks, including how to manage a small business, identify and manage relationships (Cope, 2005). This approach to entrepreneurship training will make students believe that they can start a business. Indeed, Orford et al. (2003) and Bann (2009) concur that students who believe that they have the ability to start a business are five times more likely to actually start a business than those who do not. Such students get to learn who they are, who or what they can be, and they begin constructing stories about themselves, which will ultimately lead to the realisation of their ambitions (Rae, 2000; 2005). Furthermore, students should be placed in real life business situations so that they can assess and understand various factors that impact entrepreneurial success. That way, they learn the business by experiencing it (Politis, 2005). Students should also be encouraged to identify their entrepreneurship role models, entrepreneurs that they admire, so that they can model

their entrepreneurship belief systems around these individuals and also begin to form their own identities (Dhliwayo, 2008). Dhliwayo (2008) also argues that not every young person should be recruited into entrepreneurship training. Students who have demonstrated that they have the right entrepreneurial attitude should be the only ones recruited. These are students who believe that they have something in them that can make them successful in entrepreneurship (Orford et al., 2003). Dhliwayo (2008) also recommends that the present private sector support to students through schemes such as affirmative procurement, training and funding, could be made more ‘targeted’ and ‘student focussed’. These could take the form of sponsoring placements to specific sectors/industries, provision of incubation facilities for nurturing student ideas/concepts, and affirmative procurement for promising concepts/innovations (Dhliwayo, 2008).

According to Co and Mitchell (2006), universities and colleges that offer training on entrepreneurship should deliberately build partnerships with local communities and small business owners so as to open avenues for student internships, on-site visits, consulting opportunities for senior students, as well as markets for products produced by the students. Entrepreneurship education should not only be about imparting knowledge, but also the “art” of entrepreneurship (Brijlal, 2011; Rae, 2005). The education system should be used to build confidence and self-efficacy among the learners, and to create interest in entrepreneurship as a rewarding career (Bann, 2009). Furthermore, effective entrepreneurship is one that is nurtured as a culture which is duly recognised and appreciated in society and supported by government (Brijlal, 2011; Lonsbury and Glynn, 2001). The aspects of education that are perceived to influence entrepreneurship are outlined in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Educational Aspects that Trigger Youth Entrepreneurship

Thematic Area: Entrepreneurship or Other Education Received by the Youth	
Triggers Towards Entrepreneurship	Sample Reference
Education level attained	Driver et al. (2001); Holienska et al. (2016)
Studying in institutions or universities that have close links with the business sector	Birley and Gibb (1984)
Use of “experiential” methods in entrepreneurship education	Benson (1989); Antoncic et al. (2004); Tan and Ng (2006); Dhliwayo (2008); Kew (2012)
Stimulating entrepreneurial intentions	The European Commission (2008)
Inculcating entrepreneurial culture	Brijlal (2008)
Shaping mindsets and creating motivation for entrepreneurship	Ilayaraja (2015)
Early entrepreneurship exposure and training	Neck and Greene (2011); Todoroviã et al. (2016)
Education where entrepreneurship is nurtured, recognised and appreciated as a culture	Lonsbury & Glynn (2001); Brijlal (2011)

Personal Characteristics: Some people are attracted into entrepreneurship by personal motivations, especially those driven by achievement motivation (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990). According to Rauch and Frese (2008), one's personality is a determining factor for starting a business. People with personal qualities such as innovativeness, proactiveness, self-efficacy, and high stress tolerance, are more likely to start their own business (Rauch and Frese, 2008). The personality characteristics of individuals; personality, background and skills, determine their entrepreneurial success. Belief in one's self; commonly referred to as self-efficacy, that one can start and succeed in business, causes a person to actually get into a business (Orford et al., 2003).

One of the factors that get a person thinking about a career in entrepreneurship is one's own psychological disposition (Urban and Teise, 2015), the belief that entrepreneurship is a career worthwhile pursuing (Rousseau and Venter, 2009). It is this belief that fuels self-confidence, and the desire and intention to start a business (Krueger and Carsrud, 1993). Building on Ajzen's (1991) theory of planned behaviour, Pihie (2009) explains that one's desire to be self-employed may be one of the driving factors for one to become an entrepreneur. Being self-employed stems out of the recognition and confidence in one's capabilities to fend for oneself (Townsend, Busenitz and Arthurs, 2010; Summatavet and Raudsaar, 2015). Referring to adults who are already in business, Khor and Mapunda (2014) explain that their decision to opt for entrepreneurship in their youth was influenced by their background, former knowledge and interest. Khor and Mapunda (2014) opine that one's interest in a particular area influences their desire to venture into that particular field of entrepreneurship.

Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) argue that entrepreneurial activity is behaviourist in nature. This is because entrepreneurship is said to be commonly aligned to one's interests and desires, one's approach to creative problem solving, and most importantly, the quest for some form of reward. Other people are said to be influenced into entrepreneurship by previous undesirable work or life circumstances, and so they sought entrepreneurship as a way out of their situation (Bann, 2009). Based on their study in the Niger Delta in Nigeria, Aligba and Fusch (2017) found that the key motivations and characteristics of youth that drove them into entrepreneurship included: (a) the lack of desired jobs, (b) a sense of determination, (c) a desire to maximise potentials, (d) a willingness to take risks, (e) a desire for financial independence, and (f) an eagerness to demonstrate self-motivation. These confirm internal factors that drive young people into entrepreneurship.

From Holienka, Pilková and Janèovièová's (2016) analysis of youth and young adults in V4 countries, one factor that stood out as a main driver for entrepreneurship was the entrepreneurial self-confidence of the respondents. Fear of failure significantly inhibited all examined types of entrepreneurship except of the necessity-driven efforts among young adults. Holienka, Pilková and Janèovièová (2016) also found that drivers of youth entrepreneurial activity were associated with gender. Being a female was found to be negatively associated with involvement in opportunity-driven activity in both age cohorts, as well as with involvement in necessity-driven efforts in young

adult age category. Males were more likely to start a business than their female counterparts. This is similar to Manolova, Brus and Edelman's (2008) finding that factors that motivate men to start a business were different from those of women. They explain that men were motivated by the desire to accumulate financial wealth, for self-actualisation, and to become autonomous, while women sought status and recognition in society in addition to the factors that motivate men. Table 5 below contains details of personal characteristics that are said to influence entrepreneurship.

Table 5: Personal Characteristics that Trigger Youth Entrepreneurship

Thematic Area: Personal Characteristics of the Individual Youth

Triggers Towards Entrepreneurship

	Sample Reference
Personal motivations, especially achievement motivation Commitment	Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) Simon et al. (2002); Tang (2008); Sinclair and Bruce (2009)
Goal commitment	Meyer et al. (2004); De Clercq et al. (2009)
Passion	Cardon et al. (2005); Baron (2008); Chen et al. (2009)
Personal qualities such as innovativeness, proactiveness, self-efficacy, and high stress tolerance	Rauch and Frese (2008)
Self-efficacy, confidence in one's capabilities	Krueger and Carsrud (1993); Orford et al. (2003); Townsend et al. (2010); Summatavet and Raudsaar (2015); Holienska et al. (2016)
Psychological disposition towards entrepreneurship	Urban and Teise (2015); Rousseau and Venter (2009)
Desire and intention to start a business or to be self employed	Ajzen (1991); Krueger and Carsrud (1993); Pihie (2009)
Background, former knowledge and interest in a particular area	Stevenson and Jarillo (1990); Khor and Mapunda (2014)
Previous undesirable work or life circumstances	Bann (2009); Khor and Mapunda (2014)
Emancipation from oppression/control by bosses	Verduijn et al. (2014); Khor and Mapunda (2014)
A sense of determination, desire to maximise potentials, willingness to take risks, desire for financial independence, eagerness to demonstrate self-motivation	Aligba and Fusch (2017)
Gender perspectives	Manolova et al. (2008); Holienska et al. (2016)

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that both South African and Ugandan governments have recognised the need to enhance youth entrepreneurship by putting in place responsive legislative and institutional frameworks, as well as designing interventions that attract young people into entrepreneurship. However, evidence shows that these mechanisms have not worked as intended, and as such, more need to be done to make them to deliver desired results.

We have also shown that youth entrepreneurship poses additional challenges much more than other kinds of entrepreneurship. Although young people may be amenable to self-employment, they have limited access to resources and have inadequate life and work experience. They suffer from local perceptions that youth should not run their own businesses, lack information, knowledge, appropriate premises, confidence and absence of support networks. Because of these and other limitations, young people are more likely to face greater risks and barriers to entrepreneurship than adults. Youth entrepreneurship is categorised into three levels: pre-entrepreneurs, budding entrepreneurs, and emergent entrepreneurs. This categorisation facilitates a deeper understanding of youth progression into entrepreneurship and the design of appropriate interventions that enhance their entrepreneurial skills and behaviours.

Extant literature has identified several factors that trigger youth entrepreneurship. These triggers have been broken down into three main themes: context or environment under which youth grow up; entrepreneurship or other education that they receive; and their personal characteristics. All these triggers have been discussed in detail in this work. Nevertheless, there are a number of grey areas that are pertinent to mention. For instance, youth entrepreneurship is deemed more challenging, risky and faces additional barriers than traditional entrepreneurship that adult entrepreneurs engage in. However, it is not clear how these factors make youth entrepreneurship unique and challenging. Furthermore, the literature has identified several mental triggers that drive youth into entrepreneurship. However, it is not explicit on how these triggers, individually or in combination, drive youth into entrepreneurship. It is said that the environment presents opportunities that enterprising youths can exploit, as well as difficult life conditions that force other youths to seek refuge in entrepreneurship. However, it is not clear how the potential youth entrepreneurs identify and decode these opportunities, and how they make sense of them. There is also no clarity on the factors that contribute to successful exploitation of these opportunities. The interface between the potential youth entrepreneur and entrepreneurship opportunities in the environment is also important to understand as this enlightens how youth make decisions regarding opportunities to be pursued and those to be left out.

Entrepreneurship education is considered as a double-barrelled trigger towards entrepreneurship. However, the literature is not explicit about the specific aspects of education that stimulate entrepreneurial intentions. Hence, it is worth investigating the specific aspects of entrepreneurship education that actually constitute memorable events

and circumstances that attract the young person into entrepreneurship. Based on this understanding, better ways of contextualising and delivering entrepreneurship education in a manner that can create positive lasting memories in the minds of potential young entrepreneurs can be proposed.

Personal characteristics are deemed to be latent attributes that reside inside the minds and hearts of young people and predispose them towards entrepreneurship. However, the literature does not explain how these personal qualities are acquired; how they are developed or nurtured along the entrepreneurship journey; and how they can be sustained for entrepreneurial success.

REFERENCES

- Acs, Z.** (2006). How is entrepreneurship good for economic growth. *Innovations*, 1, 97-107.
- Adewale, A. R.** (2009). African youth in the globalised world: Challenges and prospects of reducing entrepreneurial gains of globalisation/Annals of University of Bucharest. *Economic and Administrative Series*, 3, 3-21.
- Ahmad, N. and Hoffmann, A. N.** (2008). *A framework for addressing and measuring entrepreneurship*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Retrieved May 14, 2017, from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/189842959?accountid=150425>
- Ajzen, I.** (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Aldrich, H. E. and Martinez, M. E.** (2001). Many are called but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 41-56.
- Alemayehu, B. Z.** (2014). Factors hindering unemployed youths from starting their own business: The case of Mekelle City educated unemployed youths. *African Journal of Business Management*, 8(23), 1082-1093.
- Aligba, A. O. and Fusch, G. E.** (2017). Entrepreneurial motivations and characteristics of Niger Delta youths: An exploratory study. *Journal of Social Change*, 9(1), 87-99.
- Aligba, A. O.** (2013). Exploring the Motivations and Entrepreneurial Characteristics of Youths in the Niger Delta. Doctoral Dissertation submitted to Walden University. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/business/docview/1446485471/fulltextPDF/2A008B61023348FDPQ/1?accountid=150425>. Accessed June 20, 2017
- Alvarez, S. A. and Busenitz, L. W.** (2001). The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 755-775.
- Antoncic B., Scarlat C. and Erzetic B.** (2004). The quality of entrepreneurship education and the intention to continue education: Slovenia and Romania. *Managing Global Transitions*, 3(2), 197-212.
- Audretsch, D. B.** (2012). Entrepreneurship research. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 755-764.
- Audretsch, D. B., Kuratko, D. F. and Link, A. N.** (2015). Making sense of the elusive paradigm of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 45, 703-712.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J.** (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Bann, C. L.** (2009). An innovative view of the entrepreneur through exploration of the lived experience of the entrepreneur in start-up of the business. *Journal of Business and Economic Studies*, 15(2), 62-104.
- Barney, J. B.** (2001). Is the resource-based 'view' a useful perspective for strategic management research? Yes. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 41-56.

- Baron, R.** (2008). The role of affect in the entrepreneurial process, *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 328-340
- Beeka, B. H. and Rimmington, M.** (2011). Entrepreneurship as a career option for African youths. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 16(1), 145-164.
- Benson, G. L.** (1989). A note on entrepreneurship education in colleges and universities. *Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 1(3), 43-52.
- Bettina, L., Nienstedt, H. W., Proner, P., Yalazi, G., and Mauch, A.** (2012). SMEs going global: A comparison of the internationalization strategies of publishers and online social networks. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Bhagvatula, S., Elfring, T., van Tilburg, A. and van de Bunt, G. G.** (2010). How social and human capital influence opportunity recognition and resource mobilization in India's handloom industry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(3), 245-260.
- Bird, B.** (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442-453.
- Birley, S. and Gibb, A.** (1984). Teaching small business management in the UK. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 8(6), 17-21.
- Boyd, N. and Vozikis, G.** (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 63-78.
- Brandstetter, H.** (1997). Becoming an entrepreneur: A question of personality structure? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18, 157-177.
- Brijlal, P.** (2011). Entrepreneurial perceptions and knowledge: A survey of final year university students. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), 818-825
- Brijlal, P.** (2008). The state of entrepreneurship education at tertiary institutions in the Western Cape. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 25-36.
- Bruyat, C. and Julien, P. A.** (2000). Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 165-180.
- Capelleras, J. L., Mole, K. F., Greene, F. J. and Storey, D. J.** (2008). Do more heavily regulated economies have poorer performing new ventures? Evidence from Britain and Spain. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(4), 688-704.
- Cardon, M., Zietsma, C., Saporito, P., Matherne, B. and Davis, C.** (2005). A tale of passion: New insights into entrepreneurship from a parenthood metaphor. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(1), 23-45.
- Carland, J. W., Hoy, F. and Carland, J. A.** (1988). Who is an entrepreneur? Is a question worth asking. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 33-39.
- Cassim, S., Soni, P. and Karodia, A., M.** (2014). Entrepreneurship policy in South Africa. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)*, 3(9), 29-43.
- Cetindamar, D., Gupta, V. K., Karadeniz, E. E. and Egrican, N.** (2012). What the numbers tell: The impact of human, family and financial capital on women and men's entry into entrepreneurship in Turkey. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 24(1-2), 29-51.
- Chen, X. P., Yao, X. and Kotha, S.** (2009). Passion and preparedness in entrepreneurs' business plan presentations: A persuasion analysis of venture capitalists' funding decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 199-214.
- Chigunta, F.** (2002). *Youth Entrepreneurship: Meeting the Key Policy Challenges*. Wolfson College. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Chiles, T. H., Bluedon, A. C. and Gupta, V. K.** (2007). Beyond creative destruction and entrepreneurial discovery: A radical Austrian approach to entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 28(4), 467-493.
- Clapp-Smith, R. and Wernsing, T.** (2014). The transformational triggers of international experiences. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(7), 662-679.

- Clarysse, B., Bruneel, J. and Wright, M.** (2011). Explaining growth patterns of young technology-based firms: Structuring resource portfolios in different environments. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(5), 137-157.
- Co, M. J. and Mitchell, B.** (2006). Entrepreneurship education in South Africa. *Education + Training*, 48(5), 348-359.
- Corbett, A. C.** (2005). Experiential learning within the process of opportunity identification and exploration, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 29(3), 473-91.
- Cope, J.** (2005). Towards a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 373-399.
- Davidsson, P. and Honig, B.** (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(3), 301-331.
- De Clercq, D. and Honig, B.** (2011). Entrepreneurship as an integrating mechanism for disadvantaged persons. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 353-372.
- De Clercq, D., Menzies, T. V., Diochon, M. and Gasse, Y.** (2009). Explaining nascent entrepreneurs' goal commitment: An exploratory study. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 22(2), 123-139
- Dew, N., Velamuri, S. R. and Venkataraman, S.** (2004). Dispersed knowledge and an entrepreneurial theory of the firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19, 659-679.
- Dhliwayo, S.** (2008). Experiential learning in entrepreneurship education: A prospective model for South African tertiary institutions. *Education + Training*, 50 (4), 329-340.
- DoE** (2003). *The National Curriculum Statement Grades 10-12 (General): Business Studies*. Department of Education. Pretoria: Government Printer. Retrieved September 03, 2017, from www.ibe.unesco.org/curricula/southafrica/sa_us_pa2_2003_eng.pdf. Accessed September 03, 2017
- DoE** (2002). *Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R-9 (General): Business Studies*. Department of Education. Pretoria: Government Printer . Retrieved September 03, 2017, from www.ibe.unesco.org/curricula/southafrica/sa_al_lf_2002_eng.pdf
- Driver, A., Wood, E., Segal, N. and Herrington, M.** (2001), Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: South African Executive Report, available at: [www.gemconsortium.org /document/download / 1204207433925/GEM%202001% 20South Africa%20report.pdf](http://www.gemconsortium.org/document/download/1204207433925/GEM%202001%20South%20Africa%20report.pdf) (accessed September 15, 2017).
- Eckhardt J. T. and Shane S. A.** (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333-349
- Endres, A. M. and Woods, C. R.** (2006). Modern Theories of Entrepreneurial Behavior: A Comparison and Appraisal. *Small Business Economics*, 26(2), 189-202.
- EPRC** (2015). *Youth entrepreneurship in Uganda: Policy, evidence and stakeholders*. Kampala: Economic Policy Research Centre.
- Fairlie, R. W.** (2013). *Entrepreneurship, economic conditions, and the great recession*. CESifo Working Paper Series No. 4140 . Retrieved September 9, 2017, from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2228633>
- Gartner, W. B.** (1988). Who is an entrepreneur? Is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 17, 22-29.
- Gartner, W. B.** (2001). Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship? Blind assumptions in theory development . *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 27-37.
- Gartner, W. B.** (2008). Entrepreneurship-hop. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(2), 361-368.
- Gatune, J. and Najam, A.** (2011). Africa 2060: What could be driving the good news from Africa?. *Foresight*, 13(3), 100-110.
- GEM** (2014). *Global Report*. London: Global Entrepreneurship Research Association, London Business School.
- Gibb, A. A.** (1997). Small firms' training and competitiveness: Building on the small business as a learning organisation. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 13-29.
- GoU** (2016). *Uganda National Youth Policy*. Kampala, Uganda: Government of Uganda.
-

- Grieco, D.** (2007). The entrepreneurial decision: Theories, determinants and constraints. *Liuc Papers* n. 207, Serie Economia e Impresa, 54, ottobre. Available at: <http://www.biblio.liuc.it/liucpap/pdf/207.pdf>. Accessed September 15, 2017
- Hamilton, E.** (2011). Entrepreneurial learning in family business: A situated learning perspective. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 18(1), 8-26.
- Hitt, M. A., Biermant, L., Shimizu, K. and Kochhar, R.** (2001). Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: A resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 13-28.
- Holienka, M., Pilková, A. and Janèovièová, Z.** (2016). Youth Entrepreneurship in Visegrad Countries. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 4(4), 105-121.
- Hytti, U.** (2010). Contextualizing entrepreneurship in the boundaryless career. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 25(1), 64-81.
- Ilayaraja, S.** (2015). Indian educational system and its impact in “entrepreneurship as a career”. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 19, 29-39.
- Ireland, R. D., Covin, J. G. and Kuratko, D. F.** (2009). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1), 19-46.
- Isaacs, E. K., Visser, Friedrich, C. and Brijlal, P.** (2007). Entrepreneurship education and training in Further Education and Training level in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(4), 613-629.
- IYF** (2011). *Navigating challenges, Charting hope: A cross sector situational analysis on youth in Uganda*. International Youth Foundation . Retrieved June 6, 2017, from <https://usaidlearninglab.org/.../IYF%20for%20USAID%20Youth%20Map%20Uganda>
- Johnson, P. S., Parker, S. C. and Wijbenga, F.** (2006). Nascent entrepreneurship research: Achievements and opportunities. *Small Business Economics*, 27(1), 1-4.
- Kaplan, S. and Tripsas, M.** (2008). Thinking about technology: Applying a cognitive lens to technical change. *Research Policy*, 37(5), 790-805.
- Kew, J.** (2012). A co-ordinated approach critical to promote youth entrepreneurship. *Opinion Obstacles and Opportunities for Youth Entrepreneurship*, 33-37.
- Khor, P. and Mapunda, G.** (2014). A Phenomenological study of the lived experiences of the generation X and Y entrepreneurs. 4th Annual International Conference on Business Strategy and Organizational Behaviour (BizStrategy 2014). Retrieved August 27, 2017, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269165265_A_Phenomenological_Study_of_the_Lived_Experiences_of_the_Generation_X_and_Y_Entrepreneurs
- Khumalo, S. D. and Mutobola, S.** (2014). An eminent ‘volcanic’ eruption: Youth entrepreneurship. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(6), 1-20.
- Kirzner, I. M.** (1979). *Perception Opportunity and Profit: Studies in the Theory of Entrepreneurship*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kirzner, I. M.** (1982). Uncertainty, Discovery and Human Action: A Study of the Entrepreneurial Profile in the Misesian System. In I. M. Kirzner, *In Method Process and Austrian Economics* (pp. 139-159). MA: DC : Lexington.
- Kirzner, I. M.** (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(1), 60-85.
- Krueger, N. and Carsrud, A. L.** (1993). Entrepreneurship intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour . *Entrepreneurship Reg. Dev.*, 5(4), 315-530.
- Kuratko, D. F., Ireland, R. D., and Hornsby, J. S. (2001). Improving firm performance through entrepreneurial actions: Acordia’s corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(4), 60-71.
- Kuratko, D. F., Morris, M. H. and Schindehutte, M.** (2005). Understanding the dynamics of entrepreneurship through framework approaches. *Small Business Economics Journal*, 45(1), 1-13.

- Kwon, S. W., Heflin, C. and Ruef, M.** (2013). Community social capital and entrepreneurship. *American Sociological Review*, 78(6), 980-1008.
- Lin, N., Ensel, W. M. and Vaughn, J. C.** (1981). Social resources and strength of ties: Structural factors in occupational status attainment. *American Sociological Review*, 46(4), 393-405.
- Lonsburry, M. and Glynn, M. A.** (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 545-564.
- Louw, L., van Eeden, S. M., Bosch, J. K. and Venter, D. J.** (2003). Entrepreneurial traits of undergraduate students at selected South African tertiary institutions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 9(1), 5-26.
- Maija, R., Rodney, C. and Shrader, M. S.** (2012). Perception of entrepreneurial opportunity: A general framework. *Management Decision*, 50(7), 1233-1251.
- Mair, J. and Marti, I.** (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Maluleke, J.** (2016). *Entrepreneurship 101: Tackling the basics of business start-ups in South Africa* (1st ed.). Johannesburg, South Africa: BlackBird Books.
- Manolova, T. S., Brus, C. G. and Edelman, L. F.** (2008). What do women entrepreneurs want? Retrieved from onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jsc.817/full
- Marcelle, G.** (2010). *Creating linkages between entrepreneurship and innovation policy domains: The case of South Africa*. Strategic Management of Innovation Research Group Working Paper Series, 13.
- McKelvie, A. and Wiklund, J.** (2010). Advancing firm growth research: A focus on growth mode instead of growth rate. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(2), 261-268.
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E. and Vanderberghe, C.** (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 991-1007.
- Mintzberg, H.** (1987). Crafting strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 65(4), 66-75.
- Morris, M. H., Kuratko, D. F. and Schindehutte, M.** (2012). Framing the entrepreneurial experience. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(1), 11-40.
- Morrison, A.** (2000). Entrepreneurship: what triggers it? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 6(2), 59-72.
- Naffziger, D. W., Hornsby, J. S. and Kuratko, D. F.** (1994). A proposed research model of entrepreneurial motivation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18, 29-39.
- Nanda, R. and Sørensen, J. B.** (2010). *Workplace peers and entrepreneurship*. Retrieved August 20, 2017, from citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.440.6633andrep=rep1...
- National Youth Development Agency** (2014). *Final report on the internship baseline study, 2013*. Johannesburg. Retrieved June 6, 2017, from www.nyda.gov.za/.../Final%20Report%20for%20SAGDA%20revised%2028_03_201
- Naudé, W.** (2010). Entrepreneurship, developing countries, and development economics: New approaches and insights. *Small Business Economics*, 34 (1), 1-12.
- Ndedi, A. A.** (2013). Challenges and perspectives facing the development of entrepreneurship education and training in South Africa. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 9(2/3), 126-132.
- Neck, H. M. and Greene, P. G.** (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49, 55-70.
- OECD** (2007). Defining entrepreneurial activity: Definitions supporting frameworks for data collection, Nadim Ahmad and Richard G. Seymour. Retrieved December 29, 2017, from www.oecd.org/std/business-stats/39651330.pdf
- OECD** (1997). *The measurement of scientific and technological activities: Proposed guidelines for collecting and interpreting technological innovation data*. Oslo: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Retrieved December 29, 2017, from <http://www.oecd.org/science/inno/2367580.pdf>
-

- Okojie, E. E.** (2003). *Employment creation for youth in Africa: The gender dimension*. Expert Group Meeting on Jobs for Youth: National Strategies for Employment Promotion . Geneva. Retrieved June 6, 2017 , from citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.559.9795&rep=rep1...
- Orford J., Wood E., Fischer, C. Y., Herrington, M. and Segal, N.** (2003). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: South African Executive Report*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Oseifuah, E. K.** (2010). Financial literacy and youth entrepreneurship in South Africa. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 1(2), 164-182.
- Parcel, T. L. and Menaghan, E. G.** (1993). Family social capital and children's behavior problems. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56(2), 120-135.
- Parker, S. C. and van Praag, C. M.** (2012). The entrepreneur's mode of entry: Business takeover or new venture start? . *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 31-46.
- Pihie, Z. A.** (2009). Entrepreneurship as a career choice: An analysis of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention of university students. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 338-349.
- Politis, D.** (2005). The process of entrepreneurial learning. A conceptual framework. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(3), 399-424.
- Rae, D.** (2000). Understanding entrepreneurial learning: A question of how. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 6(3), 145-159.
- Rae, D.** (2005). Entrepreneurial learning: A narrative-based conceptual model. *Entrepreneurial Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 12(3), 323-335.
- Rauch, A. and Frese, M.** (2008). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis of on the relationship between owners personality traits, business creation, and success. *European Journal of Work Organisational Psychology*, 16(4), 353-385.
- Roos, I. and Gustafsson, A.** (2011). The influence of active and passive customer behavior on switching in customer relationships. *Managing Service Quality*, 21(5), 448-464.
- Rousseau, G. G. and Venter, D. J.** (2009). Investigating the importance of factors related to career choice. *Management Dynamics*, 18(3), 2-14.
- Royle, L.** (2012). Mind over matter. *Occupational Health*, 64(6), 24-25.
- RSA** (2015). *National Youth Policy, 2015 – 2020*. Republic of South Africa.
- Sandelowski, M., Docherty, S. and Emden, C.** (1997). Qualitative metasynthesis: Issues and techniques. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 20, 365-371.
- Sarasvathy, S. D.** (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(April), 234-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D.** (2003). *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. Retrieved June 7, 2018, from https://cdm.epfl.ch/files/content/sites/mtei/files/.../saravathy_book_101108.pdf
- Sato, R. A., Drennan, J. and Lings, I.** (2017). Problem recognition: integrating help-seeking theory in social marketing. *Journal of Social Marketing*, 7(1), 2-17.
- Schoof, U.** (2006). *Stimulating youth entrepreneurship: Barriers and incentives to enterprise startups by young people, SEED Working Paper, No 76.* . Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization.
- Schumpeter, J. A.** (1934, 2008). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle*. (A. Croitoru, Ed., and N. B. Redvers Opie, Trans.) London, UK: Transaction Publishers. Retrieved September 25, 2017, from <http://compaso.eu/wpd/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Compaso2012-32-Croitoru.pdf>
- Schweinbacher, A.** (2007). A theoretical analysis of optimal financing strategies for different types of capital-constrained entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(6), 753-781.
- Shane, S.** (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organisation Science*, 11(4), 448-469.
- Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S.** (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
-

- Sharma, L.** (2014). Impact of family capital and social capital on youth entrepreneurship – a study of Uttarakhand state, India. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 4(14), 1-18.
- Shay, D. and Wood, E.** (2004). *Can entrepreneurship education in schools equip South Africa's future entrepreneurs? South Africa Report* Shay, D. and Wood, E. (2004). *Can entrepreneurship education in schools equip South Africa's future entrepreneurs? South Africa Report*. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Pretoria: UVT Graduate Schools of Business.
- Simon, M., Elango, B., Houghton, S. M. and Savelli, S.** (2002). The successful product pioneer: Maintaining commitment while adapting to change. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 40(3), 187-203
- Sinclair, R. F. and Bruce, R. A.** (2009). Determining Entrepreneurial Commitment in the Entrepreneur. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 29(6), Article 18
- Stern, S.** (2004). Do scientists pay to be scientists? *Management Science*, 50(6), 835-853.
- Stevenson, H. H. and Jarillo, C. J.** (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(5), 17-27.
- Summatavet, K. and Raudsaar, M.** (2015). Cultural heritage and entrepreneurship – inspiration for novel ventures creation. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 9(1), 31-44.
- Svaleryd, H.** (2015). Self-employment and the local business cycle. *Small Business Economics*, 44(1), 55-70.
- Tan, S. S. and Ng, C. K.** (2006). A problem-based learning approach to entrepreneurship education. *Education + Training*, 48(6), 416-428.
- Tang, J.** (2008). Environmental munificence for entrepreneurs: entrepreneurial alertness and commitment. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 14(3), 128-151
- Teitelbaum, D.** (2002). Mental toughness can be yours. *Financial Services Advisor*, 145(3), 22-24.
- The European Commission** (2008). *Progress in promoting entrepreneurial attitudes and skills through primary and secondary education. Final report of the expert group "Education and Training"*. Brussels: Enterprise Directorate General of the European Commission. Retrieved September 10, 2017, from ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/2214/attachments/1/translations/en/.../native
- Todoroviæ I., Komazec S., Jevtiæ M., Obradoviæ V. and Mariè M.** (2016). Strategic management in development of youth and women entrepreneurship: Case of serbia. *Organizacija*, 49(4), 197-207.
- Townsend, D. M., Busenitz, L. W. and Arthurs, J. D.** (2010). To start or not to start: Outcome and ability expectations in the decision to start a new venture. *Journal of Business Venture*, 25(2), 192-202.
- Tripsas, M. and Gavetti, G.** (2000). Capabilities, cognition and inertia: evidence from digital imaging. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1147-1161.
- Tshikovhi, N. and Shambare, R.** (2012). Entrepreneurship intentions of students in free enterprise at Tshwane University of Technology. *Academy of Markets and Commerce*, 1, 1-5.
- Tzeng, C. H.** (2009). A review of contemporary innovation literature: A Schumpeterian perspective. *Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice*, 11(3), 373-394.
- Urban, B. and Teise, H.** (2015). Antecedents to social entrepreneurship intentions: An empirical study in South Africa. *Management Dynamics*, 24(2), 36-52.
- Wang, W., Lu, W. and Millington, J. K.** (2011). Determinants of entrepreneurial intention among college students in China and USA. Wang, W, Lu, W, and Millington, JK. (2011). *Determinants of entrepreneurship* *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 35-44.
- Xie, X., Wu, Y. and Zeng, S.** (2016). A theory of multi-dimensional organizational innovation cultures and innovation performance in transitional economies: The role of team cohesion. *Chinese Management Studies*, 10(3), 458-479.
- Zahra, S. A.** (2008). The virtuous cycle of discovery and creation of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(3), 243-257.