Demographic Variables and Teachers' Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy: Analyzing the Effect on Public and Private School Teachers

Dr. Uzma Munawar
Assistant Professor, Department of Education
Govt Sadiq College Women University
Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan
druzmamunawar@gmail.com

Dr. Syed Zubair Haider
Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Training
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
zubairiub@hotmail.com

Dr. Syeda Sidra Nosheen
Lecturer, Department of Educational Training
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
sidra.nosheen@ymail.com

Abstract
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficiency (ESE) is articulated as being necessary for a person to be a successful businessman because the solution to unemployment issues is expected to be entrepreneurship.Self-Efficacy is a fundamentallyessentialcomponent of entrepreneurial psychological studies and it is also incorporated into model entrepreneurship plans to understand that specific individual becomes entrepreneurs more likely than others. Hence, the present research aims to analyze the influence of demographic variables on the ESE of public and private school teachers in South Punjab. Data was obtained from 1436 teachers who had been conveniently selected from public and private schools. The findings indicated a substantial difference between public and private teachers in terms of ESE. Moreover, teachers' job status and monthly income emerged as the main predictors of teachers' ESE. The article ends by suggesting that further research should explore different other predictors and various facets of entrepreneurship as well as the views and expectations of teachers and their importance in entrepreneurship education

Keywords: *Public Teachers, Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, Primary, Elementary, Secondary, Demographic Variables, Private Teachers*

1. Introduction

Pakistan's unemployment is a quiet and collective crisis. People are planning to seek higher education to fulfill their needs. Unfortunately, after completing their higher education, most people have minimaljob opportunities. Higher education institutions (HEIs) should fulfill their responsibilities to provide such courses that prepare individuals for unemployment problems (WEF, 2009). The institutions of higher education should train their students in such a manner that they can get their jobs and make them skilled enough to work with otherscomfortably. Enterprise is almost generally known regarding its growth position and has led to an interest in exploring the values of entrepreneurship and socio-economic growth

skills (Matlay, Abaho, Olomi, &Urassa, 2015). Entrepreneurship is dynamic for a stable economy, and innovation is the secret to a sustainable future globally. It is an evolving phenomenon for financial gain and job growth for others. It transmits a chain of rewards to the nations because job prospects for individuals and savings in the native budget will improve with creating new organizations (Kongolo, 2010). Entrepreneurship is a relatively new academic area that Shigeru Fijii initiated at Kobe University in Japan in 1938 (McMullan and Long, 1987). Entrepreneurship is defined by Alberti, Sciascia, and Poli (2004) as a method of creating something fresh in the distribution of time, energy, and money required to devise an extra-economic, supernatural and social threat, and by obtaining the requisite incentives for self-pleasure and self-government. Pihie and Bagheri (2011)concluded that a successful entrepreneur consistently creates and assembles the expected costs, just about as blatant a chance. Various studies have found that entrepreneurship trends depend on several variables, such as facilitating, creative, adaptive, innovative, self-effective and risk-taking calculations, etc. These features make an entrepreneur competitive in the economy.

Many scholars have extended the idea of self-efficacy in the social sciences. It was created to explain human behaviour by Bandura (1969). Leadership and intellectual self-efficacy are notable areas where this principle has been applied (McCormick, 2001). Bandura (1977) defines that self-efficacy is a perceived ability of an individual to perform a given task.The ESE is very significant in entrepreneurship among the different characteristics of entrepreneurs. In terms of its propensity, the self-efficacy character is a match for the investigation of business enterprise. Self-efficacy and job preference are well known in the job theory literature of entrepreneurship concerning its attributes and characteristics (Gibb, 2007). It is a potential for career selection, professional focus, and commitment to individual achievement in complex fields. Therefore, people with a high degree of self-efficacy attribute their actions to their abilities, not external circumstances and powers. In avenues such as schooling, where learning promotes trust-building, socialization can be used as a backdrop of self-efficacy (Howorth, Smith, & Parkinson, 2012). Self-efficacy or confidence in an individual's possibility to do anything as an entrepreneur seems necessary because it is aninspiring challenge to establish an opportunity, collect money, set up a company, and develop it into a thriving unit (Rotter, 1966; Bandura, 1990).

Scholars argue that ESE is a growing catalyst for development in work and industry primarily through business start-ups and growth. Matlay, Jones, and Colwill (2013) explain ESE's concept as determining a person's confidence in his or her abilities with the required knowledge needed to pursue a new market perspective. Usually, we provoked our lives of apparent self-efficacy, and our convictions have a severe impact on our mental state and behaviours(Mitchell & Shepherd, 2010). The findings of several studies have shown that people with elevated self-efficacy are more likely to try to persevere in this struggle with a given mission. The self-efficacy realm is valid and varies between tasks and circumstances (Hallak, Lindsay, & Brown, 2011) as an individual has low self-efficacy in one area and high self-efficacy in the other (Bandura, 1997).

In comparison to other personality characteristics, ESE is not often affected by similar features such as gender, family history, source of income, human society, schooling, and past experience (Miao, Qian, & Ma, 2016).Some valuable insights into the influence of relevant variables are given in the literature. Neri, Torres, and Watson (2013) examined parental control and job experience as essential predictors of ESE and school students' motivations in early work. Herathand Mahmood (2014) defined the importance of socio-cultural variables and shown that entrepreneurs' social status could be expected as a start-up function. Hmieleski and Baron (2008) explored the differences in the attitudes of school students towards venture development. The study revealed that each nation's extraordinary social

conditions should offer changed entrepreneurship education to adoptive entrepreneurship. The research by Setiawan (2012) found that the presence and motivation of entrepreneurs from the community affected the ESE of school students. Cooper and Lucas (2006) research confirmed the attractiveness, ability, and intentionality of entrepreneurship based on students' gender and entrepreneurial experience. The participants were sufficiently aware of their attraction to entrepreneurship, their perceptions of opportunities were not favorable, and their intentions were also relatively low. The influence of both internal characteristics (motivation and self-efficacy) and external features (perceived level of schooling, opportunities, and support) on the entrepreneurial pattern of school students were also established by (Turker&Selcuk, 2009). Two internal characteristics and the declared standard of the provision were statistically essential. In their analysis, Pamell, Crandall, and Menefee (1995) compared the entrepreneurship patterns among American and Egyptian school students. The market pattern was focused on self-efficacy, perceived degree of schooling, and perceived opportunities. The analysis showed that the entrepreneurship pattern among American students remains higher than that of Egyptian students. These studies have shown that psychological, cultural, job experience, and inspiration influence students' ESEthrough education.

Thoughtful education increases student self-efficacy. It provides students with behaviours, data, and abilities to adjust dynamic tasks to chase, accumulate assets, and push the achievement challenge (Pihie& Bagheri, 2011). Education increases students' self-efficacy through understanding authority, external power, assisting them in constructive learning activities, performance development techniques, and running an open private scheme (Pittaway& Hannon, 2008). Business school is also beneficial for students to build ESE and student aspirations to start their own unique business (Pajares&Urdan, 2006). Wilson, Kickul and Marlino (2007) argued that entrepreneurship education focuses not only on technological aspects of entrepreneurship but also on students' self-confidence to become entrepreneurs. Enhancing students' entrepreneurial productivity helps them make further contributions over a longer span of time, keep on to challenges, and build arrangements to attain higher entrepreneurial targets (Adedoyin, 2010). Community and business schools are expected to serve as the foundation of developing students' ESE through adequate direction, teaching, facilitation, and realistic work. This research investigates the effect of demographic variables on ESE of school teachers, both public and private, in South Punjab, consideringESE's value.

2. Methodology

In this study, a descriptive research design was found to be acceptable, bearing in mind the essence of the analysis (Haider & Qureshi, 2016). The survey research was the most appropriate type of descriptive research for drawing accurate outcomes among various descriptive analysis. It is widely used to gather data ranging from physical numbers and frequencies to states of mind and emotions. The primary source of data collection for a survey is the questionnaire and interview (Haider & Hussain, 2014). However, in this study, the data was obtained by ESE Scale.

2.1. Population and Sample

The study population consisted of public and private school teachers of all categories (primary, elementary, and secondary). To enhance the study's external validity and minimize biases in the research, which may cause due to the selection of respondents from a single institution, 1436 school teachers (male = 718 and female = 718) were conveniently selected from the sample schools. Out of 718 male teachers, 359 (50%) were from public schools, and 359 (50%) were from private schools. Similarly, out of 718 female teachers, 359 were from public schools, and 359 were from private schools. Moreover, in 359 male teachers from public schools, 100were primary (28%), 121 were elementary (34%), and 138 were secondary

(38%) school teachers. Likewise, in 359 female teachers from public schools, 100 were primary (28%), 121 were elementary (34%), and 138 were secondary (38%) school teachers. These teachers were selected from 06 tehsils (Vehari, Dunyapur, Multan, Bahawalpur, Rajanpur, and Khanpur). Due to vigorous follow-up, the response rate of participants was 100%.

Table 1.Description of School Teachers

		Public		Private	
	Category	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender	Men	359	50.0	359	50.0
	Women	359	50.0	359	50.0
Teacher's Locality	Urban	428	59.6	556	77.4
	Rural	290	40.4	162	22.6
Job Status	Permanent	396	55.2	126	17.5
	Contractual	322	44.8	592	82.5
Teacher's Age	16-25 Years	116	16.2	274	38.2
	26-38 Years	448	62.4	372	51.8
	39-50 Years	94	13.1	58	8.1
	51-60 Years	60	8.4	14	1.9
Teacher's Experience	0-6 Years	178	24.8	266	37.0
	7-14 Years	386	53.8	338	47.1
	15-25 Years	122	17.0	100	13.9
	26-45 Years	32	4.5	14	1.9
Teacher's Monthly Income	0-4000	0	0.0	228	31.8
	4100-10000	0	0.0	292	40.7
	11000-60000	574	79.9	176	24.5
	Above 60000	144	20.1	22	3.1
Academic Qualification	FA/F.Sc.	0	0.0	268	37.3
	BA/B.Sc.	196	27.3	284	39.6
	MA/M.Sc.	422	58.8	150	20.9
	M.Phil	88	12.3	16	2.2
	PhD	12	1.7	0	0.0
Professional Qualification	No	110	15.3	146	20.3
	B.Ed.	492	68.5	422	58.8
	M.Ed.	116	16.2	150	20.9

It is evident from the collected data that 50% of respondents were from the public, and 50% were from private institutions (see Table 1). So public and private teachers were equal in number. In the public data set, 59.6% of teachers were from urban areas, and 40.6% were from rural areas. In the private data set, 77.4% of teachers were from urban areas, and 22.6% were from rural areas. More teachers were from urban areas in the private data set because private schools are more likely in cities than in remote or village areas.

Moreover, 55.2% of public teachers reported their job status as permanent teachers, and 44.8% were on a contract basis. However, only 17.5% of private teachers reported their job status as permanent, and 82.5% were on contract. So, most private teachers said that they are on contract and need job security.

Furthermore, 16.2% of public teachers reported their age range from 16-25 years, 62.4% were from 26-38 years, 13.1% were from 39-50 years, and 8.4% were from 51 to 60. While 38.2% of private teachers reported their age range from 16-25 years, 51.8% were from 26-38 years, 8.1% were from 39-50 years, and 1.9% only were within the age range of 51-60 years in private schools. Similarly, regarding teachers' experience, the data reveals that in public teachers, 24.8% have experience range from 0-6 years, 53.8% were from 7-14 years, 17% from 15-25 years, and 4.5% from 26-45 years. Likewise, in private teachers, 37% of teachers having experience 0-6 years, 47.1% have experience range from 7-14 years, 13.9% were experience range from 15-25 years, and 1.9% were from 26-45 years. Public teachers' monthly income data revealed that 79.9 % reported their monthly income from 11000-60000, and 20.1% said their income more than 60000. While in private data set, it is clear that 31.8% of teachers reported their income from 0-4000, 40.7% reported their income from 4100-10000, 24.5% of teachers said their monthly income 11000-60000 and only 3.1% reported their income more than 60000.

The data related to teachers' academic and professional qualifications manifested that 27.3% of public teachers were bachelor degree holders, 58.8% were master's degree holders, 12.3% were master of philosophy in their subjects, and only 1.7% were doctors of philosophy in public school teachers. However, in private school, 37.3% of teachers were faculty of arts or science, 39.6% holding bachelor degrees, 20.9% having master degrees in their specialization subjects, and 2.2% were master of philosophy in their area of specialization. Moreover, 15.3% of public teachers reported that they have no professional qualification, 68.5% reported their professional qualification as B.Ed, and 16.2% were M.Ed. Nevertheless, in the private teachers' data set, 20.3% of teachers said they have no professional qualification, 58.8% reported that they were B.Ed degree holders, and 20.9% were M.Ed degree holder.

2.2. Measures

De Nobel, Jung, and Ehrlich (1999) Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Scale (ESE) were utilized in this study to measure teachers' responses regarding ESE. The scale was modified according to study requirements after getting authors' permission. The original scale was based on 06 factors and 23 statements. However, in our study, we reduced the statements and factors, and only those statements and dimensions were retained that were more relevant to our study. Based on critical need assessment, five items (3, 8, 9, 17, 20, 28) and one dimension,'initiating investor relationship,' were removed from the scale to make it more easy and understandable for respondents. So, the final ESE scale was comprised of 17 statements and five facets. First factor, creating market opportunities was measured by 04 questions (public $\alpha = 0.88$, private $\alpha = 0.91$), second factor, establishing innovative environment was measured by 04 questions (public $\alpha = 0.87$, private $\alpha = 0.83$), third factor, defining core purpose was measured by 03 questions (public $\alpha = 0.93$, private $\alpha = 0.92$), fourth factor, coping with unexpected challenges was assessed by 03 questions (public $\alpha = 0.783$, private $\alpha = 0.83$), fifth and last factor, developing human resource was assessed by 03 questions (public $\alpha = 0.90$, private $\alpha = 0.94$), respectively. Moreover, a 5-point Likert scale was used to access teachers' responses,with one indicating "strongly disagree" and 5 indicating "strongly agree". For measuring responses, the scale was administered in Urdu, with questions first translated into Urdu and then back-translated to English to minimize the possibility of meaning lost. The overall Cronbach's alpha reliability of the scale was .893 in this study.

3. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, ANOVA, and regression.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Scale

	Public		Private	
Items	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Creating Market Opportunities				
I see new growth prospects for my business	3.24	0.54	4.56	0.89
For potential development, I can recognize new areas	3.91	0.63	4.89	0.69
I can form products to suit the needs of consumers	4.05	0.74	3.98	0.79
I can sell product ideas on time	3.64	0.71	4.12	0.88
Average	3.71	0.66	4.39	0.81
Establishing Innovating Environment				
I can create a workplace atmosphere that encourages people	3.87	0.66	4.29	0.88
I can create a work climate that inspires individuals to pursue something different	3.69	0.49	4.77	1.23
I can encourage people, regardless of the outcome, to take initiatives	3.54	0.87	4.36	0.81
I can form collaborations or alliances with others	4.69	0.83	3.81	0.69
Average	3.95	0.71	4.31	0.90
Defining Core Purpose				
I can express the mission and ideals of the organization	3.69	0.87	3.98	0.69
I can urge people to embrace the mission and values of the organization	4.18	0.91	3.41	0.87
I can formulate a sequence of actions in search of possibilities	4.39	0.82	3.62	0.88
Average	4.09	0.87	3.67	0.81
Coping with Unexpected Challenges				
Under constant tension and confrontation, I can work productively	4.15	0.79	4.36	0.84
I can handle sudden shifts in terms of market	3.62	0.53	4.28	0.82
In the face of hardship, I can persist	3.13	0.68	3.56	0.73
Average	3.63	0.67	4.07	0.80
Developing Human Resources				
I can hire key workers and educate them	3.95	0.68	4.11	0.88
I can create contingency plans for backfilling key personnel	3.86	0.91	4.36	0.67
I can identify management teams and develop them.	4.62	0.89	3.95	0.84
Average	4.14	0.83	4.14	0.80

The descriptive statistics of ESE's facets were presented in Table 2. In the first dimension, the high average value of (M = 4.39, SD = 0.81) of private school teachers (primary, elementary and secondary) as compared to public school teachers (M = 3.71, SD = 0.66) manifest clearly

that private teachers have more ESE regarding creating market opportunities. Similarly, in second dimension, private teachers have again high average value (*M* = 4.31, *SD* = 0.90) as compared to public school teachers (*M* = 3.95, *SD* = 0.71) regarding establishing an innovating environment. However, in the third dimension, the high mean value of public teachers (*M* = 4.09, *SD* = 0.87) undoubtedly demonstrates that they have more ESE regarding defining core purpose than private teachers (*M* = 3.67, *SD* = 0.81). Nevertheless, in fourth dimension, private teachers again showing high mean value (*M* = 4.07, *SD* = 0.80) in coping with unexpected challenges as compared to public teachers (*M* = 3.63, *SD* = 0.67). Surprisingly, in the fifth and last dimension, private teachers and public teachers have equal average value for the public (*M* = 4.14, *SD* = 0.83) and private (*M* = 4.14, *SD* = 0.80) school teachers in developing human resources.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix among Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

	1	2	3	4	5
Public					
Creating Market Opportunities	–				
Establishing Innovating Environment	.61**	–			
Defining Core Purpose	.43**	.74**	–		
Coping with Unexpected Challenges	.37	.29*	.79**	–	
Developing Human Resources	.34*	.68**	.59**	.46**	–
Private					
Creating Market Opportunities	–				
Establishing Innovating Environment	.78**	–			
Defining Core Purpose	.73**	.91**	–		
Coping with Unexpected Challenges	.59**	.71**	.63*	–	
Developing Human Resources	.33	.48**	.75**	.55**	–

*p < .05. **p < .01

The correlation matrix among the facets of ESE of both public and private teachers demonstrates low, moderate and high level of relationship (See Table 3). The first dimension, creating market opportunities moderately correlate with establishing innovating environment *r* = .61, *p*< .01 and defining core purpose *r* = .43, *p*< .01. while it has low association with developing human resources *r* = .34, *p*< .05. Likewise, establishing innovating environment has high correlation with defining core purpose *r* = .74, *p*< .01, moderate association with developing human resources *r* = .68, *p*< .01 and low relationship with coping with unexpected challenges *r* = .29, *p*< .05. similarly, defining core purpose highly correlate with coping unexpected challenges *r* = .79, *p*< .01 and moderately correlate with developing human resources *r* = .59, *p*< .01. whereas, coping with unexpected challenges has moderate correlation with developing human resources *r* = .46, *p*< .01 in public teachers.

Similar to above pattern may also be observed in private teachers' data set. The first dimension, creating market opportunities highly correlate with establishing innovating environment *r* = .78, *p*< .01 and defining core purpose *r* = .73, *p*< .01, while moderately correlated with coping with unexpected challenges *r* = .59, *p*< .01. Parallel to first dimension,

the second dimension, establishing innovating environment also has high association with defining core purpose $r = .91$, $p < .01$ and coping with unexpected challenges $r = .71$, $p < .01$, whereas, moderate association with developing human resources $r = .48$, $p < .01$. Alike first two dimensions, defining core purpose also has high relationship with developing human resources $r = .75$, $p < .01$ and moderate correlation with coping with unexpected challenges $r = .63$, $p < .05$. moreover, coping with unexpected challenges also has moderate association with developing human resources $r = .55$, $p < .01$.

Table 4.Effect of Public Teachers' Demographic Variables on their Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

Demographic Variables	Model 1 Creating Market Opportunities	Model 2 Establish Innovating Environment	Model 3 Defining Core Purpose	Model 4 Coping Unexpected Challenge	Model 5 Developing Human Resources	Model 6 Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy
Gender	0.637	0.189	1.631	0.421	0.341	0.228
Teachers' Locality	0.319	–.096	0.219	1.119	0.618	0.517
Job Status	0.779**	0.623**	0.596**	0.667**	0.514*	0.688**
Teachers' Age	0.241	0.317*	0.419*	0.632*	0.119	0.329
Teachers' Experience	–.311	–.339	0.559*	0.379*	0.266*	0.548
Teachers' Income	0.661**	0.728**	0.396*	0.827**	0.497*	0.681**
Academic Qua.	0.196	0.619	0.186	0.417	0.067	0.329
Professional Qua.	–.039	–.182	0.121	0.028	0.473	0.547
F	11.637**	7.667***	13.553***	12.455***	10.391***	14.572***
R^2	.319**	.149**	.347**	.189**	.281**	.408**

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to measure the impact of public teachers' demographic variables on their ESE(see Table 4). As a result, we observed the significant effect of some variables on teachers' ESE in public schools' data set. In first model, 31.9% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE ($R^2 = .319$, $F(8, 1427) = 11.637$, $p < .01$) in the first dimension of creating market opportunities. In second model, 14.9% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE ($R^2 = .149$, $F(8, 1427) = 7.667$, $p < .000$) in the second dimension of establishing innovating environment. In third model, 34.7% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE ($R^2 = .347$, $F(8, 1427) = 13.553$, $p < .000$) in the third dimension of defining core purpose.

In fourth model, 18.9% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE ($R^2 = .189$, $F(8, 1427) = 12.455$, $p < .000$) in the fourth dimension of coping unexpected challenges. In fifth model, 28.1% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE ($R^2 = .281$, $F(8, 1427) = 10.391$, $p < .000$) in the fifth dimension of developing human resources. In the last model, the effect of demographic variables wasnoted on teachers'

ESE in public schools. The results revealed that 40.8% variance was explained by independent variables on teachers' ESE (R^2 = .408, F(8, 1427) = 14.572, p < .000). Finally, only two variables teachers' job status and teachers' income, evolved as ESE's main predictors. One unit increase in teachers' job status will cause (β = .688, p < .01) 68.8% increase in teachers' ESE and one unit increase in teachers' monthly income will cause (β = .681, p < .05) 68.1% increase in public teachers' ESE.

Table 5. Effect of Private Teachers' Demographic Variables on their Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

Demographic Variables	Model 1 Creating Market Opportunities	Model 2 Establish Innovating Environment	Model 3 Defining Core Purpose	Model 4 Coping Unexpected Challenge	Model 5 Developing Human Resources	Model 6 Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy
Gender	0.573	0.271	0.117	0.122	0.214	0.318
Teachers' Locality	0.491	0.361	0.321	0.147	0.369	0.229
Job Status	0.649*	0.713**	0.689**	0.149	0.217*	0.549**
Teachers' Age	0.183*	0.129	0.261	0.223	0.298	0.217
Teachers' Experience	0.229	0.371*	0.551	0.189	0.367	0.361
Teachers' Income	0.559**	0.588**	0.418**	0.219*	0.518**	0.587**
Academic Qua.	0.179	0.251	0.341	0.147	0.291	0.741
Professional Qua.	0.542	0.329	0.418	0.551	0.369	0.668
F	7.661***	9.849***	10.281**	8.552***	11.201***	12.458***
R^2	.081*	.287**	.473**	.076**	.311**	.367**

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

For measuring the impact of private teachers' demographic variables on their ESE, multiple regression analysis was conducted (see Table 5). We observed the significant effect of some variables on teachers' ESE in private teachers' data set in results. In first model, 8.1% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE (R^2 = .081, F(8, 1427) = 7.661, p < .000) in the first dimension of creating market opportunities. In second model, 28.7% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE (R^2 = 28.7, F(8, 1427) = 9.849, p < .000) in the second dimension of establishing innovating environment. In third model, 47.3% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE (R^2 = .473, F(8, 1427) = 10.281, p < .000) in the third dimension of defining core purpose.

In fourth model, 7.6% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE (R^2 = .076, F(8, 1427) = 8.552, p < .000) in the fourth dimension of coping unexpected challenges. In fifth model, 31.1% variance was explained by teachers' demographics in teachers' ESE (R^2 = .311, F(8, 1427) = 11.201, p < .000) in the fifth dimension of developing human resources. In the last model, the effect of demographic variables was observed on teachers' ESE in private schools. The results revealed that 36.7% variance was explained by

independent variables on teachers' ESE (R^2 = .367, $F(8, 1427) = 12.458$, $p < .000$). Finally, only two variables teachers' job status and teachers' income, evolved as the main predictors of ESE. One unit increase in teachers' job status will cause (β = .549, $p < .01$) 54.9% increase in teachers' ESE and one unit increase in teachers' monthly income will cause (β = .587, $p <$ .05) 58.7% increase in private teachers' ESE.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this review, the analytical evidence related to determinants of ESE has been discussed. This thesis has scientific as well as political ramifications. It is the first inclusive research in South Punjab that covers the determinants of ESE among public and private school teachers. The school teachers and students of universities must play a role in implementing government initiatives to promote the culture of entrepreneurship in South Punjab. Before introducing it to creating companies, they must provide a thorough grasp of the theory. ESE experiments have typically explored the interpersonal facets of the job. The ESE plays an essential role in determining students' ambitions, which are determined by their confidence and desire to develop a sustainable vision for the entrepreneurial practices they undertake. Their determination and success impact the degree of self-efficacy of teachers. Teachers' self-efficacy has been one of education's key priority because teachers play a prominent part in the overall teaching and learning process (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

The results' review shows a variety of significant observations and uncovers the developmental measures for future advancement in the field concerned. In present study, on the basis of overall average mean values of teachers' responses, anyone can easily conclude that private teachers have more propensity towards ESE as compared to public teachers, and one single reason for this could be due to low level of job satisfaction and availability of fewer perks and privileges that private teachers are enjoying. Another main factor could be private teachers' salaries, as they are less salaried classes, especially in South Punjab. Moreover, a small number of famous private institutions found in remote areas or side areas of cities, and private schools in these areas are mostly opened by the local individuals without fair labour laws. So, they offered a very minimum salary to their employees. However, in contrast to the public sector, they provide handsome wages to all their teachers even if they worked in city schools or village schools. So, this differentiation and disparity among public and private teachers' monetary benefits motivate the private teachers and enhance their ESE to start their own business.

Scherer, Brodzinski, and Wiebe (1990) reported a substantial variation regarding gender in ESE in earlier studies. In their research, they claimed that men have a higher level of ESE as compared to women. However, the study results conducted by Sequeira, McGee, and Mueller (2005) reported no significant difference between males and females regarding ESE. Similarly, Zhao, Seibert, and Hills (2005) also described no significant difference on the basis of gender. They illustrated that in their study, they found no significant difference between males and females regarding ESE. Likewise, our research results also did not contradict previous researchin terms of gender effect and presented no substantial difference between male and female teachers regarding ESE.

Self-efficiency also has a significant effect on instructor actions and success in the execution of instructions, such as recognizing student interests, applying a variety of student-centered and creative instructional strategies, making more effort to educate challenging and unmotivated students, and considering student errors as part of the learning experience (Pihie& Bagheri, 2011). The study conducted by Mueller and Dato-On (2008) on ESE also supported our results. They conducted their research on master of business administration students and reported no significant difference in boys' and girls' students in ESE. So, based on most studies, supporting our results, we can conclude that gender is not the main predictor

of ESE among teachers in public and private teachers' in South Punjab. Similarly, other than gender, four more demographic variables, such as teachers' age, teachers' experience, academic qualification, and professional qualification, also emerged as non-significant in public and private teachers' data set in all models. Only in a few models of public and private teachers' ESE, teachers' age and experience emerged as small contributors. However, in overall results, their influence was found negligible.

For analyzing the overall effect of demographic variables on teachers' ESE, multiple regression was conducted. Its results revealed that only two demographic variables significantly affectboth public and private teachers' ESE out of a total of eight variables. In all the models, teachers' job status and monthly income remained the most influential predictor among public and private teachersto foster entrepreneurial self-efficacy. The overall results showed that a one-unit rise in teachers' job status would rise by 68.8 percent in public and 54.9 percent in private teachers' ESE.So, it is very clear from these results that job status motivates teachers to think about entrepreneurship or starting their own business. The results also revealed that contractual teachers are shown more inclination towards entrepreneurship than public teachers, and more ESE was found in them.

Similarly, the other significant variable was teachers' monthly income, and one unit rise in teachers' monthly payment will also trigger 68.1 percent in public and 58.7 percent in private teachers' ESE. The ESE is not a cure, but it is a single aspect of the multifaceted entrepreneurial decision and achievement procedure. Nonetheless, it is a personal attribute that shows signs of being distinctive to the prospective and actual entrepreneur. Using this framework in science, analysis, counseling, science, schooling, and group engagement models will make it simpler to properly understand entrepreneurial acts and provide us with some extra power to perceive imminent entrepreneurial certainty.

References

Adedoyin O. O. (2010). Factor-analytic study of teachers' perceptions on self-efficacy in Botswana junior secondary schools: Implications for educational quality. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, *2*(2), 139-155

Alberti, F., Sciascia, S., & Poli, A. (2004). *Entrepreneurship education: notes on an ongoing debate.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 14th Annual International Entrepreneurship Conference International Entrepreneurship, University of Napoli, July 4-7, Napoli Federico II, Italy.

Bandura, A. (1969). *Social-learning theory of identificatory processes*, in Goslin, D.A. (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, Rand-McNally, Chicago, IL, pp. 213-262

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *Applied Sport Psychology*, *2*(2), 128-163. doi: 10.1080/10413209008406426

Bandura. A. (1997). *Self Efficacy. the Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and company

Cooper, S.Y. and Lucas, W.A. (2006). *Enhancing Self-efficacy for entrepreneurship and innovation: An educational approach*. Brill Sense. 79-98. doi.org/10.1163/9789087903671_006

Gibb, A.A. (2007). Entrepreneurship: unique solutions for unique environments. Is it possible to achieve this with the existing paradigm?. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education,5*(5), 93-142.

Haider, S. Z., & Hussain, A. (2014). Relationship between teacher factors and student achievement: A correlational study of secondary schools. *US-China Education Review A, 4*(7), 465-480.

Haider, S. Z.,& Qureshi, A. (2016). Are All Children Equal? Causative Factors of Child Labour in Selected Districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research (NAER Journal), 5*(1), 3-10. University of Alicante. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/171372/

Hallak, R., Lindsay, N. J., & Brown, G. (2011). Examining the role of entrepreneurial experience and entrepreneurial self-efficacy on SMTE performance. *Tourism Analysis, 16*(5), 583–599.doi.org/10.3727/108354211X13202764960744

Herath, H. M. A., & Mahmood, R. (2014). Dimensions of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and firm performance. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: An Administration and Management, 14*(4), 23-30.

Hmieleski, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (2008). When does entrepreneurial self-efficacy enhance versus reduce firm performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 2*(1), 57–72. doi.org/10.1002/sej.42

Howorth, C., Smith, S. M., & Parkinson, C. (2012). Social learning and social entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(3), 371-389.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2011.0022

Kongolo, M. (2010). Job creation versus job shedding and the role of SMEs in economic development. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(11), 2288-2295.doi.org/10.5897/AJBM.9000376

Matlay, H., Abaho, E., Olomi, D. R., & Urassa, G. C. (2015). Students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy: does the teaching method matter? *Education + Training, 57*(8/9), 908-923. doi: 10.1108/ET-02-2014-0008

Matlay, H., Jones, P., & Colwill, A. (2013). Entrepreneurship education: an evaluation of the Young Enterprise Wales initiative. *Education + Training, 55*(8/9), 911-925. doi.org/10.1108/ET-04-2013-0052

McCormick, M.J. (2001). Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: Applying social cognitive theory to leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 8* (11), 22-33. doi.org/10.1177/107179190100800102

McMullan, W.E. and Long, W.A. (1987). Entrepreneurship education in the nineties. *Journal of Business Venturing, 2*(3), 261-275.doi.org/10.1177/107179190100800102

Miao, C., Qian, S., & Ma, D. (2016). The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Firm Performance: A Meta-Analysis of Main and Moderator Effects. *Journal of Small Business Management, 55*(1), 87–107. doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12240

Mitchell, J. R., & Shepherd, D. A. (2010). To thine own self be true: Images of self, images of opportunity, and entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing, 25*(1), 138–154. http://doi. org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.08.00

Mueller, S. L., & Dato-On, M. C. (2008). Gender-role orientation as a determinant of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Journal of developmental Entrepreneurship, 13*(1), 3-20. doi.org/10.1142/S108494670800082X

Neri Torres, J. L., & Watson, W. (2013). An examination of the relationship between manager self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions andperformance in mexican small businesses. *Contaduría Y Administración, 58*(3), 65–87. doi.org/10.1016/S0186-1042(13)71222-1

Pajares, F., &Urdan, T. (2006). Foreword. In F. Pajares&T.Urdan (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. Ix-xii). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing

Pamell, J., Crandall, W., & Menefee, M. (1995). Examining the impact of culture on entrepreneurial propensity: An empirical study of prospective American and Egyptian entrepreneurs. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 7*(1), 39-52

Pihie, Z. A. L., & Bagheri, A. (2011). Teachers' and students' entrepreneurial self-efficacy: Implication for effective teaching practices. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1071-1080. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.340

Pihie, Z. L., & Bagheri, A. (2011). Malay secondary school students' entrepreneurial attitude orientation and entrepreneurial self-efficacy: A descriptive study. *Journal of Applied Sciences, 11*(2), 316-322.

Pittaway, L., & Hannon, P. (2008). Institutional strategies for developing enterprise education: A review of some concepts and models. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15*(1), 202-226. doi.org/10.1108/14626000810850937

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychology Monograph, 80*(1), 1-28. doi.org/10.1037/h0092976

Scherer, R. F., Brodzinski, J. D., & Wiebe, F. A. (1990). Entrepreneur career selection and gender: A socialization approach. *Journal of small business management, 28*(2), 37-44

Sequeira, J., McGee, J., & Mueller, S. (2005). *An empirical study of the effect of network ties and self-efficacy on entrepreneurial intentions and nascent behavior.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Southern Management Association 2005 Meeting, Charleston, South Carolina.

Setiawan, J.L. (2012). *Entrepreneurship Program Assessment by Students Outcome on Their Perceived Entrepreneurial Characteristics*. Paper presented at Indonesia International Conference on Innovation. Entrepreneurship. and Small Business, Surabaya.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(4), 751-761. doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005

Turker, D., &Selcuk, S. S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? *Journal of European Industrial Training, 33*(2), 142-159. doi: 10.1108/03090590910939049

WEF (2009). *Educating the next wave of entrepreneurs; unlocking entrepreneurial capabilities to meet the global challenges of the twenty-first century*, a report of the G Education Initiative, April.

Wilson, F., Kickul, J., &Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 31*(3), 387-401. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00179.x

Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of applied psychology, 90*(6), 1265-1272. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1265