# Statistical Analysis of Students' Perceptions on the Implementation of Entrepreneurship Education Programme in The Polytechnic Ibadan, Nigeria

\*<sup>1</sup>Fantola J.O., \*\*<sup>2</sup>Oyagbemi A.A. & \*\*\*<sup>3</sup>Akanni O.O.
\*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The Polytechnic Ibadan, Nigeria.
\*\*Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
\*\*\*Department of Public Health, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria.
<sup>1</sup>fantolajubril56@yahoo.com, <sup>2</sup>ademola.oyabemi778@gmail.com, <sup>3</sup>tjstatistician@yahoo.com

*Abstract:* The negative consequences of unemployment and increasing number of people living below poverty line are enormous on the individuals and the nation at large as youth unemployment constitutes a formidable challenge for national governments. The research studies the students' perception on the implementation of entrepreneurship programme in the Polytechnic, Ibadan. Two instruments (QUESIE and QUEFIE) were used to obtain relevant information from both the students and the lecturers/facilitators. The study found out that students were aware of the significance of entrepreneurship education and that the curriculum of the study was detailed to achieve the objectives of the study. However, it was revealed that the teaching facilities are inadequate and the environment was not conducive enough for entrepreneurship education. The hypothesis testing showed that, the correlation coefficient showed a positive strong correlation between the students' understanding of the significance of entrepreneurship education and its impact (r=+0.824) and a low positive correlation between the teaching facilities and its impact on the entrepreneurship education (r=+0.287). The available teaching facilities are not adequate enough for the entrepreneurship education programme. There is a strong positive correlation between the coverage of the curriculum and its impact on the entrepreneurship education (r=+0.243). Therefore, there is need to improve on the availability of the teaching facilities and the environment for conducive teaching and learning processes.

Keywords: Unemployment, Entrepreneurship, Curriculum, Teaching facilities, Environment, Poverty

1 Introduction

With decreasing stability in the economy, work environment, and growing needs for personal control and fulfilment at work, entrepreneurship has been proposed as a viable alternative career model to traditional employment. The growth in entrepreneurship education across the country and increasingly around the world has been well recognized (Kuratko, 2005; Torrance, 2013). The pace of change in technologies is so fast that it is very difficult or even impossible to predict how the labour market and the business world will evolve; therefore, the ability to adapt, to get new ideas and to put these ideas into action, to be pro-active and tolerant to failure will be equally as important as the ability to read, write and calculate what future will be from today. As the society and the economy develop at an increasing speed, some types of knowledge become obsolete as they are replaced by new knowledge, and some skills, competences and traits, which are highly valued and advantageous to possess in previous times, are of minor value today (Lundvall, 1992). Today, where entrepreneurship and innovation are recognized as the main drivers of growth (Landstrom, 2005), most researchers and policy makers agree that another type of skill is needed. The skills needed and how these are best taught, have, however, been debated intensively (Neck & Greene, 2011). The increasing importance of entrepreneurship education and its ability to contribute to economic growth and job opportunities have inspired many institutions to offer entrepreneurship education subjects both in academic and non-academic programs. Although there are an increasing number of students who are taking entrepreneurship education, the ability to refine entrepreneurship value with traditional teaching methods remains unclear and its possibility remains debatable. Nigeria is a developing country, but has a high rate of unemployment among the graduates emerging from the higher educational institutions. This is one of the main social development problems facing the Nigeria government. Graduates" preference for being paid employees over becoming self-employed is one of the contributing factors to the current problem (Muszafarsha & Woon, 2004; Fong, 2005). Entrepreneurship would help the graduates to develop their own careers and expand the job market by easing the current unemployment problem (Norasmah, 2004). Entrepreneurship was acknowledged by many researchers as a solution to the problem of unemployed graduates (Kamariah et al., 2004; Salmah, 2006). The ability to create job, reduce the unemployment and create economic boom are among the main reasons why many countries are fostering and realizing the importance of entrepreneurship education. The creations of new business ventures by entrepreneurs generate jobs opportunities and help stimulate the economy and drive new industry of the country. McMullan (1988)emphasized the importance of entrepreneurship education to economic development and viewed it as one of the important elements of the community support infrastructure (Lekoko, 2012). Unemployed people contribute less to the economy because they are spending less and do not participate in paying tax due to lack of jobs. According to the National Bureau of Statistics report, the unemployment rate rose for the seventh straight quarter to 13.9% in the third quarter of 2016. It was the highest level since 2009, as the number of unemployed rose by 5.2% to 11.2 million. Meanwhile, youth unemployment rate increased to 25%. The negative consequences of unemployment and increasing number of people living below poverty line are enormous on the individuals and the nation at large. Among these are inability to secure basic necessities of life (food, clothing and shelter); alarming rate of social vices; increased number of dependants; poor economic growth due to reduction in investment; waste of manpower; brain-drain due emigration of professionals and skilled labours. to Entrepreneurship education has become a mandated course in the tertiary institutions curricula in Nigeria since 2007 with the aim to produce self-sustaining graduates towards enhancing national economic growth and development. Despite this development, the rate of unemployment and

people living below poverty line are continuously on the increase. Hence, this prompts the researcher to investigate the perceptions of students and their facilitators on the implementation of entrepreneurship education on the students of The Polytechnic Ibadan, Ibadan as an integral part of Nigerian graduates.

### 2 Literature Review

The past two decades have witnessed significant growth in entrepreneurship education in most industrialized countries (Matlay & Carey, 2006). The number of entrepreneurship courses offered in our higher institutions of learning and investment in entrepreneurship programme is still on the increase (Gwynne, 2008). The growth, "can be seen as indicative of widespread governmental belief in the positive impact that entrepreneurship can have on the socio-economic and political infrastructure of a nation" (Matlay, 2008). Public policy makers recognise the importance of entrepreneurship as promoter of economic development and hence, support instruments like entrepreneurship education to increase entrepreneurial activity (Fayolle *et al.*, 2006). Linan (2004) found that there are four different kinds of entrepreneurship education programmes.

Robinson et al., (1994) documented in their study that there was a strong relationship between education and the probability of becoming an entrepreneur and the probability of having success as an entrepreneur. However, they did not differentiate between the various kinds of education and disregarded the possibility of specifically designed entrepreneurship education programmes. Von Graevenitz et al., (2010) therefore argued that an entrepreneurship education programme is a foremost way for students to test their aptitude for an entrepreneurial career choice. According to the authors, the decline in entrepreneurial intention is not necessarily negative or a failure of the programme but potentially a socially desirable effect as students may discover that they have no aptitude for an entrepreneurial career and change course. Oosterbeek et al.(2010), and Von Graevenitz et al., (2010)examined compulsory entrepreneurship programmes on the school and university levels, the role of voluntary, university level education, especially in combination with methodologically sound research designs, is under-researched.

Knight (1987) suggested that opportunity identification, strategy development, and resource allocation are key

elements of entrepreneurship and all these should be emphasized in entrepreneurship courses or programs. Zeithamil & Rice (1987) argued that education in entrepreneurship should cover the entire scope of business administration. In the same line, Block & Stumpf (1992) proposed that entrepreneurship education should contain typical business management knowledge, including market analysis and planning, pricing strategies, financial analysis, leadership, human resources, and other management theories and skills. Entrepreneurship course is different from typical business courses (Henry et al., 2005; Hindle, 2007; Kuratko, 2005) and it should address the issues related to business entry (Gartner, Bird, & Starr, 1992). McMullan & Long (1987) proposed that entrepreneurship has different stages and thus education of entrepreneurship should include the knowledge and skills needed at theses stages. Based on this, Gartner & Vesper (1994) claimed that skills and knowledge required for entrepreneurial start up is different from the conventional business management. By comparing the learning focus of business school and entrepreneurship education, Gibb (1993) stressed that it is not appropriate to adopt the whole business curriculum in entrepreneurship education. Zeithaml & Rice (1987) posted the warning that it is improper to teach entrepreneurship without touching upon the knowledge about business management given a strong relationship between the two domains. In this sense, entrepreneurship education should include both business management and new business entry knowledge and skills. Ronstadt (1987) argued that entrepreneurship education should include barriers to starting a new business and possible solutions. In this way, entrepreneurship education should equip students with different skills, including leadership skills, communication skills, new product development, innovation (Plumly et al., 2008) and information communication technology (Richardson & Hynes, 2008). Donckels (1991) contended that entrepreneurship education should focus on introducing entrepreneurship as an alternative career while others stressed that entrepreneurship education should center around the sources of venture capital (Vesper & McMullan, 1988), the challenges associated with the venturing process (Plaschka&Welsch, 1990), and business opportunity exploitation (Heinonen Poikkijoki, 2006). Ronstadt (1990), students should be trained to make decisions in the "unstructured and uncertain nature of entrepreneurial environments" and hence the entrepreneurship education should focus on the practical training on how to set up and

manage a new business. Sexton & Upton (1984) argued that individual activities should be highlighted more than group activities in entrepreneurship education. Collin et al. (2006) encouraged collaborative learning approaches between students. Co & Mitchell (2006), based on different teaching approaches, explained that it is necessary to examine whether the current teaching methods achieve the course objectives. They advised using "more interactive methods such as role playing and simulation for students to practice analytical and decision making skills". Solomon et al. (2002) noted that traditional lecturing methods are popular in entrepreneurship education. However, some commentators criticized using the traditional methods and argued that the teaching of entrepreneurship should be based on innovation and practice (Mwasalwiba, 2010). The researchers argued that traditional methods which focus on theory and concepts are not appropriate to teach entrepreneurship, and instead the learning should be more proactive with teachers acting as guides or facilitators. This is supported by Young (1997) who argued entrepreneurship education required experiencedbased and practical learning settings and these are difficult to be obtained through traditional teaching attempts. Nonetheless, Shepherd & Douglas (1996) criticized the less traditional methods for entrepreneurship, such as case study, role play, simulation and problem solving, arguing that these methods actually promote logical rather than creative or entrepreneurial thinking. Shane (2003) documented that entrepreneurship process consist of capability to identify opportunity, collect resources, organize them and adapt strategy so that opportunity can be exploited. The knowledge, skills and information he obtained through education will likely improve the expected returns for exploiting the opportunity. Entrepreneurship education not only improves knowledge skill and information which needed to pursue an opportunity but also equip individual with analytical ability and knowledge of entrepreneurial process which improve the entrepreneurial judgment (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006).

Abubakar, (2010) noted that the shift from general education to specifically entrepreneurship education becomes necessary in the present realities of the need to develop and empower particularly the youths in the society. There is seeming consensus on the importance of entrepreneurship in ameliorating some socio-economic problems especially poverty, unemployment, and all sort of social vices in the society. Akpomi, (2009), Adejimola & Olufunmilayo (2009),

Dickson, et al (2008) and Vincett & Farlow (2008) have jointly consented that developing entrepreneurial skills among students at all levels has become an issue of priority to both educational policy makers and practitioners. This has resulted to sustained efforts through researches and introduction of entrepreneurial programs and courses in institutions of learning and other entrepreneurship based centers for the purpose of inculcating the culture and spirit of entrepreneurship. The Centennial Global Business Summit (2008) identified the causes of educational crisis include unaccountable teachers, dysfunctional schools, and systemic barriers like lack of political and economic will to drive changes.

### 3 **Problem Statement**

Entrepreneurship has a positive effect on the economy due to the growth innovation and competition accompanied (Zimmerer & Scarborough, 2005). In the competition intensified global economy, entrepreneurship is recognized as an effective tool to deal with the economic dynamism, by introducing innovative products and services, exploiting technological frontiers, providing new jobs, and creating new markets (Nandram & Samsom, 2006). Entrepreneurial spirit and abilities are critical for nurturing entrepreneurial activities. These elements are the driving force of business enthusiasm and growth, innovation and competition. Honig (2004) and Robinson & Sexton, (1994) indicated a positive impact of entrepreneurship education and training on entrepreneurial activity through strengthening students' attitudes, behavioral characteristics and desirability (Peterman & Kennedy, 2003; Hansemark, 1998) as well as their entrepreneurial and small business management skills (Clark et al., 1984; Charney & Libecap, 2000; 2003). Therefore, entrepreneurship education is important to facilitate entrepreneurial activities and performance and hence the economic development. However, how to design an effective entrepreneurship education program is still challenging for educators because there is a lack of consensus on the contents methods to teach the subject (Bennett, 2006). or Understanding the impact of entrepreneurship education on students' intention is the key to designing an effective entrepreneurship education program. An effective entrepreneurship education program should be developed based on a model describing how the specific education components influence entrepreneurial attitudes and intention. Therefore, this study aims at studying the impact of

entrepreneurship education on the students of The Polytechnic, Ibadan.

### **Research Questions** 4

In order to achieve the specific objectives above, the following research questions are required to be addressed:

RQ1: Do students understand the significance of entrepreneurship education?

RQ2: Are there adequate facilities for effective teaching and learning of entrepreneurship

Education courses?

RO3: Does the curriculum cover major aspects of entrepreneurship?

RQ4: Is the environment conducive for learning of entrepreneurship education?

### 5 Methods

## **Research Design**

This study adopted a descriptive and correlation survey research design in which questionnaires were employed in collecting data from the respondents on the variables studied.

## Sample and Instrumentation

The geographical scope of the work is The Polytechnic Ibadan, Ibadan, South-Western part of Nigeria. The Polytechnic Ibadan has five different Faculties and twenty-eight Departments. Two different questionnaires were designed to obtain information relevant to the objectives of the study. The first questionnaire for the students: Questionnaire for the Impact Assessment of Entrepreneurship Education on the Tertiary Students (QUESIE); and the second questionnaire for the lecturers/facilitators which was also tagged, A Questionnaire on the Teaching of Entrepreneurship Education Course in The Polytechnic, Ibadan (QUEFIE). The first set of samples is the HNDII students who were selected through a multi-stage sampling method. The choice of multi-stage sampling was based on the population of The Polytechnic, Ibadan that comprises five different Faculties and twenty eight different Departments across the various Faculties. The HND II students were purposively selected as target population. Two hundred questionnaires were administered to the students such that twenty (20) students were equally drawn from each of the selected Departments for consideration. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability test for

QUESIE, showed that the value of Cronbach's Alpha for IJSER © 2018

significance of entrepreneurship education programme was 0.810; the value of Cronbach's Alpha for impact of curriculum on entrepreneurship education programme was 0.836; the value of Cronbach's Alpha for impact of teaching facilities on entrepreneurship education programme was 0.836 and the value of Cronbach's Alpha for impact of environment on entrepreneurship education programme was 0.733. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability test for QUEFIE, the value was 0.609.

# 6 **Results and Discussion**

Table 1: A Table Showing the Demographic Analysis ofQUESIE

Items	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Faculties		
FBCS	100	50
FSC	100	50
Sex		
Male	78	39
Female	122	61
Age		
16 – 20	11	5.5
21 - 25	141	70.5
26 - 30	47	23.5
31-35	1	0.5
Marital		
Status		
Unmarried	183	91.5
Married	17	8.5

Table 1 showed that the number of respondents was equally distributed between the two selected Faculties and the number of respondents was equally distributed between the selected Departments. There were more females (61%) than males (39%) among the respondents. The age group 21 - 25 years had the highest number of respondents that covered 70.5% of the population. And this was followed by the age group 26 - 30 years with 23.5% of the population. From the Table, the majority of the students (91.5%) were not married. Majority of the students (86.5%) were Yoruba and those that were Igbo were 8.5% of the distribution. The Table also revealed that among the respondents Christians were the

majority (67.5%) while the Muslims (32.5%) were almost half of the Christian population.

Table	2:	Α	Table	showing	the	Results	the	Students'
Percep	tio	n on	the Im	pact of Ent	repre	eneurship	Edu	cation

Statement s	No. of Strongly Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Disagree d/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Strongly Disagree d/ Percentag e (%)
S1	93 (46.5)	94 (47)	8 (4)	5 (2.5)
S2	67 (33.5)	111 (55.5)	12 (6)	10 (5)
S3	82 (41)	104 (52)	8 (4)	6 (3)
S4	76 (38)	89 (44.5)	21 (10.5)	14 (7)
S5	81 (40.5)	101 (50.5)	8 (4)	10 (5)
S6	51 (25.5)	100 (50)	42 (21)	7 (3.5)
S7	74 (37)	92 (46)	26 (13)	8 (4)
S8	78 (39)	109 (54.5)	9 (4.5)	4 (2)
S9	56 (28)	113 (56.5)	25 (12.5)	6 (3)

According to Table 2, statement 1, 'I have known the importance of Entrepreneurship education during my National Diploma programme'., statement 2:'The Entrepreneurship course increases my understanding of generating innovative ideas', statement 3: 'Entrepreneurship education gives me a sense that entrepreneurship is achievable', statement 4: 'Entrepreneurship education inspires me to be self-employed', statement 5: 'Entrepreneurship education helps to create additional source of income', statement 6, 'Entrepreneurship education gives me confidence that entrepreneurship could be a mainstay for my survival', statement 7, 'Entrepreneurship education programme reduces the quest for white collar job', statement 8, 'Entrepreneurship education is necessary to improve national economic growth and development', statement 9, 'Entrepreneurship education programme increases my understanding of the motives of engaging in entrepreneurial activities' showed positive response to the statements either slightly, below or above average. Hence, high percentage of the students showed positive responses to the impact the entrepreneurship education programme has made on their lives and intentions to start their private businesses in their future endeavours. This corresponds with the findings by Kolvereid & Moen (1997) who reported that graduates with an entrepreneurship

major are more likely to start a new business and have stronger entrepreneurship intentions than other graduates.

Table 3: A Table showing the Results of the Students'Perception on the Curriculum of EntrepreneurshipEducation

Statement s	No. of Strongly Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Disagree d/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Strongly Disagree d/ Percentag e (%)
S10	47 (23.5)	91 (45.5)	52(26)	10 (5)
S11	42 (21)	101 (50.5)	51 (25.5)	6 (3)
S12	39 (19.5)	66 (33)	74 (37)	21 (10.5)
S13	56 (28)	91 (45.5)	33 (16.5)	20 (10)
S14	71 (35.5)	92 (46)	23 (11.5)	14 (7)
S15	32 (16)	107 (53.5)	46 (23)	15 (7.5)

According to Table 3, statement 10, 'The entrepreneurship education programme increases my understanding of writing a business planning', statement 11, 'The entrepreneurship education programme increases my understanding of market research for entrepreneurial ventures', statement 12, 'The entrepreneurship education programme enhances my skills of project analysis', statement 13, 'The entrepreneurship education programme exposes me to various aspect of business financing', statement 14, 'The entrepreneurship education programme increases my understanding of the personal characteristics of entrepreneurs (e.g., risk taking, innovation, etc.)', statement 15, 'The entrepreneurship course enhances my skills to deal with the risks and uncertainties' showed positive response to the statements either slightly, below or above average

Hence, high percentage of the respondents showed positive responses to the wide coverage of the syllabus of the entrepreneurship education programme. Kuratko (2003) emphasised that attention should be paid to what should be taught and how it should be taught. Fiet (2001) suggested that entrepreneurship education should stress theories and principles of entrepreneurship. The contents of the entrepreneurship courses taught in the school correspond to what was proposed by Block & Stumpf (1992) and also complied with the guides laid down by the National Board of Technical Education (NBTE).

Table 4: A Table showing the Results of the Students'Perception on the Teaching Facilities for EntrepreneurshipEducation

Statement s	No. of Strongly Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Agreed/ Percentage (%)	No. of Disagreed/ Percentage (%)	No. of Strongly Disagreed/ Percentage (%)
S16	24 (12)	67 (33.5)	57(28.5)	52 (26)
S17	21 (10.5)	76 (38)	61 (30.5)	42 (21)
S18	38 (19)	71 (35.5)	50 (25)	41 (20.5)
S19	18 (9)	53 (26.5)	68 (34)	61 (30.5)
S20	30 (15)	70 (35)	66 (33)	34 (17)
S21	26 (13)	67 (33.5)	70 (35)	37 (18.5)
S22	11 (5.5)	27 (13.5)	54 (27)	108 (54)
S23	58 (29)	69 (34.5)	21 (10.5)	52 (26)
S24	66 (33)	57 (28.5)	44 (22)	33 (16.5)
S25	34 (17)	45 (22.5)	50 (25)	71 (35.5)

According to Table 4., statement 16, 'The lecturers did a good job in making the entrepreneurship course relevant to the real world', statement 17, 'The lecturers are experienced in teaching the courses in entrepreneurship', statement 18, 'The methodologies introduced by instructors for the entrepreneurship courses are not very interesting' showed positive response to the statements either slightly, below or

statement 19, 'The lecturers teach a above average, comprehensive business plan model for the subject.'it showed that the total number of students that chose strongly agreed (18) and agreed (53) is 71 which means that below average (35.5%) of the respondents showed positive response to the statement. This showed that majority of the respondents did not enjoy the teaching of business plan model by their facilitators, statement 20, 'The lecturers have an excellent way of presenting the entrepreneurship courses' it showed that the total number of students that chose strongly agreed (30) and agreed (70) is 100 which means that average (50%) of the respondents showed positive response to the statement. This showed that half of the respondents did not enjoy the manner of presentation of the entrepreneurship courses by their lecturers/facilitators, statement 21, 'The lecturers stimulate the interest in entrepreneurship course through the teaching methodologies', statement 22, 'The lecturers take the students for visits to industries to gain more knowledge on the subject', statement 23, 'Practical sessions help a lot in understanding the entrepreneurship subject' showed positive response to the statements either slightly, below or above average, statement 24, 'The Polytechnic does not have adequate facilities to promote the entrepreneurship activities for students' it showed that the total number of students that chose strongly agreed (66) and agreed (57) is 123 which means that majority (61.5%) of the respondents showed positive response to the statement. This showed that majority of the students believed that the institution does not have adequate facilities, statement 25, 'The Polytechnic provides resources to assist students in entrepreneurship' it showed that the total number of students that chose strongly agreed (34) and agreed (45) is 79 which means that below average (39.5%) of the respondents showed positive response to the statement. Hence, the institution should provide adequate facilities with improved teaching methodologies. Jack (2008) argued that the teaching of entrepreneurship should highlight both theoretical and practical aspects of entrepreneurship. Young (1997) argued that entrepreneurship education required experienced-based and practical learning settings. The researchers argued that traditional methods which focus on theory and concepts are not appropriate to teach entrepreneurship, and learning should be proactive with teachers acting as guides or facilitators.

Table 5: A Table showing the Results of the Students'Perception on the Curriculum of EntrepreneurshipEducation

Statemen ts	No. of Strongly Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Agreed/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Disagree d/ Percentag e (%)	No. of Strongly Disagree d/ Percentag e (%)
S26	29 (14.5)	72 (36)	61(30.5)	38 (19)
S27	33 (16.5)	71 (35.5)	55 (27.5)	41 (20.5)
S28	36 (18)	58 (29)	66 (33)	40 (20)
S29	33 (16.5)	68 (34)	55 (27.5)	44 (22)
S30	80 (40)	81 (40.5)	23 (11.5)	16 (8)

According to Table 5, statement 26, 'My institution is focused towards entrepreneurship', statement 27, 'The policies in the Polytechnic promote entrepreneurship education', statement 28, 'The Polytechnic environment inspires me to develop innovative ideas for new business', statement 29, 'I met a lot of people with good ideas for new businesses in the Polytechnic', statement 30, 'Entrepreneurship courses should be made compulsory in order to stimulate entrepreneurial spirit in the Polytechnic' showed positive response to the statements either slightly, below or above average. Hence, it is evident from the responses that the institution needs to improve on the creation of enabling environment to promote the teaching and learning of entrepreneurship education. The Centennial Global Business Summit (2008) identified many causes of education crisis which include unaccountable teachers, dysfunctional schools, and systemic barriers like lack of political and economic will to drive changes

Table 6: A Table Showing the Relationship betweendifferent Learning Factors of Entrepreneurship Educationand its Impact

Variables	Pearson Correlati on Coefficie nt (r)	Coefficient of Determinati on (r <sup>2</sup> )	Level of Significan ce (a)	P- valu e
Impact and Understandi ng	0.824	0.679	0.1	0.00 0

International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research Volume 9, Issue 4, April-2018 ISSN 2229-5518

Impact and				0.00
Teaching	0.287	0.082	0.1	0.00
Facilities				0
Impact and Curriculum	0.792	0.627	0.1	0.00
Curriculum	0.792	0.027	0.1	0
Impact and				0.00
Environmen	0.343	0.118	0.1	0.00
t				0

**H**<sub>01</sub>: There is no relationship between the students' understanding of the significance of entrepreneurship education and its impact.

The correlation coefficient, r = 0.824 showed a positive strong correlation between the students' understanding of the significance of entrepreneurship education and its impact. With P-value of 0.00 which is less than 0.05, the relationship is significant. The Coefficient of Determination,  $r^2 = 0.679$ revealed that we are 68% sure that the impact of entrepreneurship education was explained by the students' understanding of its significance.

**Ho2:** There is no relationship between the effectiveness of instructional facilities available for teaching entrepreneurship education courses and its impact

The correlation coefficient, r = 0.287 showed a positive low correlation between the teaching facilities and its impact on the entrepreneurship education. With P-value of 0.00 which is less than 0.05, the relationship is significant. The available teaching facilities are not adequate enough for the entrepreneurship education programme. The Coefficient of Determination,  $r^2 = 0.082$  revealed that we are 8% sure that the impact of entrepreneurship education was explained by the Teaching Facilities.

**H**<sub>03</sub>: There is no relationship between the coverage of the curriculum of entrepreneurship education courses in the institution and its impact

The correlation coefficient, r = 0.792 showed a strong positive correlation between the coverage of the Curriculum and its impact on the entrepreneurship education. With P-value of 0.00 which is less than 0.05, the relationship is significant. The contents of the syllabus are adequate to achieve the desired success of the entrepreneurship education programme. The Coefficient of Determination,  $r^2 = 0.627$  revealed that we are

63% sure that the impact of entrepreneurship education was explained by the Teaching Facilities.

**H**<sub>04</sub>: There is no relationship between the environment and its impact on the entrepreneurship education.

The correlation coefficient, r = 0.343 showed a low positive correlation between the environment and its impact on the entrepreneurship education. With P-value of 0.00 which is less than 0.05, the relationship is significant. The environment is not conducive enough for the entrepreneurship education programme. The Coefficient of Determination,  $r^2 = 0.1176$  revealed that we are 12%

# Table 7: Frequency Distribution Table of the DemographicSection of QUEFIE

Items	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	37	66.1
Female	19	33.9
Age		
31-35	12	21.4
36-40	14	25
Above 40	30	53.6
Marital Status		
Unmarried	4	7.1
Married	52	92.9
Qualifications		
B.Sc./B.A/B.Ed	15	26.8
M.Sc/M.A/M.Ed	41	73.2
Ranks		
Chief Lecturer	1	1.8
Principal	_	
Lecturer	5	8.9
Senior Lecturer	13	23.2
Lecturer I	17	30.4
Lecturer II	14	25
Lecturer III	6	10.7
Years of Experience		

International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research Volume 9, Issue 4, April-2018 ISSN 2229-5518

1-5 years	9	16.1	Materials		
6-10years	16	28.6			
10 years and above	31	55.4	Yes	52 4	92.9 7 1

According to Table 7, the number of respondents was equally distributed between the selected Departments with two lecturers each. There were more male lecturers in the study (66.1%) than female lecturers (33.9%). The age group above 40 years had the highest number of respondents that covered 53.6% of the population. And this was followed by the age group 36 - 40 years with 25% of the population. The majority of the lecturers (92.9%) were married. Majority of the lecturers (73.2%) selected have Master education and the remaining lecturers have first degrees. It was shown that few senior colleagues were involved in the teaching of the entrepreneurship courses and most lecturers have adequate teaching experience with only 16.1% have lesser working experience of 1-5 years.

Table 8: Frequency Distribution Table of Section B ofQUEFIE showing the responses of the Facilitators on theTeaching of Entrepreneurship Courses

Items	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Class Taught		
ND	26	46.4
HND	30	53.6
Years of	f	
Teaching		
Entrepreneurship	,	
2	4	7.1
3	18	32.1
4	15	26.8
Relevant		
Academic		
Certificates		
Yes	10	17.9
No	46	82.1
Special Training	5	
Received		
Yes	2	3.6
No	54	96.4
Availability of Instructional	f	

res	32	92.9
No	4	7.1
Lecture Duration		
1 hour	12	21.4
2 hours	44	78.6
Conducive		
Environment for		
Teaching		
Yes	40	71.4
No	16	28.6
Perception on		
Special Training		
for Improvement		
Yes	50	89.3
No	6	10.7
Perception on		
Contents		
Delivery		
Yes	28	50.0
No	28	50.0
Coverage of the		
Syllabus		
Yes	56	100.0

According Table 8, lecturers teaching HND to in the selected courses were 53.6% entrepreneurship respondents and lecturers teaching ND entrepreneurship courses were 46.4% and majority of the lecturers have been teaching entrepreneurship courses for more than two years. From the table, majority (82.1%) of the lecturers do not have relevant academic certificates to entrepreneurship and majority (96.4%) of the lecturers had not received a special training on the teaching of entrepreneurship. Most facilitators/ lecturers (92.9%) agreed that the instructional materials were available for teaching of Entrepreneurship courses. It was shown that most Departments (78.6%) offered two hours lecture per week for the teaching of entrepreneurship courses. Majority of the lecturers (71.4%) agreed that the environment is conducive for learning and most of them (89.3%) were of the opinion that if the institution could organise a special training on entrepreneurship, it would improve their performances. The responses showed that half of the lecturers acknowledged that the contents

1532

delivery was not total and all the lecturers agreed that the coverage of the syllabus is adequate to achieve the objectives of entrepreneurship education programme as laid down by the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE).

# 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

The negative consequences of unemployment and increasing number of people living below poverty line are enormous on the individuals and the nation at large. Youth unemployment constitutes a formidable challenge for national governments to deal with and poses a lot of social problems. Despite that entrepreneurship education has been an integral part of tertiary education curriculum in Nigeria for almost a decade, the unemployment rate is on a continuous rise. And there has been no study that investigates how the entrepreneurship education is being implemented in the Nigerian Polytechnics. This prompted the researcher to investigate the perceptions of the students and their facilitators on the implementation of entrepreneurship education and its impact on the students of The Polytechnic Ibadan, Ibadan, as an integral part of Nigerian graduates. The students of The Polytechnic, Ibadan are now aware of the significance of entrepreneurship education programme as it positively affects individuals and the nation at large, towards improving national economic growth and development. The analysis of the two instruments showed that the curriculum of entrepreneurship education is adequate and detailed enough to have significant impact on the students. Due consideration of the contents of the syllabus each of the entrepreneurship courses offered at all levels confirmed the result of the findings (see Appendices IIA, IIB, IIC & IID). It was also revealed from the students that the provisions of the teaching facilities are not adequate to effectively contribute to the impact of the programme on the students of the institution. This result was supported by lecturers/facilitators and that majority of them neither have any relevant academic qualifications on Entrepreneurship nor have received any special training with regard to the implementation and teaching of entrepreneurship education. It was noted that most senior staff of the status of Chief Lecturer or Principal Lecturer who are expected to have more knowledgeable and experienced, do not involve in the teaching of the entrepreneurship courses in their various Departments. Their presence in the class could have lent more credence to the importance of the entrepreneurship education programme.

The policy and other environmental factors should be constantly reviewed and improved upon towards achieving the objectives of the entrepreneurship education programme in the institution. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made to improve the entrepreneurship education programme in The Polytechnic, Ibadan.

- (i) The institution should provide more infrastructures to ease both the teaching and learning processes
- (ii) The lecturers/facilitators should be well trained through organizing workshops and conferences, sponsoring them for Master and Doctor of Philosophy in Entrepreneurship and other relevant courses. This building of human capacitydevelopment will enhance effective teaching with improved teaching methodologies
- (iii) The institution should create enabling environment for market entrepreneurship products (e.g. ideas, innovations, inventions) as this will encourage start – up entrepreneurs. The institution should start commercializing the research findings instead of leaving them in the Libraries and shelves
- (iv) There should be a Gown-Town relationship such that experts and successful entrepreneurs are invited to share their wealth of experience with staff and students of the institution
- (v) A robust mentoring programme and consultancy services should be established
- (vi) There should be a monitoring and evaluation programme to follow-up the progress of the students and graduates of the institution that practice entrepreneurship
- (vii) Establishing a business hub or an enterprise by the institution will demonstrate what we are teaching to the students. And it will also serve as a means of employment for the qualified and interested students/graduates of the institution
- (viii) Development of entrepreneurship internship programme through which students are matched with the locally successful entrepreneurs to acquire more practical knowledge
- (ix) Establishing an academic Department that awards Diploma certificates and also plays a

supervisory role on VSESC will go a long way to foster entrepreneurship education towards professionalism

(x) All the stakeholders (local, state and federal governments, industries, education managers, parents etc.) should form a synergy towards achieving the national objectives of entrepreneurship education in Nigeria.

### REFERENCES

Adejimola .A.S & Olufunmilayo T. (2009). Spinning off an entrepreneurship culture among Nigerian University Students, Prospect and Challenges. African *Journal of Business Management*, 1(3), 80-88.

Baumol, W. (2002). *The Free-Market Innovation Machine*. Princeton: Princeton UniversityPress.

Bechard, J.P. & Gregoire, D. (2005). Understanding teaching models in entrepreneurship for higher education, in Kyrö, P. & Carrier, C. (eds.), *The Dynamics of Learning Entrepreneurship in a Cross-Cultural University Context*, Tampere: University of Tampere, Faculty of Education,101-134.

Bennett, M. (2006). Business Lecturers' Perception of Nature of Entrepreneurship.*International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 12 (3), 165-188

Block, Z., & Stumpf, A. (1992). Entrepreneurship Education Research: Experience and Challenge. In D. Sexton, & J. Kasarada, *The State of the Art of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 17-42). USA: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.

Bosma, N., & Levie, J. (2009). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report.* 

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America*, New York: Basic.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (2002). Schooling in Capitalist America Revisited. *Sociology of Education*.

Bowles, S. Gintis, H. & Osborne, M. (2001). Incentive-Enhancing Preferences: Personality, Behavior and Earnings, *American Economic Review* 91(2), 155–158.

Braimah, I., & King, R. (2006). Reducing the Vulnerability of the Youth in terms of Employment in Ghana through the ICT sector. International. *Journal of Education and Development*, 2(3), 23-32.

Carree, M., & Thurik, A. (1998). Small firms and economic growth in Europe. *Atlantic Economic Journal, 26* (2), 137-146.Charney, A., & Libecap, G. (2003). The Contribution of Entrepreneurship Education: An Analysis of the Berger Program. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 1* (1), 11-22.

Charney, A., & Libecap, G. (2000). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education: An Evaluation of the Berger Entrepreneurship Program at the University of Arizona, 1985-1999. Missouri: Kansas City: The Kauffman Centre for Entrepreneurial Leadership.

Chen, C.C., Greene P.G. & Crick, A. 1998). Does Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy Distinguish Entrepreneurs from Managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295-316.

Cho, B. (1998). Study of the Effective Entrepreneurship Education Method and Its Process. *Business Education Research*, 2 (1), 27-47.

Clark, B., Davis, C., & Harnish, V. (1984). Do Courses in Entrepreneurship Aid in New Venture Creation? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 22 (2), 26-31.

Collins, L., Smith, A., & Hannon, P. (2006). Applying a Synergistic Learning Approach in Entrepreneurship Education. *Management Learning*, *37* (3), 335-354.

Co, M., & Mitchell, B. (2006). Entrepreneurship Education in South Africa: A Nationwide Survey. *Education and Training*, 48 (5), 348-359.

Donckels, R. (1991). Education and Entrepreneurship Experiences from Secondary and University Education in Belgium. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 9 (1), 35-42.

Fayolle, A., Gailly, B. and Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006), "Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: a new methodology", Journal of European Industrial Training 30 (9), 701-720.

Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006b). Effect and Counter-effect of Entrepreneurship Education and Social Context on Student's Intentions. *Estudios De Economia Aplicada*, 24 (2), 509-523.

Fiet, J. O. (2001). The theoretical side of teaching entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *16*(1), 1-24. Fiet, J. O. (2001). The pedagogical side of entrepreneurship theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *16*(2), 101-117.

Fiet, J. (2001b). The Pedagogical Side of Entrepreneurship Theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *16*, 101-117.

Foex, J., & Pennington, K. (2009). The Effect of Economic Development of an Entrepreneurship Program at a North Carolina Community College. *Journal of Appled Research in the Community College*, *16* (2), 119-123.

Galloway, L., & Brown, W. (2002). Entrepreneurship education at university: a driver in the creation of high growth firms?. *Education+ Training*, *44*(8/9), 398-405.

Gartner, W.B. 1988. "Who is the entrepreneur?" Is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12, 47-68. Gartner, W.B. & Carter N.M. (2003). Entrepreneurial behaviour and firm organizing processes. InAcs, Z.J. & Audretch, D.B. (eds.) *Handbook of entrepreneurship research*. Boston: Kluwer,195-221.

Gartner, W., & Vesper, K. (1999). *University Entrepreneurship Programs*. Los Angeles: Lloyd Grief Center for Entrepreneurial Studies, University of Southern California.

Gibb, A. A. (1992). The enterprise culture and education. International Small Business Journal, 11(3).

Gibb, A.A. (2002a). In pursuit of a new entrepreneurship paradigm for learning: creative destruction, new values, new ways of doing things and new combinations of knowledge. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4 (3), 233-69.

Gibb, A.A., (2002b). Creating conducive environments for learning and entrepreneurship – living with, dealing with, creating and enjoying uncertainty and complexity, *Industry and Higher Education*, 135-148.

Gibb, A.A. (2011). Concepts into practice: meeting the challenges of development of entrepreneurship educators around an innovative paradigm – The case of International Entrepreneurship Educators' Programme (IEEP). *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 17 (2), 146-165.

Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., & King, W. (1997). Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: A ten year literature review. *International small business journal*, 15 (3), 59-77.

Graevenitz , Von, G., Harhoff, D., & Weber, R. (2010). The effects of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*,76(1), 90-112. Gupta, V. K., Turban, D.

B., Wasti, S. A., & Sikdar, A. (2009). The role of gender

stereotypes in perceptions of entrepreneurs and intentions to become an entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(2), 397-417.

Hansemark, O. (1998). The Effects of an Entrepreneurship Program on Need for Achievement. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour, 14* (1), 28-50.

Hebert, R., & Link, A. (1989). In Search of the Meaning of Entrepreneurship. *Small Busienss Economics*, *1*, 39-49.

Heinonen, J., & Poikkijoki, S. (2006). An Entrepreneurial Directed Approach to Entrepreneruship Education: Mission Impossible? *Journal of Management Development*, 25 (1), 80-94.

Henderson, R., & Robertson, M. (2000). Who Wants to Be an Entrepreneur? Your Adult Attitudes to Entrepreneurship as a Career. *Career Development International*, 5 (6), 279-287.

Henry, C., Hill, F., & Leitch, C. (2004). The Effectiveness of Training for New Business Creation. *International Small Business Journal*, 22 (3), 249-269.

Henry, C., Hill, F., & Leitch, C. (2004). What is "Enterprise Education"? An Analysis of the Objectives and Methods of Enterprise Education Programmes in Four European Countries. *Education and Training*, 46 (1), 11--23.

Honig, B. (2004). Entrepreneurship Education: Toward a Model of Contingency-based Business Planning. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *3* (3), 258-273.

Jack, S. (2008). Entrepreneurship Education within the Condition of Entreprenology. *Proceedings of the Conference on Enterprise and Learning*. Aberdeen.

Katz, J. 2003. The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18, 283–300.

Kolvereid, L. (1996b). Predictions of Employment Status Choice Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 21 (1), 47-57.

Kolvereid, L., & Isaksen, E. (2006). New Business Start-up and Subsequent Entry into Self- employment. *Journal* of Business Venturing, 21 (6), 866-885.

Kuratko, D. (2003). *Entrepreneurship Education: Emerging Trends and Challenges for the 21st Century.* U.S. Association of Small Business Education.

Kuratko, D. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. & Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 29(5), 20.

Knight, F.H. 1921, [2002]. *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit.* 3rd ed. Washington, DC. Beard Books.

Lee, S., Change, D., & Lim, S. (2005). Impact of Entrepreneurship education: A comparative Study of the US and Korea. *International Entrepreneurship and Management*, 1, 27-43.

Linan, F. (2004). Intention-Based Models of Entrepreneurship Education. *14th Annual Int. Ent Conference*. University of Napoli Federico IntEnt2004 II (Italy).

Lundvall, B. (1998). Why Study National Systems and National Styles of Innovation? *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 4 (10), 407-420.

Matlay, H. (2006). Researching Entrepreneurship and Education: Part 2: What Is Entrepreneurship Education and Does It Matter? *Education* + *Training*, *48* (8/9), 704-718.

Matlay, H. (2008). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15 (2), 382-396.

McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(1), 132-152. McMullan, W.E. and Long, W.A. (1987), "Entrepreneurship education in the nineties", Journal of Business Venturing 2 (3), 261-75.

Mwasalwiba, E. (2010). Entrepreneurship Education: A Review of Its Objectives, Teaching Methods, and Impact Indicators. *Education & Training*, 52 (1), 20-47.

Nandram, S., & Samsom, K. (2006). The Spirit of Entrepreneurship: Exploring the Essence of Entrepreneurship through Personal Stories. New York: Springer.

Ojeifo S.A. (2012). Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(14), 78-82.

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.

Peterman, N. and Kennedy, J. (2003), "Enterprise education: influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship", Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 28 (2), 129-144.

Richardson, I., & Hynes, B. (2008). Entrepreneurship Education: Towards an Industry Sector Approach. *Education and Training*, 50 (3), 189-198.

Reynolds, P., Storey, D., & Westhead, P. (1994). Cross-national Comparison of the Variation in New Firm Rates. *Regional Studies*, 28, 443-456.

Robinson, P., & Sexton, E. (1994). The Effect of Education and Experience on Small Business and Entrepreneurial Success. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *9*, 141-156.

Ronstadt, R. (1987), "The educated entrepreneurs: a new era of entrepreneurial education is beginning", American Journal of Small Business 11 (4), 37-53.

Ronstadt, R. (1990), "The educated entrepreneurs: a new era of entrepreneurial education evolves", in Kent, C.A. (Ed.), "Entrepreneurship Education", Quorum Books, New

Sexton, D.L. & Smilor, R.W. (eds.) 1986. The art and science of entrepreneurship. Ballinger.

Shepherd, D.A. & Douglas, E.J. 1996. *Is management education developing or killing the entrepreneurial spirit?* Proceedings of the Internationalising Entrepreneurship Education and Training Conference, Arnhem, June.

Say, J-B. 1803. A treatise on political economy, or the production, distribution and consumption of wealth. C.R. Prinsep, trans. and Clement C. Biddle., ed. 1855. Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger.

Scherer, R., Adams, J., Carley, S., & Wiebe, F. (1989). Role Model Performance Effects on Development of Entrepreneurial Career Preference. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 13 (3), 53-71. Scherer, R., Brodzinski, J., & Wiebe, F. (1991). Examining the Relationship between Personality and Entrepreneurial Career Preference. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, *3*, 195-206.

Shane S. 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science* 11(4): 448-469.

Shane, S. 2003. A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus. Edward Elgar.

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 217–226.

Solomon, G. T., Duffy, S. & Tarabishy, A. 2002. The state of entrepreneurship education in the United States: A nationwide survey and analysis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education* 1(1), 65–86.

Surlemont, E. 2007. Promoting Enterprising: a strategic move to get schools' cooperation in the promotion of entrepreneurship, in Fayolle, A. (ed.), *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education, Volume 2 - Contextual Perspectives*, Edward Elgar.

Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do Entrepreneurship Programs Raise Entrepreneurial Intention of Science and Engineering students? The Effect of Learning, Inspiration and Resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22, 566-591.

Sophie, P.P. (2015). An Assessment of the Objectives of Entrepreneurship Programme in Ghanaian Polytechnic: The case of Cape Coast Polytechnic as a Tret Institution. *International Journal of Humanities*, 5(10), 138-140.

Thurik, A. R. (1996). Small firms, Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth. In P. H. Admiral, *Small Business in the Modern Economy*. De Vries Lectures in Economics, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Thurik, R., & Wennekers, S. (2004). *Entrepreneurship, small business and economic growth*. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 11 (1), 140-149.

Vesper, K.H. & Gartner, W.B. 1997. *Measuring progress in entrepreneurship education*. Journal of Business Venturing, 12(5), 403–421.

Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). *Gender, Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy, and Entrepreneurial Career Intentions: Implications for Entrepreneurship Education.* Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 31 (3), 387-406.

International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research Volume 9, Issue 4, April-2018 ISSN 2229-5518

Von Graevenitz, G., Harhoff, D., and R. Weber (2010), "*The effects of entrepreneurship education*", Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization 76 (1), 90–112.

Schumpeter, J.A: 1911. The theory of economic development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press, 1934.

Zeithaml, C., & Rice, G. (1987). *Entrepreneurship/Small Business Education in American Universities*. Journal of Small Business Management, 25 (1), 44-50.

Zimmerer, T., & Scarborough, M. (2005). *Essentials of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

# IJSER