International Journal of Management, Innovation & Entrepreneurial Research
eISSN: 2395-7662, Vol. 6, No 2, 2020, pp 100-111
https://doi.org/10.18510/ijmier.2020.6210

RECONSIDERING THE ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTION-ACTION GAP FOR STUDENTS TRAINED IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN TUNISIA: AN ANALYSIS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SOCIOLOGY OF USES

Ilia Taktak-Kallel
Assistant Professor at the ESC Tunis (University of Manouba), Department of Management and Marketing, Tunisia, and Member of the THEMA Laboratory (ESC Tunis, Tunisia).
Email: ilia_kallel@yahoo.com

Article History: Received on 7th September 2020, Revised on 30th September 2020, Published on 24th October 2020

Abstract

Purpose of the study: The purpose of this paper is to provide a better understanding of the processes at work in shaping students' entrepreneurial intentions following training courses in entrepreneurship, and of the gap between entrepreneurial intention and action often seen in these training devices. The goal is to collect information that is difficult to access through the usual methods of evaluating entrepreneurial intentions by shedding light on ways in which students make use of these devices.

Methodology: Exploratory qualitative research (comprehensive case study) carried out as part of an Entrepreneurial Training Device (Professional Master's Degree) at a business school in Tunisia, using participant observation techniques, supplemented and cross-checked with multiple data types (institutional records reflecting educational intentions, regular interactions with students, etc.). Special attention was paid to the 2018 class, consisting of thirty students, due to the relative heterogeneity of the community of students and the implementation of the most recent educational model focused on active entrepreneurial pedagogy.

Main Findings: The Entrepreneurship Training Device is put at the service of the goals to be accomplished by the students (obtaining a Master's degree, expanding their studies, increasing their chances of re-enrolling a more typical/ "prestigious" course). Most students never join a phase of entrepreneurial intention. On the sidelines, without having previously articulated business intentions, some graduates participate in a business creation process.

Applications of this study: The research can be used in various disciplines (entrepreneurship, the science of education, sociology), and in various fields: the design and evaluation of entrepreneurship instruments, assessment of the entrepreneurial intentions of students, correlations and differences between entrepreneurial purpose and behavior, cultural variations in entrepreneurship, determinants of the choice of an entrepreneurial career, social representations of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship.

Novelty/Originality of this study: The mobilization of the Sociology of uses enables a deeper understanding of the motives and logics of action of students enrolling in a specialized Master's Degree in Entrepreneurship in Tunisia, and a better understanding of the degree to which these motives and logics help them to participate effectively in an entrepreneurial intention phase. Furthermore, the study invites us to challenge the supposed –linear, standardized, united- relationship between entrepreneurial intention and action.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship Training Device, Intention-based Models, Entrepreneurial Intention-action Gap, Sociology of Uses, Tunisia.*

INTRODUCTION

The abundance of work on entrepreneurship training and their potential to arouse entrepreneurial intention and action in the field of entrepreneurship echoes the commitment of national and supranational government bodies to foster entrepreneurship as an important lever of economic and social growth. It also shows that there is a wide scientific consensus on the teachable essence of entrepreneurship and the significant role that systems and devices for education and training have to play in exposing or stimulating entrepreneurial vocations.

Centered on the intentional models of social psychology [Ajzen & Fishbein (1980)'s Theory of reasoned action; Ajzen (1991)'s Theory of planned behavior; Shapero& Sokol (1982)'s Model of the entrepreneurial event formation, adopted by Krueger &Carsrud (1993)] for which action is predicted by intention, most entrepreneurship training devices work on the expectations of an entrepreneurial career's viability, its desirability and business opportunities (Verzat, 2011) to stimulate students' entrepreneurial intentions. This is meant to lead them to entrepreneurial action or, at least, to an "escalation of devotion" to entrepreneurial action (Bruyat, 1993, p. 280).

However, although numerous research studies conducted in various formative contexts have shown different potential positive impacts of entrepreneurship training, the effectiveness of these training courses is not always demonstrated, and much remains to be learned about the alchemy of factors that promote student entrepreneurial intention (Schlaegel& Koenig, 2014), and particularly on the processes between entrepreneurial intention and action really at work (Armitage & Conner, 2001). The uniformity and invariability of the intention construct has also been presumed by the abundant literature on this subject (Chabaud et al., 2017), and the linearity of the relationship between entrepreneurial intention

and action. The literature thus underestimated the individual variations of the entrepreneurial intention (Boissinet al., 2017) and cultural variations, as well as the entire human and social thickness that could explain the "intention-action gap", the "missing ties" and the potential relations between intentions and actions (Fayolle&Liñán, 2014; Chabaud et al., 2017).

More precisely, the often very large discrepancies between the goals of entrepreneurship training schemes (educational intentions) and the actual actions of students during and after training indicate the presence of types of resistance to prescriptions that challenge the merits of the theories (of students' docility, receptivity, and homogeneity) on which these training courses are centered. Therefore, it would be important to position yourself on the students' side and to understand their state of mind and the logic of action in which they incorporate and gain from entrepreneurship training in a particular cultural and educational context.

In this study, we want to examine the ways in which students capture and potentially redirect an entrepreneurial training device from its original goals for other projects or functions considered more important (Bachelet, 2004). More specifically, we would like to address the following research question: how do students take advantage of advanced entrepreneurship training and what are the implications in terms of arousing entrepreneurial intentions?

To do so, the theoretical framework of the Sociology of Uses is mobilized, which considers that the effectiveness of a device is determined by its practical usage and not by the device itself (Langouët, 1986). Furthermore, the use of a device is a socially shared practice for the Sociology of Uses, which would not be defined by the intentionality of device designers, but would rather arise from the operations of its manipulation by users trying to achieve the ends they prefer (Steiner, 2017).

We aim to have a deeper understanding of the variable efficacy of entrepreneurship training systems and the entrepreneurial intention-action gap by trying to understand how students individually and socially appropriate an entrepreneurship training device in a particular context.

Through this work, we want to clarify the lack of efficacy of entrepreneurship training and its failure in some cultural contexts to arouse entrepreneurial intentions, and thus to demonstrate the irrelevance of the debate on the discrepancy in these contexts between entrepreneurial intention and action.

This study should appeal to academic and institutional actors (teacher-researchers, coordinators of entrepreneurship training programs, decision-makers of the government) who encourage, plan, introduce, direct and/or intervene in training devices for entrepreneurship.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Increasing the understanding and acceptance of students that the entrepreneurial path is a viable career choice (Donckels, 1991) involves changes in attitudes and expectations and entrepreneurial intention generation (Fayolle&Gailly, 2009). The entrepreneurial intention has been described as "a state of mind that directs an individual's attention and action towards independent professional circumstances, as opposed to employee positions" [Fayolle&Gailly (2009), from Bird (1988)]. The precedents of intention are attitude toward actions, perceived subjective norms, and perceived behavioral controllability, and intention is the precedent of actions, according to Ajzen (1991)'s Theory of Planned Behavior, which is commonly used in this field of research.

The entrepreneurial intention may then contribute to entrepreneurial conduct when aroused (Krueger &Carsrud, 1993; Kolvereid, 1996; Linan& Chen, 2006). A large number of studies have been devoted to the confirmation of this reasoning, whether by observing the direct effect of entrepreneurship training on intention or on its antecedents whose transition can be detected more quickly after entrepreneurship training (Autio et al., 1997; Tkachev&Kolvereid, 1999; Fayolle&Castagnos, 2006; Boissin&Emin, 2007).

Several studies have shown that entrepreneurship training has an overall or partial positive impact on entrepreneurial intention and/or some of its antecedents (attitude, social norms and/or perceived self-efficacy)[Robinson et al. (1991); Noël (2001); Peterman & Kennedy (2003); Souitariset al. (2006); Pittaway& Cope (2007); Degeorge&Fayolle (2008); Pihie& Bagheri (2009); Fayolle&Gailly (2009); Jones &Iredale (2010); Leung et al. (2012); Ozgen& Minsky (2013); Bachiri (2016)]. More cautious conclusions have been drawn from other studies (Donckels, 1991; Krueger &Brazeal, 1994). More opposing conclusions were also drawn according to the initial attitudes and cultures of the communities surveyed (von Graevenitz et al., 2010), their countries (Franke &Luthje 2004), their regions of origin in the same country (Packham et al., 2010), the educational establishment (Wang &Verzat 2011); the prior exposure or not of the students to entrepreneurship and their initial degree of intention before training (Fayolle&Gailly, 2009). Finally, other studies have shown no impact on intention (Jemli, 2018; Boudabbous 2011) or even detrimental effects of training on intention (Oosterbeeket al., 2010; von Graevenitzet al., 2010) and attitudes of students towards entrepreneurship (Jemli, 2018).

This demonstrates the complex and even tenuous and equivocal essence of the potential impacts of entrepreneurship training on entrepreneurial intention (Fayolle&Gailly 2009) and probably different individual and cultural variations of entrepreneurial intention (Fayolle&Gailly 2009).

Moreover, it remains difficult to create ties between the intentions initiated, if appropriate, and the transition to entrepreneurial action. Therefore, much of the entrepreneurial literature that tried to understand it has recently been fuelled by the entrepreneurial intention-action divide. In particular, it emerged from this literature that graduates consider the entrepreneurial intention to be only the first phase in the decision to take or not (Van Gelderenet al., 2015; Toumi&Smida, 2017), that the entrepreneurial intention may follow several paths and be preserved, weakened or even disappeared according to lived experiences (Moreau &Raveleau, 2006), and that in the entrepreneurial intention-action gap, many other micro and macro theories can exist that differ from one institutional and cultural context to another: lack of intention to execute and commitment (Adam &Fayolle, 2015); lack of entrepreneurial motivation (Elfving et al., 2017); lack of practicality and anchoring in field realities when teaching entrepreneurship, hesitation, pessimism of individuals and entourage about the chances of success, lack of sources of financing, the social situation (Toumi&Smida, 2017); technical, financial and socio-cultural obstacles; a low level of progress of the project (Oliveira &Rua, 2018).

The list of works in this field of study is currently further expanded by this literature, though there is still much to learn about the concept of entrepreneurial intention and the capacity of training to produce it. As a result, the introduction of other techniques and fine analysis tools will supplement the intention models and their normal empirical implementation, increase understanding of the concepts and likely open up new research perspectives on the gap in entrepreneurial intention-action.

Analytical framework: The Sociology of Uses

The research field of Sociology of Uses refers to the conditions for the reception or social transformation of technical innovations (Steiner, 2017). Initiated in the 1980's, this field declines into two trends: the Anglo-Saxon -dominant-tradition based on modes of media reception, and the French tradition, more heterogeneous, but distinguished by researchers' shared interest in emphasizing the autonomy of users and their margins of freedom faced with communication instruments (Denis, 2009) and more broadly, faced with different modes of dominance from which the actors strive to free themselves through their inventiveness (Jouët, 2000).

de Certeau (1980), regarded as a major author in the studies of uses, provided a fine understanding of how freedom and creativity could assert themselves in users within structures of economic, social, and cultural dominance, regardless of the intensity and hold of the spaces established and enforced by institutions and legitimate culture, from the study of reading behavior (Bordeaux, 2014).

The Sociology of Uses, which therefore relates to and with what the actors actually do with the technique (Steiner, 2017), places the user at the core of the research, considers him to be an actor in his own right and a creator of sense and his own rules, and challenges his supposed passivity and docility as well as the unquestionable overdetermination and validity of techniques and devices (Denis, 2009). The actual use of a technique or device varies from its prescribed use, whether by tinkering, bypassing, adaptation or reinvention (Frau-Meigs 2005, p.139), 'poaching', appropriation, opposition, bargaining, diversion and/or invention of procedures (de Certeau, 1980). This actual use would not be decided by the function (intentionality) of the designers of the device, but rather would arise from device exploitation activities by users trying to achieve ends they support, leading to socially shared practices (Steiner, 2017). The social thickness of usage and the "social phenomena and situations of reception" (Frau-Meigs 2005, p.141) are thus at the center of the Sociology of Uses.

The increasing use of the concept of "device" since the 1970's in the field of education and training sciences conveys a conception of training as being a "socio-technical construct" and "a functional artifact that materializes a specific arrangement of artifacts, actors, structures and relationship frameworks in accordance with the training objectives in a given situation" (Albero, 2010). The rationalizing logic of the training system does not merge with that of the actor, which is a building logic and/or assignment of meaning, perception, and relation with other factors relevant to the biographical path of the actor (Bourdet& Leroux Lavoisier, 2009). Therefore, the possible instructional roles of a training device are modified by means of usage (Boudjaoui&Leclercq, 2014).

The Sociology of Uses will shed considerable light on young people's cultural reception of entrepreneurship training devices. In reality, given "the homogenizing propensity" of these devices (Labazée, 2002), the types of cultural and economic domination they express and the injunctions they hold for young people (to be "dynamic" and "enterprising" and to "become their own boss" (Chambard, 2014), it would be important to explore how students enrolled in unique institutional, cultural and training contexts obtain and use these training devices.

The use of a specialized training device for entrepreneurship in Tunisia

First, we give an overview of the context of the research, then present our methodology, and finally present the findings and conclusions.

Overview of the context of the research

From the end of the 1990's, entrepreneurship teaching in Tunisia was gradually generalized, mainly to encourage entrepreneurship as a credible career option and to work on reducing the high unemployment rates of graduates of higher education. In order to foster the transfer of graduates to entrepreneurial action, business incubators within universities,

and a major and attractive funding and financing framework for venture development have increasingly facilitated this teaching. Recent research, however, challenges the effectiveness of this teaching. Thus, it would not influence the entrepreneurial intentions of students (Jemli, 2018; Boudabbous, 2011) nor perceived behavioral controllability (Abbèset al., 2016), and would even have a negative effect on their entrepreneurial attitudes (Jemli, 2018). even if they remain especially exposed to unemployment, graduates continue to express preferences for salaried jobs and not to see business development as an alternative (Dhaoui, 2016, p.100; Toumi&Smida, 2017). this intention also emerges out of necessity (spectrum of unemployment) and/or depends on the quality of the skills and the specialization of the studies when young people plan to do business (Abdennadher&Boudabbous, 2014). This brief overview shows that entrepreneurship in the Tunisian context is a real challenge for cultural change for young people, hence the importance in studying how students in this context make use of an entrepreneurship training device.

It is a device developed by a business school, the ESC Tunis, which is part of the system of public universities. This is a relatively young school (30 years of existence), renowned for its dynamism, its openness to the world and the business environment, and for its pioneering role in initiating entrepreneurship training (a specialized master's degree, an applied bachelor's degree, a master's degree in research), in addition to various entrepreneurship courses at various curriculum levels, and several entrepreneurship awareness-raising programs. This significant entrepreneurial orientation has allowed the school to constitute a hardcore of entrepreneurship-dedicated human and educational capital.

METHODOLOGY

It is preferable to favor qualitative approaches (field observations, participant observation, interviews, etc.) and microscopic considerations situated on the same scale as users to explain the dynamics of appropriation of uses (Denis, 2009). This is why our study is qualitative exploratory and our empirical emphasis consists of students enrolled in a training device for entrepreneurship. Our aim is to explain the socially shared uses of students trying to achieve the ends they prefer, arising from practices of exploitation of the entrepreneurship learning device, and how these uses progressively influenced the training system. The goal is to understand both the entrepreneurial intention of the students (its initial level and its development during the training) and the entrepreneurial intention-action gap through socially formed uses. Therefore, our research methodology is an exploratory case study (Wacheux, 1996) with a comprehensive objective (Hlady-Rispal, 2002). The case consists of unique uses built in a singular socio-cultural context around an entrepreneurship training device. Our methodology is inductive.

Our research technique is participant observation. This technique was adopted following a long field experience with students trained in entrepreneurship as a training coordinator, careful observation of many student promotions, and disappointment with the efficacy of the training device among the targeted students, despite the continuous improvement of the training system. Participant observation is “research characterized by a time of intense social interactions between the researcher and the subjects in the latter’s setting. Data is collected systematically during this time” (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975). The knowledge in question “comes from many sources: strictly speaking 'participant observation' (what the researcher states, 'observes' when living with people, sharing their activities), interviews (occasional field conversations), the analysis of official records and, above all, ‘personal documents’ (‘materials’ in which people, in their own words or on particular topics, usually expose their point of view on questions concerning them)”(Lapassade, 1991). The participant observation is viewed as “an important means of accessing what is concealed, retracing the chain of acts and experiences, or even knowing what is not said or “what goes without saying” (Chauvin &Jounin, 2010, p.145). This technique is focused on strong validity claims, in particular access to comprehensive data that would otherwise be difficult to obtain, and reduction of the issue of altering the actions of the individuals observed (Bernard, 2002). Moreover, it can also be used from an action-research point of view to encourage intellectual engagement on the part of the researcher in order to bring about progress (Soulé, 2007), by returning the constituted knowledge in input to the environment in question (Lapassade, 1991).

Participant observations, however, require the researcher to take certain precautions in order to maintain a certain distance from his research object, of which he is himself an actor (Bourdieu, 2003; Elias, 1993). This is why the researcher must be able to explain the position chosen or kept, respect its properties and handle its biases as much as possible while using this technique (Olivier de Sardan, 2008, p.190). He must also be able to self-assess (Berthiaume, 2004).

Since its formation in 2000, we have been involved in the specialized Master’s degree in Entrepreneurship in more than one way (coordinator, co-coordinator, teacher, work supervisor, etc.). We have carried out multiple pedagogical coordinator terms, the last of which was for the period 2015-2018 and ensuring that a new pedagogical model was introduced during the academic year 2018-2019. The exercise of this technical and institutional duty consisted of:

- Recruiting candidates and closely monitoring student development,
- Developing and rearranging the training framework and the educational model on a periodic basis;
- Improving the educational resources and ensuring the smooth running of the courses;
- Handling emerging problems, coordinating training and communication activities;

- Consolidating socio-economic and institutional training support (networking);
- Assigning student supervisors for their project studies (preparation of business plans), tracking the progress of these studies and engaging in some job defenses; assisting students in training, project and even personal matters;
- Training and supervision of a range of entrepreneurial projects as an instructor.

These numerous caps have led us to the thorough observation of the students' dispositions, motives, speeches, and behaviors and their evolution, have constantly fuelled our reflexivity on the training practices and have led us, on the one hand, to provide input on the training device in the form of reorganizations and continuous improvements, and on the other hand, to turn the practice and experience feedback into a research piece.

Thus, we were "completely involved in the situation" (Junker, 1960), with a "prior belonging to it" (Adler & Adler, 1987), and led "internal participant observation" (Lapassade, 1991). In terms of commitment, like most entrepreneurship researchers (Caudron&Ibert, 2017), we assume a stance of pro-entrepreneurial engagement and dedication to the growth of training effectiveness. However, our constant reflexivity in and on practice has also led us to a certain ethical obligation to students in the sense of respecting their person and cultural dignity, recognizing that entrepreneurship is not the "natural" option for all, not trying to boost the effectiveness of the training at all costs and avoiding falling into implacability and exploitation of the profound attitudes of students.

Our observation was completed and cross-checked with several types of data:

- Reference to institutional documents representing education intentions (official texts, original and reorganized models of education);
- Informal exchanges and interviews with students from different graduation courses;
- Daily reviews and exchanges with statutory and professional teachers participating in the training process.

The population analyzed consists of student promotions that have incorporated the Master's degree since its inception. On average, each promotion is made up of about 30 students, at the conclusion of the pre-selection process, which holds 70 to 80 candidates in the contest. But there is a high attrition rate for pre-selected candidates. Several reasons can be given for this waste rate: acceptance in Master's degrees in research or more "disciplinary" specialized Master's degrees, opportunities for study abroad, and the "administrative" nature of enrollment in order to continue to benefit from student status.

Specific attention has been given to recent promotions and more specifically to the 2018 promotion, which involves relatively broad student profiles (managers, engineers, biotechnology experts…; salaried and non-salary students), and has benefited from the newest learning model. Here are some of the features of this 2018 promotion:

- 76 out of 257 candidates shortlisted on the basis of their scores (in addition to the maximum 10 percent quota allocated to professional candidates);
- Of the 76 shortlisted candidates, there are:
  - 51 of the girls;
  - 35 students from the same institution (completed their initial training at the ESC Tunis);
  - High-level applicants who are physicians and pharmacists, engineers in various fields, architecture graduates, food technology graduates, anesthesia, nursing sciences…, but who have never entered raining.
- The 30 students who have actually entered and remained there are mainly management graduates, mostly from the ESC Tunis, but also from other universities and technology institutions. Most of them are recent graduates (especially in 2018 for management graduates and in 2017 and 2016 for graduates of other disciplines). They have an average age of 25 years. A significant rate of absenteeism (from 30 to 40% depending on the course) could be seen in the promotion, particularly among students with a professional occupation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Study of the particular uses of a specialized master's degree in entrepreneurship

First, we present the training device that has been examined. We then explain the social uses found by this training device. Finally, we draw the implications of these social uses in terms of entrepreneurial intentions, dedication to entrepreneurial action, and entrepreneurial intention-action gap.

Initial setup and evolution of the training device studied

This is the first specialized Master's degree in Entrepreneurship to be created in Tunisia in 2000. Several improvements have been made to the initial educational model, triggered by international cooperation programs, the flaws found in training and the need to increase the effectiveness of training, the evolution of awareness in the field of entrepreneurship

education, as well as economic and entrepreneurial news. Today, it is an LMD diploma course specializing in entrepreneurship, which is essentially part of "Small Business Education" (preparing learners for the formation and management of their own business)[1], without this primary objective preventing significant work on the de-dramatization of entrepreneurship and the development of pro-entrepreneurial attitudes. Initially intended for management graduates of the ESC, the training has increasingly opened up to students from other disciplines -in particular, graduates of engineering schools- and to skilled candidates, respectively, in order to foster multidisciplinary and synergies between students and meet an audience likely to take the leap of business development.

Training revolves around five pillars in terms of content:

- Entrepreneurship Familiarization (general knowledge of entrepreneurship);
- Entrepreneurship specialization (development of skills and know-how, unique to entrepreneurial situations);
- Information and expertise relating to the structural context and the national and regional environment of entrepreneurship (actors, organizations, systems of support and funding rules, legislation, tax, and financial benefits, etc.);
- Development of cross-sectional and interpersonal skills (professional behavior, language, and communication, networking, etc.);
- Development of information and know-how relevant to the territory: recognition of territorial actors, diagnosis, and foresight … relating to the singularity of the Master's degree in terms of formational approach and material.

For the period 2018-2022, the last educational model approved enhances the areas of specialization in entrepreneurship and focuses more on active pedagogy and entrepreneurial scenarios, and on bringing students together with shareholders and the realities of the national and regional entrepreneurial ecosystem. In addition, the different courses are gradually placed at the disposal of the student's final project (the Business Plan), which is regarded as a training centerpiece.

Most of the training is conducted by academic instructors, but economic and institutional participants are active in a number of ways and provide a variety of services (professional teaching, student job supervision, internships, financial and logistical support for the organization of training activities such as business competitions, the support is given to students and graduates involved in the process of entrepreneurship).

Logics of appropriation of the training device by the students

Applicants with entrepreneurial motives (attraction to entrepreneurship, presence of an entrepreneurial project, and/or intention) and/or an entrepreneurial profile are targeted by the training; these qualities can be assessed by interviews and deemed to have priority over the criterion of scientific excellence. But this profile of candidates for those looking to enroll in training is very unusual. In addition, even though recent ministerial provisions have introduced the standardization of the standards for admitting students in Masters' courses, which has had the effect of increasing the criterion of scientific excellence, neither does training happen more to attract the most outstanding students in view of the preference of the most talented ones for training in more conventional or "familiar" disciplinary specialties.

As a result, candidates who come to the specialized Master's Degree in Entrepreneurship are mostly candidates who have no specific appeal to entrepreneurship and are motivated by the 'option' of the Master's courses in which they have the greatest potential to be admitted. Many candidates state their reasons for starting a company in order to increase their chances. Others admit that, by doing a Master's in some discipline, they want to pursue their education. For many of them (in particular, for the management graduates who are the dominant profile of the students), training is a default option, a way to retain student status and delay the deadline for choosing a profession, and/or an intermediate phase. Professional applicants are more or less in the same state of mind, as the course attracts more and more civil servants who want to pursue a Master's degree in the course and can thus demand almost automatic professional advancement upon presentation of the diploma. Therefore, the Master's degree is diverted from its primary vocation to the point that its basic formative characteristics are stripped of it and instead used as a default Master's training.

These initial disposals and motives seem to be able to justify the low investment of the students in the activities of training. Indeed, students do not completely engage in scheduled activities (especially those requiring continuous participation and learning), thus creating a permanent tension between the goals and potentialities of the device in terms of practical training and what is actually accomplished. The teaching is reduced to the normal formative "molds" and to classical pedagogies because of the primacy of the mark and the diploma over skills learning and the consequent

[1]Entrepreneurial education has three main purposes: acquiring general knowledge related to the creation of ventures and the creation of economic value (Entrepreneurship Education); equipping learners with the specific skills needed to create and manage their own business (Small Business Education); developing general skills in learners that can be useful in multiple work and life situations (Enterprise Education) (Pepin, 2011).

propensity to shallow and instantaneous learning (significant absenteeism; permanent bargaining with teachers on deadlines and on the requirement level for work to be done). This results in a low degree of appropriation of expertise and skills and a low capacity to mobilize them in scenarios (participation in competitions and business challenges) and during the planning of the Business Plan that feeds the training-crowning graduation project. The poor production of the feeling of self-efficacy for entrepreneurial actions at the end of the training seems to be able to clarify this lack of appropriation of entrepreneurial skills.

On the other hand, the training considerably increases the self-confidence of the students, which leads the most outstanding of them to reposition themselves on the job opportunities and professional ventures that made them dream before joining the training. Observations, conversations, casual contacts, and exchanges of emails with some students from the most recent specialized Master's degree promotions will explain this:

- ✓ Student A is an engineering graduate and an industrial company project manager. He demonstrated strong entrepreneurial inspiration and joined the Master's program in 2018. Actually, he brought to the training a lot of dynamism. The Master's courses have opened up for him even more career opportunities in the business where he works as in other large companies. As the end of the academic year approached, however, he started to ask about the possibilities and requirements for admission to the doctoral school and the likelihood of equating a diploma between his specialized Master's and the Entrepreneurship research Master's.
- ✓ Student B from the same promotion did her initial preparation in management at the ESC. She says: "My dream is to become a university professor and it is also the dream of my parents. But sadly, I was told that it is not easy with a specialized master's degree, and that I needed a research master's degree to be able to teach at universities. So is it possible without wasting a year to turn my specialized master's degree into a research master's degree? ".
- ✓ Student C is a former ESC graduate. He joined the Master's as a career candidate and, considering his professional obligations, was a serious and attentive student. He graduated in 2019 and joined the ESC's Entrepreneurship Research Master's Degree. Likewise, he demonstrated his seriousness and his desire to take advantage of all the courses. He also did a lot on social media to inspire young people to start their own companies (communication about business prospects, free support for young first-time company creators). His life plan, however, is to settle in Canada and embark on an educational career as a teacher-researcher.
- ✓ Student D initially graduated with a degree in biomedical technology and also received several certifications in various ICT fields. In terms of professional and associative interactions and active engagement in business challenges, she had an important history. Her reasons for applying for the Master's degree were "to complete her preparation to start entrepreneurship". She was very autonomous during the training, constantly challenging herself with new experiences and putting in the necessary effort and investment. In 2019, she completed the Master's courses and did her obligatory end-of-study internship in a French research laboratory. This internship opened up opportunities for her, both to build a company (patent filing, entrepreneurial support, and funding opportunities) and to pursue doctoral studies (research award, hosting, and funding promises). Currently, between these two openings, she hesitates a lot. She says: "I'm very tempted to create my own business and I know that I won't do it later if I don't do it now. At the same time, the opportunity for a research career is very tempting and can converge on the creation of the business. In reality, for me, the Master's degree has opened up many possibilities! ".

Therefore, whatever the initial course, the position (employee or full-time student), or the reasons initially shown for joining the training, the most excellent students all display a sustained interest in the career of the teacher-researcher. Moreover, as the training progressed, most students develop a recurrent discourse to explain their low commitment to business creation, even though they claim to have acquired a lot of managerial and entrepreneurial skills: "We realized that we weren't made for starting a business", "We do not have the requisite funding to create".

Consequently, it seems that this training in entrepreneurship strengthens the self-confidence and optimism of students and opens up new horizons in terms of professional possibilities and choices for them. These attributes allow students to reposition themselves with more trust in professional projects that are socially valued (more typical, less risky, and considered to be more prestigious). Consequently, the training is put to the service of these idealized ventures, and the students who subscribe to the specified uses and purposes of the training are uncommon.

In addition, this trend has had a major effect on the training device in terms of access requirements, priorities and expectations, and the occupations for which the training is being planned. The latter now target candidates from different backgrounds, whose path has a minimum of consistency, given the low proportion of students who create a company at the end of the training. Starting a business is now seen as one option among many, particularly in the medium and long term. Increasingly diverse, the occupations for which training is prepared are open to more managerial and generalist perspectives (managers of companies, consultants, etc.). Overall, a de-singularization of the Master's initial professional perspectives was involved.

As a result, there is now a duality between the discursive and communicational register maintained around the Master's degree to permanently (re)legitimize it (in particular by sublimating the success stories of the few students who have

created businesses), and the actual institutional status of the training (a Master's degree course that certainly enhances the employability of the graduates, but mainly outside business creation[2]).

Review of entrepreneurial intentions, dedication to entrepreneurial action, and the entrepreneurial intention-action gap

As we have shown, the motivations of candidates when enrolling in the Professional Master's Degree in Entrepreneurship (obtaining a Master's degree, getting a temporary occupation while waiting to be able to reposition themselves on a more traditional or more "rewarding" course) induce a minimalist learning logic among students that is not conducive to improving their sense of effectiveness towards business creation. In addition, if their attitudes towards starting a business are not inherently unfavorable (training may play a positive role in these favorable attitudes), they often have trouble identifying with it personally, possibly because the social standard (very important in a collectivist culture such as Tunisia) is clearly moving towards existing positions and the replication of professional trends deemed to be rewarding and safe (education, the job in the public service). Consequently, the antecedents of entrepreneurial intention are not fulfilled and it is difficult to change them through teaching. Training does not, therefore, necessarily arouse entrepreneurial intention, and there is no need to talk about a void in entrepreneurial intention-action.

However, often, but very rarely, some of the students mentioned, nothing predisposed in particular to build a company (no particular entrepreneurial profile or background; low cultural, social and relational capital) get caught up in the game and decide at the end of the training to take the leap of business creation without having matured an entrepreneurial intention previously. Their transition to the act of entrepreneurship is almost impulsive and inadvertent. They make the most of their preparation, the relationships built with their teachers and coaches, the tax and financial benefits intended for graduates of higher education and the help of their families, and launch small ventures that are not inherently very innovative (cheese factory, fake jewelry manufacturing, ice cream cones) but which they will aim to perpetuate and improve.

In general, they are not very secure in their ability to find a quality wage job, want to take up a challenge, and/or are in a kind of logic: "Nothing to lose and anything to gain". Therefore, it is a (rather marginal) configuration without prior intention to turn to an entrepreneurial act.

Ultimately, the training device is primarily placed at the service of every Master's degree, expanding studies and/or enhancing one's chances of re-registering/ accessing a career that is more common (less risky and uncertain) and socially valued. Therefore, most students begin training without entrepreneurial intentions or even with the intention of not developing a company, and this state of mind prevents them from making full use of the training and from considering new career opportunities. While the training enhances the self-confidence and excitement of students about their potential prospects, most students would never join a phase of entrepreneurial intention. This outcome is consistent with those obtained by Boudabbous (2011), Abbès et al. (2016), and Jemli (2018), with many samples of students from Tunisia having undergone training in entrepreneurship. We cannot talk of an entrepreneurial intention-action gap to this degree. The study also revealed several exceptions to this dominant trend. Indeed, without prior intention, some students engage in entrepreneurial action with a specific logic (skepticism about one's chances of finding a quality job, willingness to take on a challenge, and conviction that one has nothing to lose and everything to gain).

Therefore, the Sociology of Uses offers an interesting framework that makes it possible to understand in a new and situated way what happens in an entrepreneurship training device and to finely understand aspects related to entrepreneurial intentions and dedication to entrepreneurial action that does not allow intention models and normal quantitative methodologies to be grasped or indirectly (Boissinet al., 2009).

In terms of conceptual consequences, the research opens up a viewpoint that demonstrates that what can be seen as the intention-action gap from outside training is not really one if we position ourselves, at least in certain cultural contexts, from the perspective of students. Therefore, the acuteness of the current debates on the intention-action gap should be moderated and the methods of collecting and measuring entrepreneurial intentions should be returned to the founding debate. Secondly, it is worth deepening the-even minimal- the trend of entrepreneurial behavior without prior intention, as it would imply the poor explanatory capacity of intention in the transition to an entrepreneurial act and the presence of behavior-incentive factors that still elude entrepreneurship researchers. More broadly, this finding indicates the presence of many cultural possibilities in relation to the relationship between entrepreneurial intention and behavior.

In our opinion, the practical implications lie in clarifying the status of entrepreneurship training. In fact, while high hopes are placed in these training courses, our study demonstrates the weight of socio-cultural factors that shape the “vision of the world” and the "prioritized cultural goals" (Scheinberg & MacMillan, 1988) of the students and define their relationships with knowledge and disciplines, work and professional activity, others.

[2]Within 12 months following the graduation, over 90% of graduates find a job, for some in their internship places, for others by mobilizing their family and social relationships, for others finally in low-quality jobs (in call centers, for example).

CONCLUSION

The main aim of this article was to provide a better understanding, by mobilizing the theoretical framework of the Sociology of Uses, of the entrepreneurial intention-action gap frequently encountered in entrepreneurship training. The study of the processes of the appropriation of an entrepreneurship training device by students in Tunisia revealed specific mechanisms of deviation from the prescribed uses of this device, including by types of active or passive resistance. The lack of social and cultural legitimacy of business and entrepreneurship among young people, the cultural opposition to entrepreneurship and the ways in which attempts to encourage entrepreneurship have deviated from their primary purpose in the Tunisian context, are more profoundly exposed in these diversions of uses.

It must be admitted that there is little impact on these socio-cultural factors from training. Therefore, entrepreneurship training should not be expected to perform miracles, especially because it is carried out, led, and assisted by actors (teachers, administrators, partners) who hold the same cultural values themselves. Nonetheless, there is important space for action, in particular with regard to the rigor of the selection of candidates, the close and individualized follow-up of students and their progress in learning, and the ability to effectively engage teachers and other stakeholders in active pedagogy training, ongoing efforts to get closer to the entrepreneurial ecosystem and realities, and exemplarity with regard to entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors.

LIMITATIONS AND STUDY FORWARD

The first limitation is related to the Sociology of Uses theoretical framework, which deals with immediate uses and ignores possible medium-and long-term uses. It is likely that there is a "maturation impact" among students who have taken these training courses in entrepreneurship training systems (Caudron & Ibert, 2017). The limitations in the empirical part are those associated with the single case study (generalization difficulties) and the participant observation method (significant subjectivity and interpretive bias). Despite these limitations, the study opened up a viewpoint that would benefit from being examined in other (academic, cultural, and institutional) contexts in order to better explain the rationale of the development of entrepreneurial intentions and the relationship between entrepreneurial intention and action. Moreover, a better understanding of what is at stake in entrepreneurship training devices could require an analysis, from an interactionist point of view, of the uses also made in these training courses by other stakeholders (statutory teachers, professional speakers, institutional decision-makers and managers) in accordance with their intended purposes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was carried out on an individual basis and did not benefit from funding or supporting agencies. However, I would like to express my gratitude to my home institution, the ESC Tunis, whose institutional support has enabled me to fuel this reflection.

REFERENCES

1. Abbès, I., Amari, F., & Allaya, A. (2016). *Impact de l'enseignement de l'entrepreneuriat sur l'intention d'entreprendre*. Communication présentée à la XXVème Conférence Internationale de Management Stratégique (Hammamet, 30 mai-1er juin). https://www.strategie-aims.com/events/conferences/27-xxveme-conference-de-l-aims/communications/3943-impact-de-l-enseignement-de-l-entrepreneuriat-sur-l-intention-d-entreprendre/download.
2. Abdennadher, S.,& Boudabbous, S. (2014). Rôle du parcours scolaire dans l'acte entrepreneurial : cas du contexte tunisien. *Recherches&éducations*, 12(1), 147-162. https://doi.org/10.4000/rechercheseducations.2284
3. Adam, A.-F., & Fayolle, A. (2015). Bridging the entrepreneurial intention-behaviour gap: The role of commitment and implementation intention. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 25(1), 36-54. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2015.068775
4. Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (1987).*Qualitative Research Methods:Membership roles in field research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984973
5. Ajzen, I. (1991).The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*,50(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
6. Ajzen, I.&Fishbein, M.(1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood. Prentice-Hall :Cliffs (NJ).
7. Albero, B. (2010). La formation en tant que dispositif : du terme au concept. InB. Charlier&F. Henri(Eds.),*La technologie de l'éducation :recherches, pratiques et perspectives*(pp. 47-59).Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, coll. "Apprendre". https://doi.org/10.3917/puf.charl.2010.01.0047
8. Armitage, C.J., &Conner,M.(2001).Efficacy of the theory of planned behavior: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(4), 471-499.
9. Autio, E., Keelyey, R., Klofsten, M., & Ulfstedt, T. (1997). Entrepreneurial intent among students: Testing and intent model in Asia, Scandinavia, and United States. In Reynolds,P.D. (Ed.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, 1997: Proceedings of the seventeenth annual Entrepreneurship Research Conference*(pp. 133-147). Wellesley, Mass.: Babson College.

10. Bachelet, C.(2004).*Usages des TIC dans les organisations, une notion à revisiter ?*.Actes du IXème colloque AIM INT d'Evry (Evry, 26-28 mai). http://www.aim2004.int-evry.fr/pdf/Aim04_Bachelet.pdf
11. Bachiri, M. (2016). Les déterminants de l'intention entrepreneuriale des étudiants, quels enseignements pour l'université marocaine ?. *Management & Avenir*, 89(7), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.089.0109
12. Ben Nasr, K., & Boujelbene, Y. (2014). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education. *2nd World Conference On Business, Economics And Management* - WCBEM2013, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 109 (2014), 712–715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.534
13. Bernard, H.R.(2002).Participant observation. *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*(pp. 322-364). Oxford: Alta Mira Press (Rowman & Litlefield Publishers), Third edition.
14. Berthiaume, D.(2004).*L'observation de l'enfant en milieu éducatif.* Montréal: G. Morin.
15. Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case of intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442-453. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306970
16. Bogdan, R.&Taylor, S.J.(1975).*Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. A Phenomenological Approach to the Social Sciences.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.
17. Boissin, J.-P., Chollet, B. & Emin, S. (2009). Les déterminants de l'intention de créer une entreprise chez les étudiants : un test empirique. *M@n@gement*, 12(1), 28-51. https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.121.0028
18. Boissin, J.-P.,&Emin, S.(2007).Les étudiants et l'entrepreneuriat: l'effet des formations. *Gestion 2000*, 24(3), 25-42.
19. Boissin, J.-P., Favre-Bonté, V., & Fine-Falcy, S. (2017). Diverse impacts of the determinants of entrepreneurial intention: Three Submodels, Three Student Profiles. *Revue de l'entrepreneuriat*, 16(3-4), 17-43. https://doi.org/10.3917/entre.163.0017
20. Bordeaux, M.-C. (2014). Pour un réexamen de la notion d'usage : la dimension culturelle de l'expérience. *Lendemains - Études allemandes comparées sur la France*, 154-155, 76-100. https://alfea.hypotheses.org/files/2016/09/Bordeaux_2014-Lendemains-Pour-un-r%C3%A9examen-de-la-notion-dusage-mis-en-forme-14-sept-2014.pdf.
21. Boudabbous, S. (2011). L'intention entrepreneuriale des jeunes diplômés. *Revue Libanaise de Gestion et d'Economie,* 6(4), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1999-7620(11)70033-7
22. Boudjaoui, M., &Leclercq, G. (2014). Revisiter le concept de dispositif pour comprendre l'alternance en formation. *Éducation et francophonie*, 42(1), 22–41. https://doi.org/10.7202/1024563ar
23. Bourdet, J.-F., &Leroux Lavoisier, P.(2009).Dispositifs de formation en ligne. De leur analyse à leur appropriation. *Distances et savoirs*, 1(7), 11-29. https://doi.org/10.3166/ds.7.11-29
24. Bourdieu, P. (2003). L'objectivation participante. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, « Regards croisés sur l'anthropologie de Pierre Bourdieu », 150, décembre, 43-58. https://doi.org/10.3406/arss.2003.2770
25. Bruyat, C. (1993).*Création d'entreprise : contributions épistémologiques et modélisation*(Thèse de doctorat ès sciences de gestion).Université Pierre–Mendez, Grenoble 2, France.
26. Caudron, F., &Ibert, J. (2017). La Formation à l'Entrepreneuriat à l'Épreuve du Réel : Bilan de 5 Années de Licence Professionnelle des Métiers de l'Entrepreneuriat. *Revue ManagementS*, Dossier N°1: Perspectives africaines, 1er Juillet. https://www.revue-managements.com/category/dossiers/perspectives-africaines/
27. (de) Certeau, M.(1980).*L'invention du quotidien*. Tome 1 : *Arts de faire*. Paris : Gallimard.
28. Chabaud, D., Sammut, S., & Degeorge, J.-M. (2017). De l'intention à l'action entrepreneuriale: antécédents, écarts et chainons manquants. *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, 16(3), 7-15. https://doi.org/10.3917/entre.163.0007
29. Chambard, O. (2014). L'éducation des étudiants à l'*esprit d'entreprendre* : entre promotion d'une idéologie de l'entreprise et ouverture de perspectives émancipatrices. *Formation emploi*, 127, 7-26.
30. Chauvin, S., & Jounin, N. (2010).L'observation directe. In *L'enquête sociologique* (pp.143-165). Paris: PUF. https://doi.org/10.3917/puf.paug.2012.01.0143
31. Degeorge, J.M., &Fayolle, A. (2008). Is entrepreneurial intention stable through time? First insights from a sample of French students. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 5(1), 7–27. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2008.015951
32. Denis, J.(2009).Une autre sociologie des usages ? Pistes et postures pour l'étude des chaînes sociotechniques. *Article de synthèse pour le programme TIC & Migrations (MSH Paris)*, septembre, ffhalshs-00641283f. https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00641283/document
33. Dhaoui, I. (2016). *L'enseignement supérieur en Tunisie : Dynamiques et analyses de la performance*. Institut Tunisien de la Compétitivité et des Etudes Quantitatives (ITCEQ), Etude n°1, février.
34. Donckels, R. (1991). Education and Entrepreneurship Experience from Secondary and University Education in Belgium. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise*, 9(1), 35-42. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.1991.10600389
35. Elfving, J, Brännback, M., &Carsrud, A. (2017). Motivations matter in entrepreneurial behavior: depends on the context. In M.Brännback&A.L. Carsrud (Eds.),*Revisiting the Entrepreneurial Mind*(pp.83-89). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45544-0_7
36. Elias, N.(1993).*Engagement et distanciation : contributions à la sociologie de la connaissance.* Paris : Fayard.

37. Fayolle, A.(2004).*Evaluation de l'impact des programmes d'enseignement en entrepreneuriat: Vers de nouvelles approches*. Communication présentée au 7ème Congrès international Francophone en entrepreneuriat et PME (Montpellier, 27-29 octobre).
38. Fayolle, A., & Castagnos, J.-C.(2006).Impact des formations à l'entrepreneuriat: vers de nouvelles méthodes d'évaluation. *Management international*, 10(4), 43-52.
39. Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2009). Évaluation d'une formation en entrepreneuriat : prédispositions et impact sur l'intention d'entreprendre. *M@n@gement*, 12(3), 176-203. https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.123.0176
40. Fayolle, A., &Linan, F. (2014). The future of research on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 663-666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.024
41. Franke, N., &Luthje, C. (2004).Entrepreneurial Intentions of Business Students - A benchmarking study. International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management, 1(3), 269–288. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219877004000209
42. Frau-Meigs, D. (2005).Usages, In Commission nationale française pour l'Unesco, *La « société de l'information » : glossaire critique*(pp. 139-141). Paris : La Documentation française.
43. Gartner, W.B.,&Vesper, K.H. (1994).Executive forum: Experiments in Entrepreneurship Education, Successes and Failures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(2), 179-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(94)90028-0
44. (von)Graevenitz, G., Harhoff, D.,& Weber, R. (2010). The effects of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of EconomicBehavior and Organization*, 76(1), 90–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2010.02.015
45. Hlady-Rispal, M.(2002).*La méthode des cas – Application à la recherche en gestion*. Bruxelles : De Boeck Université. https://doi.org/10.3917/dbu.hlady.2002.01
46. Jemli, H. (2018). Effet de l'enseignement de l'entrepreneuriat sur l'intention entrepreneuriale des étudiants inscrits dans les écoles tunisiennes d'ingénieurs. *Revue Marché et Organisations*, 33(3), 145-171. https://doi.org/10.3917/maorg.033.0145
47. Jones, B., &Iredale, N.(2010).Enterprise education as pedagogy. *Education and Training*, 52(1), 7–19. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911011017654
48. Jouët, J.(2000).Retour critique sur la sociologie des usages. *Réseaux*, 100(18), 487-521. https://doi.org/10.3406/reso.2000.2235
49. Junker, B.H. (1960).*Field work: an introduction to the social sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
50. Kolvereid, L. (1996). Prediction of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20(3), 45-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879602100104
51. Krueger, N.F., & Brazeal, D.V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 19(3), 91–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879401800307
52. Krueger, N.F., & Carsrud, A.L. (1993).Entrepreneurial intentions: applying the theory of planned behavior. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 5(4), 315–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985629300000020
53. Labazée, P.(2002).Les entrepreneurs entre le local et le global. *Les Temps Modernes*, 620-621(4-5), 357-391. https://doi.org/10.3917/ltm.620.0357
54. Lakhal, S., H'mida, S., Olivier, C., & Dondassé, I. (2006).*La mesure de la motivation entrepreneuriale chez les jeunes Acadiens francophones*. Communication présentée au 23ème Colloque annuel du Conseil canadien des PME et de l'entrepreneuriat (Trois–Rivières, Canada).
55. Langouët, G.(1986).Innovations pédagogiques et technologies éducatives. *Revue Française de pédagogie*, 76(1), 25-29. https://doi.org/10.3406/rfp.1986.1499
56. Lapassade, G.(1991).*L'ethnosociologie: Les sources anglo-saxonnes.* Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck.
57. Leung, K.-Y., Lo, C.-T., Sun, H., & Wong, K.-F. (2012). Factors influencing engineering students' intention to participate in on-campus entrepreneurial activities. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 15 (ISSNs: 1098-8394, ISSN (Electronic): 1528-2651), 1–20.
58. Linan, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2006).*Testing the Entrepreneurial Intention Model on a Two-Country Sample*. Working Paper 200607, Department of Business Economics, UniversitatAutonoma de Barcelona.
59. Moreau, R., &Raveleau, B.(2006).Les trajectoires de l'intention entrepreneuriale. *Revue internationale P.M.E.*, 19 (2), 101–131. https://doi.org/10.7202/1008497ar
60. Noel, T.W. (2001). Effects of Entrepreneurial Education on Intent to Open a Business, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, in Babson Conference Proceedings, 78-146, available at: www.babson.edu/entrep/fer
61. Oliveira, A., &Rua, O.L. (2018). From intention to entrepreneurial action: Assessing the impact of the barriers on the creation of new organizations. *RAUSP Management Journal*, 53(4), 507-534. https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-07-2018-0039
62. Olivier de Sardan, J.-P.(2008).*La rigueur du qualitatif : Les contraintes empiriques de l'interprétation socio-anthropologique.* Coll. Anthropologie prospective. Bruxelles : Academia-Bruylant.
63. Oosterbeek, H., van Praag, M.,& Ijsselstein, A. (2010).The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442–454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2009.08.002

64. Ozgen, E., & Minsky, B. D. (2013). Why some college students engage in entrepreneurial activities while others do not. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 16(1), 45–58.
65. Packham, G., Jones, P., Miller, C., Pickernell, D., & Brychan, T. (2010).Attitudes towards entrepreneurship education: A comparative analysis. *Education & Training*, 52(8/9), 568–586. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911011088926
66. Pepin, M. (2011). L'entrepreneuriat en milieu scolaire : de quoi s'agit-il?.*Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill*, 46(2), 303–326. https://doi.org/10.7202/1006441ar
67. Peterman, N.E., & Kennedy, J. (2003). Enterprise Education : Influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(2), 129-144. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1540-6520.2003.00035.x
68. Pihie, Z.A.L.,& Bagheri, A. (2009).Entrepreneurial Intention of University Students. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture, and Change Management: Annual Review*, 9, 49-60. https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9524/CGP/v09i04/49734
69. Pittaway, L.,& Cope, J. (2007).Entrepreneurship education –a systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479-510. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607080656
70. Robinson, P.B., Stimpson, D.V., Huefner, J.C., & Hunt, H.K. (1991). An attitude approach to the prediction of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(4), 13-30. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879101500405
71. Scheinberg, S., &MacMillan, I.C. (1988). An 11-country study of motivations to start a business. In B.A Kirchoff, W.A. Long, W.E. McMullan, K.H. Vesper &W.E. Wetzel (Eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 669 – 687). Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
72. Schlaegel, C.,& Koenig, M. (2014). Determinants of entrepreneurial intent: a meta-analytic test and integration of competing models. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 291-332. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12087
73. Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982).The social dimensions of Entrepreneurship, In C.A. Kent, D.L. Sexton& K.H. Vesper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 72-90). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
74. Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2006). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students ? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 566-591. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.05.002
75. Soulé, B. (2007).Observation participante ou participation observante? Usages et justifications de la notion de participation observante en sciences sociales. *Recherches qualitatives*, 27(1), 127-140.
76. Steiner, P. (2017). L'usage : quelques modes d'emploi. *Cahiers COSTECH*,1, 3 mai. http://www.costech.utc.fr/CahiersCOSTECH/spip.php?article13
77. Tkachev, A., &Kolvereid, L. (1999). Self-employment intentions among Russian students. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 11(3), 269- 280. https://doi.org/10.1080/089856299283209
78. Toumi, M., & Smida, A. (2017). *L'échec au passage à l'acte entrepreneurial des diplômés issus d'une formation entrepreneuriale en Tunisie : Rôle de la culture*. Communication présentée au *10ème Congrès de l'Académie de l'Entrepreneuriat et de l'Innovation AEI* (Dakar, 6-8 décembre). http://entrepreneuriat.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Toumi.pdf
79. Van Gelderen, M., Kautonen, T., & Fink, M. (2015). From entrepreneurial intentions to actions: Self-control and action-related doubt, fear, and aversion. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(5), 655–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2015.01.003
80. Verzat, C. (2011). "Esprit d'entreprendre, es-tu là ?" Mais de quoi parle-t-on ? *Entreprendre & Innover*, 11-12, 7-18. https://doi.org/10.3917/entin.011.0007
81. Wacheux, F.(1996).*Méthodes qualitatives et recherche en gestion*. Collection « Gestion », Série : Politique générale, Finance et Marketing. Paris : Economica.
82. Wang, Y.& Verzat, C. (2011). Generalist or specific studies for engineering entrepreneurs?: Comparison of French engineering students' trajectories in two different curricula. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 18(2), 366–383. https://doi.org/10.1108/14626001111127124

