Validation of a Didactic Model for the Analysis of Training Objectives in Entrepreneurship

by Jean-Pierre Béchard, Ph.D., and Jean-Marie Toulouse, Ph.D.

Cahier de recherche n° 96-11-01
Novembre 1996
ISSN : 0840-853X
Abstract

Organizations wishing to develop entrepreneurship by education, presuppose that the lack of training for entrepreneurs is the main reason for the failure of small and medium-sized businesses (SME). In this context, it is legitimate to question the quality and effectiveness of these programs. What do we know of these programs? What are their general education objectives? What are their pedagogical targets? This research is concerned with the situation of formal entrepreneurship training programs and, more particularly, the development of the educational content that they offer.

In summary, this research was designed to test a didactic model for the analysis of the objectives of entrepreneurship training. The results present three categories of objectives: general objectives, teaching objectives, and specific objectives. For the general objectives, the model identifies three types of entrepreneurship development programs: PED awareness (entrepreneurial logic), business creation PED (managerial and functional logic), and small business development PED (strategic managerial logic). We have also enumerated eight teaching objectives: competitive forces, the entrepreneur, the context, administration, strategy, the technical trade, the visionary process, and the stages of creation. Finally, an analysis of the main trends of the specific objectives suggests the use of the following methods: market studies, entrepreneurial skills, support systems, management, growth strategies, technical orientation, the discovery of ideas, and the business plan.
Current Situation

Entrepreneurship is in fashion. Everyone is talking about it: politicians, experts, and entrepreneurs themselves. According to them this phenomenon will be the salvation of our industrial societies so badly in need of redefinition. To keep up the momentum, academic and community organizations have undertaken to train entrepreneurs capable of revitalizing both the local and national economy by creating jobs. Organizations wishing to develop entrepreneurship by education, presuppose that the lack of training for entrepreneurs is the main reason for the failure of small and medium-sized businesses (SME).

In this context, it is legitimate to question the quality and effectiveness of these programs. What do we know of these programs? What are their general education objectives? What are their pedagogical targets? This research is concerned with the situation of formal entrepreneurship training programs and, more particularly, the development of the educational content that they offer.

Review of the Literature

Since the start of the 1980s, there has been a proliferation of courses and programs dedicated to entrepreneurship. But how have these organizations developed their entrepreneurship training programs? An analysis of the literature dealing with entrepreneurship and education suggests four possible responses. The contents of entrepreneurship training programs can be planned from the point of view of the educators, the point of view of the student-entrepreneurs, the point of view of those who design the programs, and the point of view of the evaluators.

First of all, developing an entrepreneurship training program from the point of view of the educators implies identifying and defining diverse knowledge as well as organizing it sequentially into a coherent whole. However, these contents come from the available expertise of the educators who provide the course or program (Vesper, 1993; Robinson, Christensen, 1992; Dana, 1992; Gillin, 1991; Wilson, 1991). It is, therefore, not surprising to note that this type of organization of knowledge is found mainly in academic organizations, particularly universities.

Program content developed from the perspective of the student-entrepreneurs tries to respond to the learning needs of the students. There is much research relating to this vision of the content (Harper, 1984; Buzzard, 1984; Boberg, Kiecker, 1988; Gibb, 1988; Loucks, 1988; Kantor, 1988; Wyckham, 1989; Stanworth, Gray, 1992; Hood, Young, 1993). The
research all agrees that the content must take into account the learning context of each individual. This view focuses on the students' perceptions of their needs and the skills they must develop as entrepreneurs. This level of concern is more psycho-social.

Analyzing the contents of entrepreneurship programs from the viewpoint of those who design them means defining the different teaching/learning objectives and deploying them within a logical framework. There is little research in this area, although, we should mention Interman (1992) and Johannisson (1991). These two works are taxonomical, the one examining the main focuses of entrepreneurship development programs (EDP), and the other entrepreneurial skills.

Finally, the viewpoint of the evaluators of entrepreneurship training programs contents contributes to the definition of criteria for program quality and effectiveness (Robinson, Haynes, 1991; Plaschka, Welsch, 1990; Garnier, Gasse, Raynal, 1991; Singh, Singh, 1993; Allen, 1992; Kirby, Mullen, 1990; Price, Monroe, 1993; Patel, 1992). This research suggests a posteriori adjustments to the contents.

This breakdown of the literature on entrepreneurship and education into four parts raises two questions. First, can course contents be developed using more than one perspective, for example, the expertise of educators and the needs of student-entrepreneurs? Second, why has so little research been done on the point of view of those designing the courses and so much on the point of view of the evaluators? This imbalance in the contributions leads us to believe that, on the one hand, evaluation is a measurable activity that is necessary to justify the value of the programs, and, on the other hand, that the point of view of the designers is less visible and more ambiguous. There is more interest in the output than in the input. Therefore, this article will further develop the main objectives that orient entrepreneurship training programs. We feel this route offers a good research opportunity and that it will provide a framework to the whole of the research mentioned in the other three perspectives.

**Theoretical Framework**

In his book *Dictionnaire actuel de l'éducation*, Legendre (1993) identifies three levels of important objectives: general objectives, teaching objectives, and, finally, specific objectives. A general objective is an abstract formulation concerning changes in aptitude and behaviour that is hoped for from students. A teaching objective brings together the goals of teaching and learning and is situated in the median phase between the general objective and the specific objective of the didactic cycle. Finally, a specific objective is the overall knowledge of contents, abilities, and situations that has been sufficiently tested to enable it to be applied to a large number of similar teaching situations (Figure 1).
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1. Defining the General Objectives

Entrepreneurship literature uses two expressions to describe the types of programs that teach entrepreneurship. They are "entrepreneurship education" and "small business education." Let us see how these concepts can help us to define the general objectives. First of all, "entrepreneurship education" is an abstraction that is frequently used in American and Canadian entrepreneurship journals. It has essentially two meanings: the first reference is to programs that train the future entrepreneur and help him to start up his business (Vesper, 1982), and the second reference is to career education programs for the entrepreneur (Ronstadt, 1985).

In Europe, the expression "small business education" covers four types of programs (Curran, Stanworth, 1989):

- Entrepreneurial education (in the Schumpeterian sense of "carrying up new combination of elements")
- Education for small business ownership and self-employment (reproduction or acquisition of an existing business)
- Continuing small business education (continuing education for owners of small businesses)
- Small business awareness education (career education for entrepreneur).

As we have noted, the European and American definitions combine several possible objectives. If we want to examine all of the general objectives, we must use a broader term. Three international organizations have agreed on a common definition: According to them, we should be speaking of Entrepreneurship Development Program (EDP). An EDP is a

---

1The International Management Development Network (INTERMAN), The United Nations Development Program (UNAP), and the International Labour Organization (ILO) of Geneva.
collection of formalized teachings that informs, trains, and educates anyone interested in participating in socio-economic development through a project to promote entrepreneurship awareness, business creation, small business development or to train the trainers (INTERMAN, 1992) (see Table 1). We suggest that this definition serve as a guide for the definition of the general objectives.

### Table 1

**Typology of Entrepreneurship Development Programs**  
(Interman, 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of programs</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship awareness</td>
<td>General information programs on entrepreneurship and reflection on the career of entrepreneur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business creation</td>
<td>Training in technical, human, and managerial skills to generate personal income, create a business, or create jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business development</td>
<td>Made-to-measure programs to answer the specific needs of owner/managers who cannot afford to pay specialists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of trainers</td>
<td>Programs to develop educators’ skills in consultation, education, and follow-up of small businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this article, we will deal with the first three general objectives (entrepreneurship awareness, business creation and small business development). We will leave the discussion of training educators for another time.

If the general objectives are easily identified, the same does not hold true for the large categories of teaching objectives. This type of objective is the median part of the didactic cycle, and its purpose is to blend the multiple aims of teaching and learning. Neither too abstract, nor too concrete, teaching objectives are at the very heart of the teaching discipline. Therefore entrepreneurship teaching objectives should emerge from the major questions of the field. But what are the questions raised by the study of entrepreneurship? To answer this question and subsequently discover the most significant teaching objectives, we think is necessary to identify, analyze critically, and then synthesize the key contributions.

### 2. Defining Teaching Objectives

The approach of the field of entrepreneurship raises several challenges that are sometimes difficult to meet. The usual way is to have a senior mentor who can show you the principal authors that absolutely must be read. This classic method is very quick as it gives access to key authors but falls short by reason of the mentor’s personal bias. Gartner (1990) tried to circumvent this difficulty by asking academicians and leaders from the business world as well as politicians for their definitions of entrepreneurship. This Delphi type methodology is very
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astute as it avoids the problem of one expert confined to his own little universe; the problem, however, is in identifying the experts.

We suggest another way of getting to the heart of the discipline: the analysis of the titles most often quoted in the bibliographies of articles dealing with entrepreneurship. We used PRO-QUEST software to track down these articles and searched the data bank for the two words "entrepreneurs" and "entrepreneurship." The exercise was first conducted in 1991 and then again in 1995 which gave us access to articles published in professional and scholarly journals between October 1986 and April 1995, nearly ten years of research work on entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship is mentioned in more than one hundred journals written for practitioners and academicians. This wide publication base is balanced by the fact that slightly less than half of the articles are concentrated in three American journals that specialize in entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice (76 articles), Journal of Business Venturing (54 articles), and Journal of Small Business Management (37 articles). We decided to use the 167 articles published in these journals as our basic material. Then we computerized all the titles found in the bibliographies of these 167 articles. Our hypothesis is that the most frequently cited references are the source of the arguments of those who are building the field of entrepreneurship. This monastic work brought to light the top 30 most often quoted authors in the 167 indexed articles. We identified eleven books, seven parts of books, and twelve scholarly articles.

An analysis of this list of most frequently cited authors suggests a classification of the field of entrepreneurship into three levels of thought: the praxiological level, the disciplinary level, and the epistemological level. The first level combines all the practical knowledge that prescribes the norms and limits of conduct in management situations and in the development of entrepreneurship (Vesper, 1985; Drucker, 1985). The disciplinary level is characterized by theoretical and empirical knowledge from one or several sciences such as economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc. This knowledge is constructed with the goal of understanding and/or predicting the field of entrepreneurship according to rigorous scientific methodology. This level is concerned with economic theories (Schumpeter, 1934), psychological theories (McClelland, 1961; Collins, Moore, Unwalla, 1964; Collins, Moore, 1970; Brockhaus, 1982; Horwitz, 1986; Bird, 1988), organizational theories (Porter, 1980; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Smith, 1967; Churchill, Lewis, 1983; Katz, Gartner, 1988; Stinchcombe, 1965; Aldrich, Zimmer, 1986), and cultural theories (Shapero, Sokol, 1982; Kilby, 1971).

Finally, the epistemological level can be seen as a meta-theoretical group of knowledge that combines several disciplinary contributions, and which has the goal of defining, modelling, classifying, and evaluating the field of entrepreneurship as a whole (Carland, Hoy, Boulton, Carland, 1984; Gartner, 1988; Carland, Hoy, Carland, 1988; Gartner, 1990; Vesper, 1980, 1990; Gartner, 1985; Carsrud, Olm, Eddy, 1988; Wortman, 1987; Low. MacMillan, 1988; and Bygrave, 1989a, 1989b).
Four main debates emerge from a serious analysis of these thirty most often cited contributions to entrepreneurship.

Debate No. 1: Does entrepreneurship regulate the demand for goods and services or does it simply supply these goods and services?

Debate No. 2: Does entrepreneurship imply people with definite personality traits or with skills that can be developed?

Debate No. 3: Is entrepreneurship determined by a certain socio-cultural context or can it vary according to the ability of each member of a society to perceive and act upon opportunities for social change?

Debate No. 4: Is entrepreneurship necessarily the phenomenon of adapting an existing organization to the competition or is it the creation of a new organization?

Armed with an understanding of the main debates that emerge from the field, can we find a group of teaching objectives that can be used to develop contents for entrepreneurship training? Table 2 presents a list of teaching objectives drawn from the four debates. In fact, the first debate (dealing with economics) between the regulation of demand and the development of the supply seems, on the one hand, to favour the knowledge of competitive forces in the industry in which one wishes to do business as well as its own dynamics, and on the other hand, to value the knowledge of the most effective development strategies in order to exploit a niche. In the second debate, psychological in nature, the chosen teaching objectives are to make known what an entrepreneur is and to introduce and perfect the technical skills (expertise) that will serve to offer quality goods and services.

Are there certain precise socio-cultural traits or skills that can be learned that will make it possible to discern and act on opportunities for change? The third debate, socio-cultural in nature, invites a knowledge of cultural forces that encourage or inhibit the spirit of enterprise in a region or country, and of the elements of the visionary process and its dynamics. Finally, in the fourth debate, organizational in nature, the idea of entrepreneurship as the emergence of a new organization is contrasted to entrepreneurship as adapting an existing organization to the competition. This contrast suggests two teaching objectives: knowing the stages of the creation of a business and knowing the rudiments of managing a small business and making it work.

Now that we have suggested three categories of general objectives (entrepreneurship awareness, creation and development of a small business) and eight teaching objectives, let us now go on to identify the specific objectives.
Table 2
Identification of Eight Teaching Objectives from the Debates on Entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the debates</th>
<th>Generic questions</th>
<th>Corresponding teaching objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic nature of entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Regulation of demand?</td>
<td>1. Know the industry’s competitive forces and its own dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of supply?</td>
<td>2. Know the most effective development strategies to exploit a niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological nature of entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Personality traits?</td>
<td>3. Know what an entrepreneur is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills to develop?</td>
<td>4. Know one or several elements of technical expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural nature of entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Socio-cultural traits?</td>
<td>5. Know the cultural forces that encourage or inhibit the spirit of enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to perceive and act on social change?</td>
<td>6. Know the elements of the visionary process and its dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational nature of entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Adaptation of the organization to competitive forces?</td>
<td>7. Know the rudiments of managing a small business and making it work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergence of a new organization?</td>
<td>8. Know the stages of creating a business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Defining Specific Objectives

The specific objectives represent the concrete dimension of the general and teaching objectives. According to Gibb (1988), Wyckham (1989), Gasse (1992), Ghosh, Block (1993), balance and diversity of knowledge are important characteristics of an entrepreneurship training program. Johannisson (1991) identifies five levels of learning for developing entrepreneurial skills: know why (attitudes, values, motivation), know how (abilities), know who (short and long term social abilities), know when (intuition), and know what (knowledge). Table 3 presents this taxonomical approach.
According to Legendre’s (1993) didactic cycle, a specific objective is divided into content objectives that Johannisson (1991) calls the know what, skill objectives that Johannisson (1991) calls the know how (abilities), the know who (long term social skills), and, finally, situational objectives identified by Johannisson (1991) as the know why, know when, and know who (short term social skills). This new breakdown of Johannisson’s (1991) taxonomy allows us to harmonize identified entrepreneurial abilities within a coherent conceptual framework, that is the didactic cycle.

4. The Didactic Model

What use can be made of the results thus obtained? To answer this question we must go back to the theoretical framework from which we started. First of all we identified three general objectives: entrepreneurship awareness and the creation and development of a small business. Then, for each of these general objectives, we found eight teaching objectives: knowing the competitive forces of the industry as well as its own dynamics; knowing the most effective development strategies for the exploitation of a product/market pair; knowing what an entrepreneur is; knowing one or several elements at the basis of technical expertise; knowing the cultural forces that encourage or inhibit the spirit of enterprise; knowing the rudiments of managing a small business and making it work; knowing the stages of creating a business. Finally, we suggested three specific objectives for each of these eight teaching objectives: content objectives, skill objectives, and situational objectives.
This leads us to suggest a didactic model for entrepreneurship training programs where the three categories of objectives are interrelated (Figure 2). We would like to illustrate this proposition. Within the framework of a program of business creation (general objective), the educator identifies the need to develop awareness of the industry's competitive forces and its own dynamics as a teaching objective. To reach this pedagogical target, the educator organizes his course around three specific objectives: understanding the elements that make up a market study (content objective); evaluating an existing market study (skill objective); transferring the information gathered from a market study to the student's personal project (situational objective). However, it could be reasonably advanced that for each teaching objective, there are any number of specific objectives, possibly quite different from those described above.

Now, let us see how the proposed didactic model fares with its first empirical test.

Methodology

In order to test the didactic model, we have analyzed training programs already indexed in the data bank of The International Management Development Network (INTERMAN) in the framework of an international project for the development of entrepreneurship. INTERMAN is an independent international association that brings together academic institutions, businesses, regional networks, economic promotion agencies, and many other organizations dedicated to management as a vital factor in the development of all countries.

Inspired by this mission, INTERMAN supports a multitude of initiatives such as the Inter-Regional Program for the Promotion of Entrepreneurship and Business Creation. Supervised by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and financed by the United Nations Development Fund (UNDP Project No. Int 87-029), this project attempts to facilitate international exchanges regarding the development of entrepreneurship and to suggest a series of training programs without imposing any one particular program.

The INTERMAN researchers have developed an exhaustive questionnaire to categorize entrepreneurship training efforts. First, they identified the leaders in the field of entrepreneurship. These leaders were then asked for information on their activities. Gathering this data made it possible to identify the institutions involved in this field and to describe the training programs that they offer. A total of 205 programs offered by 116 organizations in 40 different countries are gathered in a computerized data bank for consultation and research.

Within this secondary data bank, the question which interested us the most was "What are the training inputs of each program?" We analyzed the content of the themes given in response to this question, and we classified them by means of our didactic model.
Figure 2
Proposition of a didactic model in entrepreneurship

Teaching objectives
Results

Here are the results of the analysis of the INTERMAN 1991 secondary data bank. We are interested in finding the themes related to the general objectives, the teaching objectives, and the specific objectives of the entrepreneurship development programs.

1. The Search for General Objectives

All the respondents to this survey had to classify their training activities according to one of the three types of entrepreneurship development programs found in Table 4. Each of these types was clarified by themes that the respondent could check off (question A.13.b). Of the 205 entrepreneurship development programs, 67 were of Type I, 71 were of Type II, and 67 were of Type III. Unfortunately, the data base does not allow a breakdown of the themes.

Table 4
Frequency of General Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of programs</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I: related to entrepreneurship orientation and awareness programs</td>
<td>1. creating awareness</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. giving career orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II: related to new enterprises creation programs</td>
<td>3. self-employment</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. promoting first-generation entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. diversified sources of ownership of business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. rehabilitation of released civil servants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. employment creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. industrial development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. others (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III: related to existing entrepreneur programs for small business survival and growth</td>
<td>10. improving health of existing enterprises</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. growth-diversification-modernisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. others (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember that this classification was made by the respondents when filling out the questionnaire and all we have done is count the programs in each of the types.
2. The Search for Teaching Objectives

Next, we proceeded to analyze the content of the qualitative data that appeared under the headings marked "inputs" (question B.5 for Type I), "objectives" (question C.8 for Type II), and "program outline" (question D.2 for Type III) of the INTERMAN 1991 data bank. We thus identified 837 themes. This data was classified according to the eight teaching objectives defined in the didactic model. Table 5 presents the results of this analysis.

A careful examination of the numbers suggests that entrepreneurship awareness programs are more likely to target the elements of cultural forces and the entrepreneur as teaching objectives, and to ignore the elements of strategy and technical expertise. Programs dedicated to business creation are more likely to value management over strategies. Finally, the most outstanding teaching objectives of the programs dedicated to small business development are management and strategy while little attention is paid to the learning of technical skills, the stages of creation, and the analysis of competitive forces.

In summary, entrepreneurship awareness programs present an entrepreneurial logic, business creation programs are structured around a functional managerial logic, and, finally, small business development programs concentrate on a strategic managerial logic. It should be noted that there are twice as many objectives for business creation programs. This may be explained by the longer duration of these programs.

3. The Search for Specific Objectives

Although we were able to trace the teaching objectives by analyzing the 837 themes found in the data bank, classifying the specific objectives proved much more difficult. For example, how do you identify the three levels of specific objectives—content objectives, skill objectives, and situational objectives—in the teaching objective Competitive Forces? It is not possible to enumerate specific objectives using the INTERMAN 1991 data bank. Also, it is important to remember that an educator can find several specific objectives for each teaching objective, and that it is possible to have as many specific objectives as there are educators.

However, an analysis of the 73 themes classified under the teaching objective competitive forces shows that the most frequent specific objective is the theme market study. The 122 themes under the teaching objective entrepreneur suggests entrepreneurial skills as a specific objective. The 130 themes under the teaching objective cultural forces gives us the specific objective support systems. The teaching objective administration calls for the teaching of management. The 69 themes under the teaching objective strategy show growth to be the most frequent specific objective. Under the teaching objective technical expertise, 48 themes are directed mainly at career orientation. The teaching objective visionary process which has 81 themes leans towards business opportunity guidance. Finally, the 81 themes grouped under the teaching objective stages of creation are all oriented towards business plan as a specific objective.

Starting with the strong tendencies traced in the themes, Table 6 reconstructs a matrix of the specific objectives according to the teaching objectives. Each teaching objective is dissected into dominant specific objectives. The results of our content analysis reveals that
each specific objective is identified at least once in the data bank. Without enumerating them, we can say that each of the specific objectives found in the didactic model are represented.
### Table 5

**Distribution of the Themes According to the Didactic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching objectives</th>
<th>Competitive forces</th>
<th>Entrepreneur</th>
<th>Cultural forces</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Technical expertise</th>
<th>Visionary process</th>
<th>Stages of business creation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship awareness</td>
<td>11 (6.1%)</td>
<td>38 (21.1%)</td>
<td>50 (27.8%)</td>
<td>37 (20.6%)</td>
<td>6 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
<td>17 (9.4%)</td>
<td>18 (10%)</td>
<td>180 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business creation</td>
<td>57 (12%)</td>
<td>62 (13.1%)</td>
<td>73 (15.4%)</td>
<td>126 (26.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>44 (9.3%)</td>
<td>52 (10.9%)</td>
<td>61 (12.8%)</td>
<td>475 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business development</td>
<td>5 (2.7%)</td>
<td>22 (12.1%)</td>
<td>7 (3.85%)</td>
<td>70 (38.5%)</td>
<td>63 (34.6%)</td>
<td>1 (5.5%)</td>
<td>12 (6.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>182 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Matrix of Specific Objectives According to Teaching Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching objectives</th>
<th>Specific objectives</th>
<th>Competitive forces</th>
<th>The entrepreneur</th>
<th>Cultural forces</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Technical expertise</th>
<th>Visionary Process</th>
<th>Stages of business creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content objectives</td>
<td>Understanding the elements that make up a market study</td>
<td>Understanding the characteristics of an entrepreneur</td>
<td>Understanding the socio-cultural factors that encourage or limit the spirit of enterprise</td>
<td>Understanding the rudiments of managing a small business</td>
<td>Explaining the different technical skills that can lead to a trade</td>
<td>Understanding the identification stages of a business idea</td>
<td>Understanding the elements that make up a business plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill objectives</td>
<td>Evaluating an already constructed market study</td>
<td>Identifying the main skills in a successful entrepreneur</td>
<td>Identifying a country’s entrepreneurship support systems</td>
<td>Applying knowledge of management to solve a problem, real or simulated</td>
<td>Making a strategic analysis of successful small business</td>
<td>Doing an internship in a business to appreciate different technical skills</td>
<td>Identifying several business opportunities in different industries</td>
<td>Evaluating a business plan that is already constructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational objectives</td>
<td>Transferring knowledge gained from a market study to a personal project</td>
<td>Making an assessment of each individual’s entrepreneurial potential</td>
<td>Making contact with the support groups that are directly related to the personal project</td>
<td>Transferring knowledge of managing a small business to the personal project</td>
<td>Developing a strategy that is consistent with the personal project</td>
<td>Developing a technique that will be the operational basis of the personal project</td>
<td>Exploiting a business opportunity that is consistent with the individual visionary process</td>
<td>Developing a business plan to describe the personal project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

In light of these results, what can be said about the proposed didactic model? Can it capture the reality of entrepreneurship training objectives?

As regards the general objectives, the didactic model and the data bank were structured around the same definitions: awareness objectives, creation objectives, and small business development. The results show programs in all three categories. This leads us to believe that this classification makes sense and confirms the INTERMAN 1991 study.

However, the data bank is confused when it comes to the teaching and specific objectives. The respondents interchanged teaching objectives and specific objectives without taking into account their conceptual level. The didactic model seems to shed some light on the situation. From the eight teaching objectives stemming from the great debates in entrepreneurship literature, we were able to classify all the objectives listed under questions C.8 and D.2. There again, the didactic model proved useful for categorizing all the objectives. In other words, the study of the key contributions most often cited in entrepreneurship seem to have been successful.

The task is more difficult when it comes to the specific objectives. Although it was impossible to enumerate them exactly, we were able to discern the major trends and to propose a matrix of specific objectives that is representative of each of the themes in the data bank. Remember that in 1991 Johannisson was able to trace the specific knowledge useful for the development of entrepreneurial skills from in-depth interviews with entrepreneurs. Along the same lines, he would have had to interview educators to obtain the details of the specific objectives that vary according to the clients and their projects.

In summary, this research was designed to test a didactic model for the analysis of the objectives of entrepreneurship training. The results present three categories of objectives: general objectives, teaching objectives, and specific objectives. For the general objectives, the model identifies three types of entrepreneurship development programs: PED awareness (entrepreneurial logic), business creation PED (managerial and functional logic), and small business development PED (strategic managerial logic). We have also enumerated eight teaching objectives: competitive forces, the entrepreneur, the context, administration, strategy, the technical trade, the visionary process, and the stages of creation. Finally, an analysis of the main trends of the specific objectives suggests the use of the following methods: market studies, entrepreneurial skills, support systems, management, growth strategies, technical orientation, the discovery of ideas, and the business plan.

We suggest keeping this didactic model for further research into entrepreneurship and education. In our opinion, it can be useful not only to classify entrepreneurship development programs but also to evaluate their quality and effectiveness.
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