
AN EVALUATION OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION IN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN NIGERIA: A NEED FOR RE-ENGINEERING

¹ Tpl. Mrs. Catherine. E. Uloko, ²Galadima Abok B & ³Jafaru Maigida
*Kaduna Polytechnic, P.M.B 2026,
Kaduna State, Nigeria.*

Abstract

The transformation agenda of the President Jonathan's regime is meant to bring about the desired change in some key areas of the socio-economy, cultural and political development in the country for which human capital development is inclusive. The appropriate entrepreneurship education is said to be an agent of transformation of human capital development because it has the capacity to reduce unemployment in the country and motivate self-reliance among the youths, hence would bring about economic growth, and sustainable development. However, the attainment of the desired human capital transformation agenda can only be possible if the right environment for entrepreneurship education is provided. The research was conducted in Kaduna Polytechnic. The survey and case study research designs were adopted. The simple random sampling method was employed to administer structured questionnaires to 350 final year students, 30 teachers of entrepreneurship education and 20 industries where graduates of the entrepreneurship education are employed. The study revealed that the key problems facing entrepreneurship education in tertiary institutions in Nigeria include poor/inadequate quality/quantity of relevant infrastructures for teaching of entrepreneurship education, poor teaching/learning environment, pedagogy of teaching is theoretically based hence practical's are not carried out, and lack of industrial/site visits among others. The paper recommended that Tetfund intervention is needed in areas of providing job-specific infrastructure for all programmes in tertiary institutions, sponsoring internship and field trips for students and staff and also to provide research grants for research work in entrepreneurship education. The American model of entrepreneurship education which basically is practically motivated should be copied. The training of entrepreneurship educators should cut across all disciplines as is the case in Kaduna Polytechnic.

Keywords: *Evaluation, entrepreneurship education, tertiary institutions, re-engineering, and transformation agenda*

Background to the Study

Entrepreneurship Education according to Chinasa (2012) as defined by the consortium for entrepreneurship education is a form of education that seeks to prepare people especially youths to be responsible enterprising individuals who become entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial thinkers and who contribute to economic development and

sustainable communities. Entrepreneurship education is not based on a textbook course, rather students are immersed in real life learning experiences where one has an opportunity to take risk, manage the results and learn from the outcomes.

Similarly, Musa (2005), viewed entrepreneurship education as being the broad scope of behavior modification plans aimed at preparing, training, developing, upgrading the operational efforts and other competencies required for effective self-reliance and self-employment practices especially in the formal school setting.

The prevalence of unemployment in Nigeria remains a great challenge confronting the government and the people today. This calls for scholars of various disciplines of learning to brainstorm on how best our educational system and methodology can begin to yield result in curbing this menace.

As part of the on-going effort to find lasting solution to the high level of unemployment in Nigeria and to move the country towards self-reliance, economic growth and sustainable development; this paper examines "Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria: A need for re-engineering."

Statement of the Problem

From observation and experience as members of the academia and teachers of entrepreneurship in tertiary institutions, the problem of entrepreneurship education can be summarized as comprising weak ideological and curriculum base, improper methodology, poor funding and wrong attitude of institutions. It is based on a textbook course, rather than students being immersed in real life learning experiences where one has an opportunity to take risk, manage the results and learn from the outcomes. Consequently the development of effective human capital suitable to enhance overall socio- economic is threatened.

It is in the realization of these that it became imperative that the study was undertaken to reveal the actual status of the phenomenon. This therefore, forms the basis for this study, particularly for the tertiary institutions of learning.

Objectives of the Study

The paper aims at evaluating entrepreneurship education in Nigeria with a view to identifying challenges and suggests measures toward its transformation. This can be achieved through the following objectives

1. To assess the perception of students to the teaching of entrepreneurship
2. To assess the perception of teachers to the learning of entrepreneurship
3. To assess the perception of industries to entrepreneurship education
4. To make recommendations towards the transformation of Entrepreneurship education in Nigeria

Research Questions

The following research questions shall be answered in this paper:

1. What is the perception of students to the teaching of entrepreneurship?
2. What is the perception of teachers to the learning of entrepreneurship?
3. What is the perception of industry to entrepreneurship education?
4. How can Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria be re-engineered to meet the needs of the industry and the society in general?

Conceptual and Theoretical Background

In order to put this research into context, some conceptual and theoretical issues were reviewed as follows: concepts of entrepreneurship education, models of entrepreneurship education, and entrepreneurship education in Nigeria.

Concepts of Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria

There has been considerable controversy on a workable definition of what an entrepreneur is and what constitutes entrepreneurial practice entrepreneurship from the time it was first recognized by Cantillon in 1755 cited in Cantillon, (1931), through the period of Schumpeter in the 1930s, to the present day.

Entrepreneurship study has been described as a scholarly field that seeks to understand how opportunities to bring into existence future goods and services are discovered, created and exploited, by whom, and with what consequences. It is concerned with the creation and recognition of opportunities, as well as the pursuit of those opportunities by turning them into wealth creating businesses during a limited window of time (Sexton, 1997).

There are various definitive labels used to describe entrepreneurship education. Essentially, Gibb made a clear distinction between enterprise education and entrepreneurship education, with the former focusing on the advancement of personal enterprising attributes and attitudes that prepare the individual for self-employment, while the latter relates to the development of functional management skills and abilities that train the individual to start, manage, and develop a business. Despite this distinction, the ultimate aim of both enterprise and entrepreneurship education is to encourage independent business creation.

Models of Entrepreneurship Education

Notable studies (Ronstadt, 1984, 1990; Rushing, 1990; Alarape, 1999; Streeter *et al.*, 2002; Blenker *et al.*, 2004) have discussed various approaches and models of entrepreneurship education. These studies identified three primary models of entrepreneurship education: composite, integrated and network models.

Composite Model

The composite model consists of series of courses taught out of traditional academic departments. Under the composite model, the courses in entrepreneurship are usually assigned to lecturers/tutors whose principal interest and specialties lie elsewhere (e.g. economics, management, agricultural economics, sociology and psychology). This is a major defect addressed by the integrated model.

Integrated Model

The integrated model is delivered through a separate department or centre for entrepreneurship studies. The major strength of this model is the coordination of the entrepreneurship courses by a separate unit. This gives the programme more visibility and administrative support, reduces the gaps and overlaps that may develop in curriculum and support the emerging pedagogies of teaching entrepreneurial skills and a better understanding of entrepreneurship studies.

Network Model

The network model is not provided by a single university, but results from collaboration of two or more institutions. The network model has become increasingly popular due to the increasing decline in universities' financial resources in the face of increasing competing ends, and the growth in entrepreneurship studies in content and pedagogies. This network model has the advantage of creating a critical mass for entrepreneurship activities that would otherwise not be possible for an individual institution to achieve. However, it is plagued by a number of administrative and practicality problems relating to allocation of income and costs among collaborating institutions (Blenker *et al.*, 2004).

Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria

Since 1987, in order to combat unemployment and poverty, the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), with the technical assistance of multilateral institutions like United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations Development Programmes (UNDP) and International Labour Organization (ILO), and the cooperation of

the organized private sector (OPS), implemented some entrepreneurship development programmes. These were the 'Work-for-Your-Self Programmes' implemented across Nigeria between 1987 and 1991; the 'Start-and-Improve-Your-Business' programme introduced in 1994; and the 'Work-Improvement-for-Small Enterprises' (WISE) programme in 1997. The emphasis of these short-term formal trainings was on business start-ups and management skills.

In view of these, entrepreneurship can therefore be viewed as: the process of being self-employed by owning a small business, and its management for growth. These short-term entrepreneurship programmes achieved success in their own right. However, they were not adequate to provide entrepreneurial training for the teeming unemployed youths and hence the need for entrepreneurship education in the Nigerian educational system. In the last decade, the federal government instructed that all tertiary institutions establish entrepreneurship centers showing that the integrated model has been adopted by the Nigerian government.

Underlying the human capital entrepreneurship theory are two factors, education and experience (Becker,1975).The knowledge gained from education and experience represents a resource that is heterogeneously distributed across individuals and in effect central to understanding differences in opportunity identification and exploitation (Anderson & Miller, 2003, Chandler & Hanks, 1998). Therefore any attempt to fashion out a framework for the teaching of Entrepreneurship must be hinged on the development of human capital. This would be in line with one of the transformation agenda of the Goodluck Ebele Johnatan administration.

Methodology

The survey and case study research methods were adopted for this paper, the reason being that such would enable the researchers to obtain detailed and first hand information on the subject matter. Data for the study were obtained through interview with the relevant audience based on the simple random sampling method. The simple random sampling method was adopted to sample the respondents. The class list of the students in all the Departments in the Polytechnic was the sampling frame. A total of 350 final year students, 30 lecturers and 20 industries were interviewed using a well structured questionnaire. The case that was investigated is Kaduna Polytechnic and the period under study was 2010 to 2014. The four (4) points Likert scale was used to measure the variables (See Table 3.1). The descriptive analysis was employed using the mean and grand mean scores. The data were presented in textual and tabular forms.

Table 3.1: Rating System for the Likert Scale.

Rating	Description
1	Highly not satisfied
2	Not satisfied
3	Satisfied
4	Highly satisfied

Source: Adapted from Nworgu (1988) in Nworgu (1999)

In interpreting the data collected based on a four (4 points Likert Scale, which ranged from 1 (for highly not satisfied) to 4 (for highly satisfied), any mean score of the respondents between 2.45 and 4.00 was considered as acceptance (agree), and the mean score of respondents of below 2.45 (between 0.00 and 2.44) as rejection (disagree).

Findings and Discussions

This section analyzed the results from the questionnaires administered to the

respondents. All the 350, 30 and 20 questionnaires distributed to the students, teachers and industry respectively were returned, hence, the analysis therefore covers the responses as contained in same. The analysis of the data was done based on the research questions and in accordance with the rating system in Table 3.1 and the decision rule thereof thus:

Research Question (1): What is the perception of students to the teaching of entrepreneurship?

Mean Responses of Students on Teaching of Entrepreneurship Education

The analysis of the variables in Table 4.1 indicates that majority of the respondents were not satisfied with the variables under investigation. The grand mean score is 2.41, signifying rejection. This therefore implies that the students are not satisfied with the teaching of entrepreneurship basically due to inadequate infrastructures for teaching, lack of practical among others. It is therefore expedient to provide more favorable and conducive environment for the teaching of the subject.

Table 4.1: Mean Responses of Students on their perception on Teaching of Entrepreneurship Education

S/No	Variables	1	2	3	4	N= 350	\bar{x}	Remark
1	Quality of relevant infrastructures for teaching of entrepreneurship education	230	160	60	80	530	1.51	Reject
2	Quantity of relevant infrastructures for teaching of entrepreneurship education	130	300	120	120	670	1.91	Reject
3	Quality of teachers	10	180	510	320	1020	2.91	Accept
4	Quantity of teachers	100	200	240	280	820	2.34	Accept
5	Teachers that have entrepreneurship training	120	140	330	200	790	2.26	Reject
6	Pedagogy is practically motivated	170	140	180	200	690	1.97	Reject
7	Pedagogy is theoretically based	10	140	390	560	1100	3.14 0	Accept
8	Quality of group assignments	40	260	210	440	950	2.71	Accept
9	Inspiration approach (stories of successful entrepreneurs)	70	140	330	400	940	2.69	Accept
10	Quality of invited guest entrepreneurs	140	220	180	160	700	2.00	Reject
11	Experience of guest entrepreneurs	150	200	150	200	700	2.00	Reject

12	Quality of examination	30	160	540	240	970	2.77	Accept
13	Quality of practical's	90	260	210	240	800	2.29	Reject
14	Industrial/site visits	180	200	210	0	590	1.69	Reject
15	Coverage of syllabus	90	180	240	360	870	2.49	Accept
16	Number of lecture hours per semester	80	100	300	480	960	2.74	Accept
17	Practical's used for skill acquisition	140	200	210	160	710	2.03	Reject
18	Practical's used for attitude acquisition	140	200	300	40	680	1.94	Reject
19	Practical's used for knowledge application (business planning)	70	200	360	240	870	2.49	Accept
20	Entrepreneurship education has aided technical capabilities	40	160	240	600	1040	2.97	Accept
21	Entrepreneurship education has enhanced social insight	40	120	450	400	1010	2.89	Accept
22	Importance of Entrepreneurship education in field of study	30	100	270	720	1120	3.20	Accept
	Grand Mean $52.94/22 = 2.41$							Reject

Research Question (2): What is the perception of teachers to the learning of entrepreneurship?

Mean Responses of Teachers on Teaching/Learning of Entrepreneurship Education
The analysis of the variables in Table 5.2 indicate that majority of the respondents were satisfied with the variables under investigation. The grand mean score is 2.57, signifying acceptance. This therefore, implies that the teachers are satisfied with the teaching and learning of entrepreneurship even though they attested to the fact that there is lack of infrastructure for practicals hence the pedagogy is theoretically based. There is therefore the need to provide the suitable environment for the teaching and learning of the subject.

Table 4.2: Mean Responses of Teachers on their perception on Teaching/Learning of Entrepreneurship

S/ No	Variables	1	2	3	4	N= 20	\bar{x}	Remark
1	Curriculum	3	6	36	48	93	3.10	Accept
2	Lecture hours	0	36	27	12	75	2.50	Accept
3	Practical's	24	6	9	0	39	1.30	Reject
4	Participation of students during lectures	0	12	63	12	87	2.90	Accept
5	Feedback of students on application of knowledge in their day-to-day operations	3	30	36	0	69	2.30	Reject
6	Teaching/learning environment	18	6	18	12	54	1.80	Reject
7	Pedagogy is practically motivated	0	42	18	12	72	2.40	Reject
8	Pedagogy is theoretically based	0	18	36	36	90	3.00	Accept
9	Improvement of students technical skills	3	12	54	12	78	2.60	Accept
10	Improvement of students entrepreneurial activities	3	6	63	12	84	2.80	Accept
11	Entrepreneurship education has aided technical functions	0	0	36	72	108	3.60	Accept
	Grand Mean $28.30/11 = 2.57$							Accept`

Research Question (3): What is the perception of industry to entrepreneurship education?

Mean Responses of Industry on Entrepreneurship Education Based on the Performance of Graduates

The analysis of the variables in Table 4.3 show that majority of the respondents were satisfied with the variables under investigation. The grand mean score is 2.72, signifying acceptance. This therefore implies that the industry is satisfied with the performance of the graduates of entrepreneurship education hence the need to improve on the training of such students for better performance.

Table 4.3: Mean Responses of Industry on their perception on Entrepreneurship education based on the performance of graduates

S/ No	Variables	1	2	3	4	N= 20	\bar{x}	Remark
1	Dream/Passion	0	20	24	8	52	2.60	Accept
2	Creativity/innovativeness	0	12	30	16	64	3.20	Accept
3	Initiative/pro-activeness	0	20	30	0	50	2.50	Accept
4	Self motivation	2	16	18	16	52	2.60	Accept
5	Ability to work as a team (team work spirit)	0	4	36	24	64	3.20	Accept
6	Relationship with colleagues	0	0	30	40	70	3.50	Accept
7	Ability to motivate others	2	12	36	0	50	2.50	Accept
8	Being in charge of one's destiny	4	24	12	0	40	2.00	Reject
9	Flexibility and adaptability/resilience	2	20	24	0	46	2.30	Reject
10	Commitment	2	8	36	8	54	2.70	Accept
11	Time management	0	12	42	0	54	2.70	Accept
12	Ability to multi-task/work under pressure	4	16	18	8	46	2.30	Reject
13	Problem solving ability	0	8	30	24	62	3.10	Accept
14	Confidence	0	12	36	8	56	2.80	Accept
15	Social responsibility	2	12	30	8	52	2.60	Accept
16	Dedication to duty	0	4	36	24	64	3.20	Accept
17	Entrepreneurship ability	0	4	30	8	48	2.40	Reject
	Grand Mean 46.20/17 = 2.72							Accept

Conclusion

The research was designed to address the teaching, and learning of entrepreneurship education with the aim of making recommendations towards re-engineering. The study revealed that there are problems faced in the teaching and learning of entrepreneurship education. Among these problems are; poor/inadequate quality/quantity of relevant infrastructures for teaching of entrepreneurship education, poor teaching/learning environment, pedagogy of teaching is theoretically based hence practical's are not carried out, lack of industrial/site visits, and many more.

These problems therefore have resulted in the inability to achieve the tenets of entrepreneurship education in the Country. If the problems identified are resolved, there would be improvement in entrepreneurship education, and this would also reduce the prevalence of unemployment in the country and motivate self-reliance among the youths. It would bring about economic growth and sustainable development. Human capital development would also be enhanced thereby attaining the transformation agenda for the nation. In this light, there is therefore the need for efforts to be made by all major stake holders to implement the preceding recommendations.

Recommendations

There exists high level of unemployment in Nigeria and since self-reliance is one of the means of job creation, urgent actions are required towards solving the identified problems of entrepreneurship education. Therefore in order to achieve the objectives of the transformation agenda on human development toward attaining vision 20-20-20, the following

Recommendations are made:

1. Skills acquisition should not be equated to entrepreneurship education as often been misconstrued
2. Tetfund intervention is required in the area of providing job-specific infrastructure for all programmes after needs assessment has been carried out by the Entrepreneurship Centre of each institution
3. Tetfund needs to also intervene in entrepreneurship education by sponsoring internship and field trips for students and staff
4. Tetfund is to also encourage students and staff by establishing a special grant for research work in entrepreneurship education
5. The syllabus of the subject recommends that at least a guest Entrepreneur be invited to motivate students; however, this aspect is very poorly handled by both the teachers, and the institutions. To overcome this problem, institutions should use their IGR to fund this aspect in line with the external examiner model
6. Copying the American Model, which has no written examination, but emphasizes the use of residential incubators to help students in start-ups; Nigerian tertiary institutions should adopt the above model.
7. Training of entrepreneurship educators should cut across all disciplines as is the case in Kaduna Polytechnic.
8. Entrepreneurship education should be taught at all levels because of the volume of the syllabus.
9. Inter institutional/interdepartmental collaborations should be encouraged through the establishment of competitions, seminars and workshops.

References

- Alarape, A. A. (1999), "Entrepreneurship education: Challenges of Nigerian universities". *Ife Social Science Review*, 17, 118-124.
- Anderson, A., & Miller, C. (2003), "Class matters: human & social capital in the entrepreneurial process"
- Becker, (1975), "Human Capital. Chicago", IL: Chicago University Press.
- Blenker, P., Dreisler, P., Færgemann, H. M., & Kjeldsen, J. (2004), "Entrepreneurship education & university context.
- Cantillon, R. (1931), "Essays on the nature of commerce in general". (H. Higgs. Trans). London: Macmillan & Company. (Original work published 1755).

- Chandler, G., & Hanks, S. (1998), "An examination of the substitutability of founder's human & financial current trends (Working paper 2002)". Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Department of Applied Economics
- Chinasa O.E. (2012), "Business Education & Entrepreneurship Education Agenda as a Synergy for the reduction of unemployment in Nigeria". Retrieved on September 3, 2014, from www.mcser.org/.../Obi%20Emmanuel%20Chinasa.pdf
 "Entrepreneurship education" Current developments, future directions (pp. 69-88). New York: Quorum Books. future directions (pp. 29-40). New York: Quorum Books. Retrieved August 26, 2014, from http://epe.cornell.edu/downloads/WP_2002_final.PDF.
 Management.
- Musa A (2005), "Modalities & requirements of promoting entrepreneurship education in Nigerian technical institutions". Being a Paper presented at the capacity building workshop for lecturers of Polytechnics & Monotechnics in Nigeria. Held at Kano State Polytechnic, Kano, between 18th 29th September, 2005
- Ronstadt, R. (1984), "Entrepreneurship". Test, cases & notes. Dover, MS: Lord Publishing.
- Ronstadt, R. (1990), "The educated entrepreneurs". A new era of entrepreneurial education is beginning. In C. A. Kent (Ed.),
- Rushing F. W. (1990), "Entrepreneurship & Education In: C.A. Kent (ed.) Entrepreneurship education". Current developments,
- Sexton, D. L. (1997), "Entrepreneurship research needs & issues". In: D. Sexton & R. Smilor (Eds.) Entrepreneurship 2000.
- Streeter, D. H., Jaquette, J. P., Jr., & Hovis, K. (2002), "University-wide entrepreneurship education". Alternative models