

Entrepreneurship as a Career Choice: An Analysis of Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Intention of National High School Senior Students at the Municipality of Calinog, Iloilo

ROME B. MORALISTA, DR. GABRIEL C. DELARIARTE

jerlynagustar@yahoo.com

West Visayas State University, Calinog, Campus

PHILIPPINES

***Abstract** - The main objectives of the study were to determine the entrepreneurial career choice, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intention of National High School Senior Students at the Municipality of Calinog, Iloilo. Descriptive survey type of research was utilized in the study. personal choice is mainly considered in career choice. Creativity is mainly considered in entrepreneurial self-efficacy. To be a teacher (Educator) is very popular in entrepreneurial intention of the respondents. The main variables of the study are significantly and positively related which means that the increase in one variable is also in increase in another. It is recommended that parents, guidance counsellors, and the like consider the results of this study in guiding the respondents in their career decisions*

Keywords – Entrepreneurship, Career Choice, Self-Efficacy

I. INTRODUCTION

Colleges and universities nationwide have been adding entrepreneurship classes, minors, majors and even degrees at a record pace, however, the career entrepreneurship is still conspicuously missing from established lists of career choices. Therefore, to support the continued growth of entrepreneurship in the academic arena, the legitimacy of the entrepreneurial career needs to be firmly established Sinclair (2008). The entrepreneurial career has been theoretically defined by Dyer (1994). Differentiation between the entrepreneurial styles, specifically novice, serial, and parallel entrepreneurs, has been theorized and support given (Alsos & Kolvereid, 1998; Kirschenhofer & Lechner, 2006; Westhead, Ucbasaran & Wright, 2003, 2005a, b; Westhead, Ucbasaran, Wright & Binks, 2005c; Westhead & Wright, 1998a, b, 1999; Wright, Robbie & Ennew, 1997) and even the conceptualization of differentiation between male and female entrepreneurs has been shown to have support (Carter, Gartner, Shaver & Gatewood, 2003; Chrisman, Carsrud, DeCastro & Herron, 1990).

According to Dyer (1994), careers should have clear career paths, roles, and socialization practices. Furthermore, one might infer that the entrepreneurial career represents an inconsequential anomaly. Finkle & Deeds, (2001); Katz, (2003) cited that entrepreneurship classes, programs, and even degrees at an incredible pace.

Katz (2003) noted that the entrepreneurial career represents a rapidly and continuously growing segment of the career domain. Dyer (1994) suggests that such omissions are due to the absence of a comprehensive theory of the entrepreneurial career. Career choice is seen as an extension of the personality/interest of the individual (Savickas, 2005; Spokane & Cruza-Guet, 2005). Effectively, an individual's choice of career is an extension of who one is, and as such, is likely expressed in the reasons given for choosing that career (Savickas, 2005). In addition, it is known that only a small percentage of the general population, 7.5% choose to become entrepreneurs (Bygrave, 2006).

Kickul, Wilson, and Marlino (2004) found that entrepreneurial self-efficacy had a stronger effect on entrepreneurial career interest for teenage girls than for boys. Furthermore, it appears that their perceptions that they have the abilities or skills to succeed as entrepreneurs are simply more important in considering future career options than for boys.

Bandura, (1992) explained that the adults indicate that women are more likely than men to limit their ultimate career choices because of their lack of confidence in their abilities. Chen, Greene, & Crick, (1998) identify women, in particular, shun entrepreneurial endeavours because they think they lack the required skills.

Betz & Hackett (1981, 1983); Eccles (1994); Hackett & Betz, (1981); Kourilsky & Walstad, (1998) cited that entrepreneurial intentions were higher for teen boys than for teen girls, we could not test causality, that is, we cannot claim the lower observed self-efficacy in girls led to their lower entrepreneurial intentions.

The researchers believe that choosing a career is crucial in one's life it will affect ones future and

success. Furthermore, they wanted to know if those who take up entrepreneurship have the confidence to take the course and have the intention to take such course.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objectives of the study were to determine the entrepreneurial career choice, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intention of National High School Senior Students at the Municipality of Calinog, Iloilo. It further aimed to find out whether entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention would relate to career choice. Specifically, to identify the entrepreneurial career choice, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and intention of National High School Senior Students; and discuss the relationship among entrepreneurial self-efficacy, entrepreneurial intention and entrepreneurial career choice of National High School Senior Students.

III. METHOD

This descriptive survey research aimed to determine the entrepreneurial career choice, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intention of National High School Senior Students at the Municipality of Calinog, Iloilo. It further aimed to find out whether entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention would relate to career choice.

Conducted in the second semester of the academic year 2013-2014, from December to January 2012 at National High School in the Municipality of Calinog, Iloilo, the study utilized 100 randomly selected Senior Students from the Carvasana National High School and Calinog National High School as participants. The Gartner et.al. (2004) Reasons for career choice, and Wilson, F. et.al. (2007). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention were adapted to gather data.

The researchers personally sought the permission of the respondents to be part of this study through face-to-face encounter. The main purpose of the present study and the process by which the respondents were chosen were explained to them thoroughly. Then an oral consent was secured before the actual gathering of data were scheduled and conducted. The respondents were given 20 to 30 minutes to complete the data-gathering instruments.

Upon retrieval of the accomplished instruments, the obtained data were coded, tallied, computer-processed, and interpreted. The statistical tools used were frequency counts, percentage analyses, mean and standard deviation and were further employed in the analysis of the obtained data.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The 100 respondents came from 2 National High Schools in the Municipality of Calinog. 75 (75%) from Calinog National High School and 25 (25%) from Carvasana National High School. Table 1 presents the data.

Table 1. Reasons for Career Choice

Category	WM	VI	SD
a. To challenge myself.	4.03	ML	.46
b. To fulfil a personal vision.	3.77	ML	.46
c. To lead and motivate others.	3.60	ML	.72
d. Grow and learn as a person.	3.54	ML	.50
e. To earn a larger personal income.	3.51	ML	.50
f. Build great wealth/high income.	3.49	ML	.42
g. Financial security.	3.47	ML	.48
h. To develop an idea for a product.	3.46	ML	.50
i. Innovate and in the forefront of.	3.46	ML	.39
j. To be respected by my friends.	3.46	ML	.50
k. Higher position for myself.	3.46	ML	.50
l. Follow example of person I admire	3.45	ML	.51
m. To achieve something and get recognition.	3.44	ML	.55
n. Greater flexibility for personal life.	3.44	ML	.49
o. Freedom to adapt my approach to work.	3.41	ML	.59
p. To continue a family of tradition.	3.31	L	.65
q. Build business children can inherent.	3.31	L	.52
r. Power to influence an organization.	3.19	L	.51

Scale: *Very Much Like (VML): 4.21 – 5.00; Much Like (ML): 3.41 – 4.20; Like (L): 2.61 – 3.40; Dislike (D): 1.81 – 2.60; Very Dislike (VD): 1.00 – 1.80*

Most of the respondents “*Much Like*” the reasons for career choice wherein (M=4.03) to challenge myself followed (M=3.77) to fulfil a personal vision, and (M=3.60) to lead and motivate others. The least three are “*Like*” (M=3.31) to continue a family of tradition; followed by (M=3.31) build business children can

inherent; and lastly, (M=3.19) power to influence an organization.

When it comes to entrepreneurial self-efficacy the respondents had “*Very Strong*” the top three categories are (M=3.68) being creative; followed by (M=3.51) managing money; and (M=3.51) being able to solve problems. Finally, the least one “*Strong Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy*” (M=3.40) being a leader.

Table 2 Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

Category	WM	VI	SD
a. Being Creative	3.68	VS	.49
b. Managing Money	3.51	VS	.53
c. Being Able to Solve Problems	3.51	VS	.64
d. Making Decisions	3.49	VS	.50
e. Getting People to Agree with You	3.42	VS	.49
f. Being a Leader	3.40	S	.51

Scale: *Extremely Strong (ES)*: 4.21 – 5.00; *Very Strong (VS)*: 3.41 – 4.20; *Strong (S)*: 2.61 – 3.40; *Somewhat Strong (SS)*: 1.81 – 2.60; *Not Strong (NS)*: 1.00 – 1.80

The “*Very Strong Entrepreneurial Intention*” of the respondents these are (M=4.03) teacher; followed by (M=3.76) military; and (M=3.54) doctor, nurse, or other medical professional. The least three have “*Strong Entrepreneurial Intention*” such as (M=3.30) Journalist/Writer; (M=3.30) Scientist/Engineer; and (M= 3.29) Non-profit/Government.

Table 3 Entrepreneurial Intention

Category	WM	VI	SD
a. Teacher	4.03	VS	.46
b. Military	3.76	VS	.46
c. Doctor, Nurse, or Other Medical Professional	3.54	VS	.70
d. Working with Computers	3.54	VS	.50
e. Business or Management	3.48	VS	.50
f. Actor/Actress or Other Performer	3.48	VS	.42
g. Artist/Graphic Designer	3.46	VS	.45
h. Starting/Owning your Own Business	3.45	VS	.50
i. Manager	3.45	VS	.38
j. Lawyer	3.30	S	.50
k. Sales/Marketing	3.30	S	.45
l. Professional Athlete	3.30	S	.45
m. Journalist/Writer	3.30	S	.46
n. Scientist/Engineer	3.30	S	.46
o. Non-profit/Government	3.29	S	.70

Scale: *Extremely Strong (ES)*: 4.21 – 5.00; *Very Strong (VS)*: 3.41 – 4.20; *Strong (S)*: 2.61 – 3.40; *Somewhat Strong (SS)*: 1.81 – 2.60; *Not Strong (NS)*: 1.00 – 1.80

Positive and significant relationships existed between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention, between their entrepreneurial intention and entrepreneurial career choice, and between their entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial career choice of the respondent.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It can be concluded that personal choice is mainly considered in career choice. Creativity is mainly considered in entrepreneurial self-efficacy. To be a teacher (Educator) is very popular in entrepreneurial intention of the respondents. The main variables of the study are significantly and positively related which means that the increase in one variable is also in increase in another. It is recommended that parents, guidance counsellors, and the like consider the results of this study in guiding the respondents in their career decisions.

REFERENCES

- Alsos, G. A., & Kolvereid, L. 1998. The Business Gestation Process of Novice, Serial, and Parallel Business Founders. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 22(4): 101.
- Bygrave, W. 2006. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: Summary 2006 - United States of America, www.gemconsortium.org.
- Bandura, A. (1992). Exercise of personal agency through the self-efficacy mechanism. In R. Schwartzer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action* (pp. 3-38). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- May, 2007 403
- Betz, N. & Hackett, G. (1983). The relationship of mathematics self-efficacy expectations to the selection of science-based college majors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 23, 329-345.
- Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B., Shaver, K. G., & Gatewood, E. J. 2003. The Career Reasons of Nascent Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1): 13. USASBE 2008 Proceedings - Page 792.
- Chen, C., Greene, P., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295-316.
- Chrisman, J. J., Carsrud, A. L., DeCastro, J., & Herron, L. 1990. A Comparison of Assistance Needs of Male and Female Pre-Venture Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5(4): 235.

- Dyer, W. G., Jr. 1994. Toward a Theory of Entrepreneurial Careers. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 19(2): 7.
- Eccles, J. (1994). Understanding women's educational and occupational choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 585-609.
- Finkle, T. A., & Deeds, D. 2001. Trends in the Market for Entrepreneurship Faculty, 1989-1998. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(6): 613.
- Gartner, W. B., Shaver, K. G., Carter, N. M., & Reynolds, P. D. (2004). *Handbook of Entrepreneurial Dynamics: The Process of Business Creation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hackett, G. & Betz, N. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 326-339.
- Katz, J. A. 2003. The Chronology and Intellectual Trajectory of American Entrepreneurship Education 1876-1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2): 283.
- Kirschenhofer, F., & Lechner, C. 2006. Long-Term Performance of Habitual Entrepreneurs – Which Direction to go?, *Workshop on Firm Exit and Serial Entrepreneurship*. Max Planck Institute (Jena, Germany).
- Kickul, J., Wilson, F., & Marlino, D. (2004, January). *Are misalignments of perceptions and self-efficacy causing gender gaps in entrepreneurial intentions among our nations' teens?* Presented at USASBE Annual Conference, Dallas, TX.
- Kourilsky, M. & Walstad, M. (1998). Entrepreneurship and female youth: Knowledge, attitudes, gender differences and educational practices. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 77-88.
- Savickas, M. L. 2005. The Theory and Practice of Career Construct. In S. D. Brown, & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career Development and Counseling*: 42-70. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sinclair, R. (2008). The First Step toward a Theory of the Entrepreneurial Career
- Spokane, A. R., & Cruza-Guet, M. C. 2005. Holland's Theory of Vocational Personalities in Work Environments. In S. D. Brown, & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career Development and Counseling*: 24-41. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Westhead, P., & Birley, S. 1993. A Comparison of New Businesses Established by 'Novice' and 'Habitual' Founders in Great Britain. *International Small Business Journal*, 12(1): 38.
- Westhead, P., Ucbasaran, D., & Wright, M. 2003. Differences between Private Firms Owned by Novice, Serial and Portfolio Entrepreneurs: Implications for Policy Makers and Practitioners. *Regional Studies*, 37(2): 187.
- Westhead, P., Ucbasaran, D., & Wright, M. 2005a. Decisions, Actions, and Performance: Do Novice, Serial, and Portfolio Entrepreneurs Differ? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 43(4): 393.
- Westhead, P., Ucbasaran, D., & Wright, M. 2005b. Experience and Cognition: Do Novice, Serial and Portfolio Entrepreneurs Differ? *International Small Business Journal*, 23(1): 72.
- Westhead, P., Ucbasaran, D., Wright, M., & Binks, M. 2005c. Novice, Serial and Portfolio Entrepreneur Behaviour and Contributions. *Small Business Economics*, 25(2): 109. USASBE 2008 Proceedings - Page 795
- Westhead, P., & Wright, M. 1998a. Novice, Portfolio, and Serial Founders in Rural and Urban Areas. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 22(4): 63.
- Westhead, P., & Wright, M. 1998b. Novice, Portfolio, and Serial Founders: Are They Different? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(3): 173.
- Westhead, P., & Wright, M. 1999. Contributions of Novice, Portfolio and Serial Founders Located in Rural and Urban Areas. *Regional Studies*, 33(2): 157.
- Wilson, F. et.al. (2007). Gender, Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, and Entrepreneurial Career Intentions: Implications for Entrepreneurship Education.
- Wright, M., Robbie, K., & Ennew, C. 1997. Serial Entrepreneurs. *British Journal of Management*, 8(3): 251.