

Pedagogical Practices In Teaching Entrepreneurship Education In Universities In South-West Nigeria

F. A. Adesoji (Ph.D)

Science, Mathematics and Technology Education Department
University of Ibadan

S. A. Sangoleye (M.Ed)

Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education
Owerri, Imo State.

ABSTRACT

The study examined the qualifications of entrepreneurship education lecturers and pedagogical practices in teaching entrepreneurship education in universities in south-west Nigeria. Stratified sampling was used to classify universities in Nigeria into federal, state and private based on ownerships of the institutions. Using simple random sampling, four universities each were selected from federal and state strata totaling eight universities while private stratum was purposively partial out. Purposive and random sampling were used to select 51 entrepreneurship education lecturers, 6 directors of EDCs and 831 400L undergraduates. Two instruments designed and validated by the investigators were used for data collection. Results indicated that non-specialists teach entrepreneurship education; writing and presenting business plans and feasibility study is the most common teaching strategies in teaching entrepreneurship education. There is a significant influence of approach of the institution to internship on undergraduates' disposition to self-employment ($F_{(2,828)} = 3.209$; $P < 0.05$). Hence, employment of qualified lecturers, artisans, practicing entrepreneurs and construction of incubation centres in teaching entrepreneurship education in universities in south-west Nigeria are imperative.

INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of graduate unemployment in Nigeria has become worrisome to stakeholders in the education industry and the need to restructure the curriculum and the education system towards ameliorating this problem becomes imperative. Adejimonla and Olufunmilayo (2009) observed that 80% of graduates from Nigerian universities find it very difficult to get employment every year. This is partly due to the curricula of the universities and other tertiary institutions, which lay emphasis on equipping students for white-collar jobs. Most students in tertiary institutions are equipped with only theoretical knowledge of the course they enrolled in without the practical aspect which has created skill gap on graduation. Apart from the fact that facilities for teaching and learning are lacking, it is most likely that the curricula are skewed toward acquisition of factual knowledge and certificates which force teachers/lecturers to use the expository methods in teaching (Obanya, 2002; 2007).

Put differently, the curricula of these tertiary institutions lack entrepreneurial content that would have equipped graduates with necessary skills and attitudes for them to be self-reliant on graduation. The consequences of this is reflected on the high rate of unemployment and the deplorable state of the economy and its consequential social ills like prostitution, armed robbery, thurgery, kidnapping, among others.

Recent reports put the unemployment rate in Nigeria at 18.3% in the fourth quarter of 2016 from 13.9% in the third quarter of 2016, 13.3% in the second quarter and 12.1% in the first quarter of 2016 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2016).



Figure. 1: Unemployment and Underemployment Rates (2010-Q3, 2016)

Graduate unemployment in Nigeria is cumulative; it increases as institutions turn out graduates annually and this is compounded by the change in the value system of many Nigerian youths who look down on agriculture in spite of the vast arable land available at a cheaper rate. Research results (Anyago, 2009; Akpan and Etor, 2013) affirm the scourge of graduate unemployment in Nigeria and blamed it on tertiary education curriculum. The obsolescence of knowledge coupled with value placed on acquisition of soft skills by graduates in the labour market has limited the number of white collar jobs available for the graduates and this has resulted in high rate of unemployment or underemployment or un-employability of graduates, (Durosaro and Adegoke, 2011).

This phenomenon, consequently, affects the living standard of the unemployed graduates and the spillover effects are visible on the polity since the myriads of unemployed graduates have become clogs in the wheel of nation's progress. Confirming this, Adepegba (2011), Ibrahim (2011), Lartry (2011), Olatunji and Abioye (2011), Okafor (2011) and Adebayo (2013) observe that unemployment rate in Nigeria has continued to be on the increase despite the abundant human and natural resources available in the country. Nigeria streets are filled with youth hawkers who, ordinarily would have either been job creators or skilled enough to get gainful employment in some enterprises. The large number of unemployed youths is capable of undermining not only the economy but also the democratic process as they constitute serious threat if they are engaged by the political class for criminal activities such as political thurgery, militancy, among others.

In other words, there is obvious lack of connection and mismatch between the expectation of the industry and products of the nation's higher institutions, thereby rendering many graduates of higher institutions in Nigeria unemployable (Onuoha, 2011; Gabadeen and Raimi, 2012). Offorma (2005) advises that for Nigeria to become a key player in the world economy of the 21st century, entrepreneurial education should be introduced at all levels of the education system. Addressing this scourge of graduate unemployment and the mismatch, no doubt, requires some educational intervention, hence, the Federal Government of Nigeria through the National Universities Commission introduced entrepreneurship education into the curriculum

of university education in 2006. The course (entrepreneurship education) was also made compulsory for all undergraduates students (Gabadeen and Raimi, 2012; Obioma, 2012; Akpan and Etor, 2013).

The aim of this educational intervention is to equip students with entrepreneurial skills, attitude and competences in order to be job creators and not job seekers. This is also expected to improve the economic, technological and industrial development of the nation. This would consequently reduce poverty to its barest minimum (Oduwaiye, Abdulkareem and Oyeniran, 2011; Olorundare and Kayode, 2014).

Little wonder the Federal Republic of Nigeria introduced entrepreneurship education curriculum into the tertiary education in order to help university undergraduates imbibe entrepreneurial competences at early stage so that on graduation, they may become graduate entrepreneurs and managers of new businesses. It should be noted at this point that the place of entrepreneurship education is reflected in the National Policy on Education Section 5, sub-section 81, which states the goals of tertiary education as follows:

- a. Contribute to national development through high level manpower training;
- b. Provide accessible and affordable quality learning opportunities in formal and informal education in response to the needs and interests of all Nigerians;
- c. Provide high quality career counseling and life-long learning programmes that prepare students with the knowledge and skills for self-reliance and the world of work;
- d. Reduce skill shortages through the production of skilled manpower relevant to the needs of the labour market;
- e. Promote and encourage scholarship, entrepreneurship and community service;
- f. Forge and cement national unity; and
- g. Promote national and international understanding and interaction (FRN, 2013).

Looking at the items a–g above, it can be deduced that items a-e are specific to the development of entrepreneurial skills among undergraduates. Similarly, sub-section 86(d) states that university education shall make optimum contribution to national development by making entrepreneurial skills acquisition a requirement for all Nigerian universities.

Entrepreneurship education curriculum is expected to be functional by addressing the problem of graduate unemployment in the country. And this can be done if the curriculum provides two basic fundamentals namely skill development and job creation. Skill development will make undergraduates productive participants and economically active contributors to the development of the country's economy and the global economy while job creation would prevent the undergraduates from totally depending on government for employment upon graduation. Scholars have different views in defining entrepreneurship education. Gabadeen and Raimi (2012) defined entrepreneurship education as a learning process that requires from learners self-direction and self-management, unlike the traditional stereotype teaching. It is the gateway to job opportunity and job creation which would constantly enhance self-reliance and self-employment among university graduates (Okiti, 2009).

Entrepreneurship education is that aspect of education which equips an individual and creates in the person the mindset to undertake the risk of venturing into something new by applying the knowledge and skills acquired in school (Nwosu and Ohia, 2009). In other words, entrepreneurship education can simply be defined as an educational intervention, which is designed to inculcate in the learners entrepreneurship knowledge, skills, attitudes and competencies; that would not only make them possess saleable skills and be marketable in the

world of work but also be employable and be self-reliant, create their own job, become employers of labour and wealth creators rather than being perpetual job seekers.

The fundamental questions one asks at this point are what are the qualifications of and teaching strategies entrepreneurship education lecturers employed in implementing entrepreneurship education curriculum in Nigerian universities so as to achieve the objectives of the curriculum. Obioma (2012) posits that teaching and learning entrepreneurship is different from that of other disciplines. Entrepreneurship is more of factor of motivation and behavioural attitude rather than instrumental knowledge. Obioma stated further that the way actual entrepreneurs learn should guide us in crafting curriculum and mode of instruction for entrepreneurship. That is, actual entrepreneurs primarily learn by doing or by direct observation. Dhliwayo (2008) observed that most of the existing entrepreneurship education curriculum emphasizes the theoretical knowledge and give less attention to the practical application of the subject. The programmes accentuate the established knowledge; however, they are frail on skill development and tacit experience, which are critical features for nascent entrepreneurs.

Suleiman and Wan-Fauziah (2015) remarked that the teaching of entrepreneurship courses remains relatively underdeveloped. It is all-comer game (Inegbenbor, 2005) despite the growing demand for more entrepreneurial oriented graduates. The result of neglecting the teaching aspects is that most of the lecturers of entrepreneurship education do not have relevant entrepreneurship qualification and necessary competences to teach the courses.

Sulaimen and Wan-Fauziah (2015) conducted a study on relevant educational qualifications for entrepreneurship lecturers in Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) in Malaysia and Nigeria. The findings revealed that in Malaysia, higher degree in management has the highest mean score of 4.81, closely followed by higher degree in entrepreneurship and higher degree in management with the mean scores of 4.78 and 4.66 respectively. A minimum of master degree in any field has the lowest mean score of 4.30. Also, the findings revealed that higher professional degree in entrepreneurship education (mean=4.50) rated as the most relevant educational qualification for teaching entrepreneurship education in Nigeria higher learning institutions. The respondents also rated higher degree in management with a mean score of 4.19 as the second most relevant educational qualification required by entrepreneurship education lecturers. Good higher degree in non-management courses has the lowest mean score of 4.01. They, therefore, concluded that the teaching of entrepreneurship courses can only be effective when the lecturers handling the courses have the relevant educational qualifications.

Myrah and Currie (2006) assert that lecturers who are qualified in industrial or entrepreneurship experience are in short supply. Little wonder Oduwaiye, et al (2011); Olorundare and Kayode, (2014); and Uzoegwu and Egbe (2014) opine that the responsibility of running the programme is entrusted with the Centre for Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Development Research. The centre has a pool of lecturers drawn from cognate facilities/departments.

Teaching entrepreneurship education is both a science and an art. However, there is a unanimous agreement among entrepreneurship educators that there needs to be a shift of emphasis from the scientific to the artistic and creative teaching of entrepreneurship (Lee and Wong, 2007; Arasti, Falavarjan, and Imanipour, 2012). The key to a successful entrepreneurship education is to find the most effective way to manage the teachable skills and identify the best match between students' needs and teaching techniques as there is no

universal pedagogical recipe to teach entrepreneurship. The choice of technique and modalities depends mainly on the objectives, content and constraints imposed by the institutional context. As soon as the objectives have been agreed upon and specific constraints have been identified, the right teaching methods can be selected. Also, the effectiveness of entrepreneurship programme depends mostly on teacher's skill and knowledge of different teaching methods particularly entrepreneurship teaching methods (Arasti, Falavarjani and Imanipour, 2012; Fajolle and Gailly, 2008).

While emphasizing the objectives of entrepreneurship education as an important yardstick in determining the ways to offer entrepreneurship education, Hytti and O'Gorman (2004) state that if the objective of the education is to increase the understanding of what entrepreneurship is all about, the most effective way to accomplish the objective is to provide information through public channels such as media, seminars or lectures. These methods are effective in sending relevant information to a broader population in a relative short time period. If the objective is to equip individual with entrepreneurial skills, which are applicable directly to work, the best way is to provide education and training that enable individuals to involve directly in the entrepreneurial process through industrial training. Lastly, if the objective of the education is to prepare individuals to act as entrepreneurs, the most effective technique is to facilitate experiments by trying entrepreneurship out in a controlled environment, for instance through business simulation or role playing.

Scholars have identified various teaching methodologies that the universities have to use in programme implementation for students to develop knowledge-based applied skills. They include analysis of real entrepreneurial case studies, business plan development, teaching by entrepreneurs in addition to academic staff. Case study, group discussion, individual/group presentation, individual written report, group project, formal lecture, guest speaker action learning, seminar, web-based learning, video recorded, individual project, training in an enterprise, simulation, are some of the teaching methods employed in entrepreneurship education (Carrier, 2007; Hindle, 2007; Fayolle, 2007; Fayolle et al 2008; Arasti et al, 2012; Fosu and Boateng, 2013; Lonappan, 2013). According to Lee and Wong (2007) business plan development, case studies and lectures are the most popular methods of teaching in entrepreneurship education. Bennet (2006) revealed that 95% of the lecturers give formal lectures. In Malaysia, 84% of entrepreneurship programme were conducted via lectures (Cheng et al, 2009). These teaching methods have been categorized into traditional methods (comprising lectures) and innovative methods (action-based methods). While active methods facilitate learning and said to be more appropriate for nurturing entrepreneurial attributes among students, traditional methods are less effective in encouraging entrepreneurial attributes and that such methods actually make students become dominant participants, prepare them to work for an entrepreneur, but not to become one (entrepreneur) (Arasti et al, 2012; Bennet, 2006; Fiet, 2000; Adedoyin, 2010).

Commenting on the existing shortfall in entrepreneurship programme implementation, Ezene (2015) reveals that lecturers who teach Entrepreneurship Development Education (EDE) (as it is called in polytechnic education) courses mainly used lecturer-oriented methods that would not lead students to acquire relevant skills. Mwasalwibe (2010) confirm that most entrepreneurship educators though relate their courses with new venture creation, they actually end up teaching 'about' entrepreneurship. If entrepreneurship is to be learned as a career, it is best done using some kind of apprenticeship. Traditional methods should only be used to give students the commercial underpinnings of their entrepreneurial actions. Doing something practical and having an opportunity to question, investigate, converse and discuss with real-world entrepreneurs gives both knowledge and skills and also stimulate attitudes.

However, in reality, most of the advocated action-based teaching methods are costly and somehow may not align to the conventional university system of teaching and awarding. Little wonder Fiet (2000) explains that institutions rely on lecture-based methods because they can be easily employed and also require less investments.

In other words, if entrepreneurial learning will be enhanced and graduate entrepreneurs would be produced among university undergraduates, lecturers who handled the programme must be entrepreneurial. Entrepreneurial teachers beget entrepreneurial students. Appropriate learning activities in the students' chosen areas of entrepreneurial activity (computer repair, table water production, hair-dressing/barbing, tailoring, farming, among others) should be provided through collaboration between universities and industry, use of local entrepreneurs to act of quest speaker, internship and lecturers, who have industrial and entrepreneurship experience. This implies that entrepreneurship educator should be more of a coach, facilitator of learning, than someone who lectures.

Teaching entrepreneurship education should emphasize active learning and practical experiences should be provided to students outside classroom situation. Students should be exposed to the programme in such a way that the programme develops in them entrepreneurial attitude, knowledge and skills, which should enable them to recognize opportunities and turn such to job-creating and wealth-making ventures. These entrepreneurial competences require active methods of engaging students to realize their potentials (creativity and innovativeness) through hand-on, real life learning activities. The use of lecture method should be deemphasized unless when teaching about entrepreneurship while experiential learning, individual project should be encouraged. Group project when used should incorporates project defence by each member of the group.

Unfortunately, this may be tedious and difficult for lecturers handling the programme due to large class size that characterizes general courses, inadequate facilities to work with, lack of artisans in most entrepreneurship centres, level of lecturer's commitment and work load, among others. That is, a combination of formal lecture and practical learning in a chosen entrepreneurial activity outside the classroom should be employed by entrepreneurship education lecturers for students to have enriched learning experiences.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of the introduction of compulsory entrepreneurship education in Nigerian universities, many graduates are still unemployed after graduation because they lack entrepreneurial skills. Entrepreneurship education seems not to be achieving the objectives for which it was introduced. Hence, there is need to examine the process of instructional delivery in entrepreneurship education classes in order to produce graduate entrepreneurs.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered in the study:

1. What is the profile of entrepreneurship education lecturers in terms of gender, qualification, quantity, teaching experience, area of specialization and class population?
2. What teaching strategies do entrepreneurship education lecturers employed in the implementation of entrepreneurship education curriculum?
3. Is there any collaboration between universities and industries around them in imparting entrepreneurial skills in students?
4. What is the relationship between teaching hour per week and students' attitude to entrepreneurship education?

METHOD

Sampling Procedure and Sample

A multi-stage sampling technique was used. At the first stage of sampling, four States in South-West Nigeria were randomly selected. At the second stage of sampling, a stratified sampling technique was adopted to classify the universities in each of the States into three strata based on the ownership of the institutions (Federal, State and Private). At this stage of sampling, the private stratum was purposively partial out while the remaining two strata (Federal and State Universities) were selected. At the third stage of sampling, random sampling was used to select one federal and one state university. At the fourth stage of sampling, three faculties were randomly selected in each of the selected universities. Purposive sampling technique was used at the last stage of sampling to select 400Lundergraduates and entrepreneurship education lecturers. They were purposively selected because lecturers were involved in the implementation and students have been exposed to entrepreneurship education curriculum in their 300L.

Instrument

Two instruments –Lecturers’/Students’ Perception of Entrepreneurship Education Curriculum Questionnaire (LSPEECQ) and Pedagogical Practices in Curriculum Implementation Scale (PPCIS) were used to collect data. LSPEECQ is made up of two sections. Section A sought socio-demographic data of the respondents while section B contains twenty-five items that measured lecturers and students’ perception of the implementation process. Cronbach alpha yielded a reliability index of 0.81. PPCIS contains 14 items indicating various teaching strategies used by the lecturers. Its reliability index of 0.75 was established using cronbach alpha.

Scoring

Lecturers and students rated their perception on the curriculum on 4-point Likert Scale of Strongly Agree-4; Agree-3; Disagree-2; and Strongly Disagree-1. Negatively worded items were reversely scored. PPCIS was structured along 4-point rating scale of Very Often-4; Often-3; Sometimes-2; and Not At all-1 for lecturers to indicate the frequency of use of the strategies.

Procedure for Data Collection and Analysis

The researchers obtained permission to conduct the study from directors of entrepreneurial centre and university lecturers. Students’ questionnaire were administered first with the help of university lecturers and the instruments were retrieved immediately after completion. Lecturers’ questionnaire and PPCIS were left with entrepreneurship education lecturers for a week before retrieval. Descriptive statistics of frequency counts, mean, standard deviation and rank order were used.

RESULTS

Research Question 1

What is the profile of entrepreneurship education lecturers in terms of gender, qualification, quantity, teaching experience and area of specialization?

Table 1: Percentage Analysis of the Profile of Entrepreneurship Education Lecturers in Selected Universities in South-West Nigeria

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	33	64.7
	Female	17	33.3
	No indication	1	2.0
	Total	51	100.0
Qualifications	B.Sc	1	2.0
	Masters	13	25.5
	Ph.D	30	58.8
	No Indication	7	13.7
	Total	51	100.0
Teaching Experience	0-10 years	23	45.1
	11-20years	11	21.6
	20years and above	13	25.5
	No indication	4	7.8
	Total	51	100.0
Area of Specialization	Social Sciences	25	49.0
	Medical sciences	1	2.0
	Technology	1	2.0
	Education	2	3.9
	Agriculture and Forestry	2	3.9
	Entrepreneurial /Business Administration	15	29.4
	Arts	1	2.0
	No indication	4	7.8
Total	51	100.0	
Suggested lecturer House per week	2	33	64.7
	3-4	5	9.8
	5-6	8	15.7
	7+	5	9.8
	Total	51	100.0

A cursory look at table 1 revealed that 64.7% are male 33.3% are female while 2.0% failed to indicate gender. Under lecturers' qualification, it can be observed that 58.8% are Ph.D holders, 25.5% are masters holders and 2.0% being first degree holders and majority of entrepreneurship education lecturers are well experience. Also, 49.0% of entrepreneurship education lecturers specialized in social sciences. 29.4% specialized in Entrepreneurial Studies /Business Administration, 3.9% specialized in Education, Agriculture and Forestry while a specialist in Medical Sciences, Technology and Arts (2.0%) also delivered instruction in entrepreneurship education class.

Research Question 2:

What teaching strategies do entrepreneurship education lecturers employ in the implementation of entrepreneurship education curriculum?

Table 2: Teaching Strategies Employed by Entrepreneurship Education Lecturers in Implementing Entrepreneurship Education Curriculum.

S/N	Teaching Strategies Used	VO	O	S	NAA	Mean (\bar{x})	S.D	Rank Order
1	I use lecture and discussion methods through Power point presentation when the objective is to teach students what entrepreneurship is all about.	10(19.6)	15(29.4)	19(37.3)	6(11.8)	2.53	1.01	8 th
2	I assign students into various group for them to carryout projects	16(31.4)	16(31.4)	17(33.3)	2(3.9)	2.90	0.90	3 rd
3	Students are given individual project to execute	12(23.5)	21(41.2)	14(27.5)	3(5.9)	2.78	0.95	6 th
4	Guest speakers/ model entrepreneurs are called upon to delivery lectures/seminars	7(13.7)	17(33.3)	23(45.1)	3(5.9)	2.51	0.88	9 th
5	Students are sometimes placed with industries for projects and for them to simulate or try their ideas in practice	11(21.6)	14(27.5)	17(33.3)	8(15.7)	2.51	1.07	9 th
6	I employ problem – solving method in teaching students	16(31.4)	24(47.1)	10(19.6)	1(2.0)	3.08	0.77	2 nd
7	I make use of case studies	14(27.5)	22(43.1)	13(25.5)	-	2.90	0.94	3 rd
8	I inspire students to write and present business plans and feasibility studies	18(35.3)	21(41.2)	12(23.5)	-	3.12	0.77	1 st
9	I take students on field trips/excursion	9(17.6)	17(33.3)	16(31.4)	9(17.6)	2.51	0.98	9 th
10	I combine lecture/discussion with collaborative method	12(23.5)	23(45.1)	11(21.6)	3(5.9)	2.78	1.01	6 th
11	I combine lecture/discussion with project method	12(23.5)	20(39.2)	17(33.3)	2(3.9)	2.82	0.84	5 th
12	I implore students to show case their products or services (exhibition)	9(17.6)	15(29.4)	20(39.2)	5(9.8)	2.47	1.03	12 th
13	Web-based learning	6(11.8)	10(19.6)	16(31.4)	18(35.3)	2.04	1.06	13 th
14	Video-recorded lecture	3(5.9)	8(15.7)	15(29.4)	24(47.1)	1.76	0.95	14 th
	Weighted Mean = 2.62							

Figures in parentheses are percentages.

Key: Mean response ranges from 0.00-1.40 – Not at all, 1.50 – 2.40 – Sometimes, 2.50-3.40 – often and 3.50 – 4.00 = very often.

Table 2 revealed that writing and presenting business plans and feasibility studies had the highest means score ($\bar{x} = 3.12$) and is ranked first while video-recorded lecture ranked 14th ($\bar{x} = 1.76$). Also, none of the strategies is employed very often and none is not employed at all.

Research Question 3:

Is there any collaboration between universities and industries around in imparting entrepreneurial skills in students?

Table 3: Collaboration between Universities and Industries around in Imparting Entrepreneurial Skills in Students

S/N	Statements	Lecturers (\bar{x})	Students (\bar{x})
1	Students visit industries to have real life learning experiences	2.84	2.80
2	In my school, students do go for internship in related entrepreneurial training.	2.98	2.79
	Weighted Mean =	2.91	2.79

The weighted means of both lecturers and students ($\bar{x} = 2.91$ and 2.79) are both greater than the midpoint 2.50. It implies that there is collaboration between the universities and industries around in imparting entrepreneurial skills in Students.

Research Question 4:

What is the influence of institutional approach to internship on students' disposition towards self-employment?

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics on Approach to Internship and Students' Disposition to Self-Employment.

	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Students visiting	209	31.1579	5.05631	0.34975	30.4684	31.8474
Entrepreneur visiting	119	29.5294	7.92317	0.72632	28.0911	30.9677
Lecture Alone	501	30.4032	5.26166	0.23507	29.9413	30.8650
Total	829	30.4680	5.68650	0.19750	30.0804	30.8557

From table 4, it is obvious that students visiting entrepreneurs are better than students who received lecture alone and students who received alone are better than students who were visited by entrepreneurs in terms of their disposition towards self-employment.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Approach to Internship on Students' Disposition towards Self-employment.

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	206.41	2	103.21	3.209	0.041
Within Groups	26567.99	826	32.17		
Total	26774.40	828			

Significant at $P < 0.05$

Table 5 shows that there is a significant influence of the approach of the institution to internship on the undergraduates' disposition towards self-employment [$F_{(2,828)} = 3.209$; $P < 0.05$]. This implies that the disposition to self-employment mean score (31.16) of students, whose their institutions approach to internship involves students visiting the entrepreneurs outside the school is significantly different from the mean score (29.53) of students, whose their institution offers no internship but only allows entrepreneurs to visit but not significantly different from those who offered lecture alone (mean score = 30.40)

Research Question 5:

What is the relationship between teaching hour per week and students' attitude to entrepreneurship education?

Table 6: Relationship between Teaching Hour per Week and Students' Attitude to Entrepreneurship Education.

	Mean	N	R	Sig
Attitude	51.31	826	0.09	0.809
Duration of Teaching Hour	1.25	831		

Table 6 indicates that there is no significant relationship between the duration of teaching hour per week and students' attitude to entrepreneurship education ($r = 0.09$; $p > 0.05$). This implies the number of teaching hours per week has no influence on students' attitude to entrepreneurship education.

DISCUSSION

The study revealed that majority of entrepreneurship education lecturers (58.8%) are Ph.D holders, 25.5% are master holders while only 2.0% is a first degree holder with their teaching experience ranging between one-twenty years and above. Hence one can say that entrepreneurship education lecturers in universities in south-west Nigeria are well qualified. This study is in support of Zhang and Sternberg (2008) who asserted that lecturer who possesses advanced degree in science or education contributed to higher student achievements in science. That is, highly educated lecturers are indeed more successful lecturers in terms of students' outcomes. As far as area of specialization is concerned, 29.4% of entrepreneurship education lecturers specialised in Entrepreneurial Studies/Business Administration, 49.0% specialised in Social Sciences while the remaining percentage are either in Technology, Medical Science, Education, Agriculture and Forestry or Arts. This means teaching of entrepreneurship education in universities in south-west Nigeria is all comer game. The finding gives credence to Myrah and Currie (2006); Oduwaiye et al (2001); Amoor (2008); Nwekeaku (2013) who remarked that lecturers who are qualified in industrial or entrepreneurship experience are in short supply; the responsibility of running entrepreneurship education is entrusted with the centre for Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Developments, who draws her pool of lecturers from cognate faculties/departments.

Also, the study shows that writing and presenting business plans and feasibility studies had the highest mean score ($\bar{x} = 3.12$) and is therefore, ranked first. This is followed by the use of problem-solving strategy ($\bar{x} = 3.08$). Group project and case studies strategies were ranked third ($\bar{x} = 2.90$). Combination of lecture/discussion with project method ranked fifth ($\bar{x} = 2.82$); combination of lecture/discussion with collaborative strategy ($\bar{x} = 2.78$) and individual project execution ($\bar{x} = 2.78$) ranked seventh. Lecture and discussion ($\bar{x} = 2.53$) ranked eight; use of guest speaker/model entrepreneur, simulation and field trip ($\bar{x} = 2.51$) ranked ninth. Exhibition, web-based learning and video-recorded lecture ranked 12th, 13th and 14th with mean scores ($\bar{x} = 2.47$; 2.04 and 1.76) respectively. This implies that all the strategies are being employed by entrepreneurship education lecturers.

While preparation and presentation of business plans and feasibility studies is often employed ($\bar{x} = 3.12$), the use of video-recorded lecture is sometime employed ($\bar{x} = 1.76$). It is therefore, discovered that none of the teaching strategies is employed very often and none is not employed at all. It means entrepreneurship education lecturers have sound pedagogical content knowledge of different teaching strategies in entrepreneurship education. These findings corroborate Fayolle and Gailly (2008); Arasti, Falawarjani and Imanipour (2012) who stated that there is no universal pedagogical recipe to teach entrepreneurship education and that the effectiveness of entrepreneurship programme depends mostly on teacher's skills and knowledge of different teaching methods particularly entrepreneurship education teaching methods. The findings also agree with Lee and Wong (2007) who found business plan development, case studies and lectures as the most popular methods of teaching

entrepreneurship education. However, the findings negate Bennet (2006); Cheng et al (2009) and Ezene (2015) who revealed that lecturer

The study revealed that there is collaboration between universities and industries around in imparting entrepreneurial skills in students [weighted mean = 2.91 (lecturers); 2.79 (students)]. Since the weighted means are not equal to 4.00 each, it implies that not all universities collaborate. Also, the study shows that there is a significant influence of the approach of the institution to internship on students' disposition toward self-employment [$f_{(2,828)}=3.209$; $p<0.05$]. In other words, the disposition to self-employment mean score (31.16) of students, whose their institution approach to internship involves students visiting the entrepreneurs outside the school is significantly different from the means score (29.53) of students, whose their institution offers no internship but only allows entrepreneurs to visit school but not significantly different from those who offered lecture alone ($\bar{x} = 30.40$). This implies that students visiting entrepreneurs are better than students who received lecture alone and students who received lecture alone are also better than students who were visited by entrepreneurs in terms of their disposition to self-employment. This findings support Mwasalwibe (2010) conclusion that if entrepreneurship is to be learned as career, it is best done by using some kind of apprenticeship.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that the teaching of entrepreneurship education is all-comer game. Though writing and presenting business plans and feasibility study is the most common strategy in teaching entrepreneurship education, the study revealed that lecturers have sound pedagogical content knowledge of the various teaching strategies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings of study, it was recommended among others that only lecturers, who specialised in entrepreneurial studies and/or related disciplines should teach entrepreneurship education, artisans and practicing entrepreneurs should be included in instruction delivery in entrepreneurship classes for students to have broad exposure in learning experience; universities should collaborate with industries around them in imparting entrepreneurial skills in students.

References

- Adebayo, A.A. 2013. Youths' Unemployment and Crime in Nigeria: A Nexus and Implication for National Development. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 5,8: 350 – 357 Retrieved from <http://www.Academicjournals.Org/IJSA> 21st February, 2016
- Adejimola, A.S. and Tayo-Olajubutu, O. 2009. Spinning off an entrepreneurship culture among Nigerian University Students: Prospects and Challenges. *African Journal of Business Management* 3,3: 80-88
- Adepegba, A. 2001. Police arrest 51 Over Post Election Violence. *The Punch*, Saturday 23 April. of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Akpan, C. and Etor, C. 2013. University Lecturers' Perception of Entrepreneurship Education as an Empowerment Strategy for Graduate Self-Employment in South-South Nigeria. *International Journal of Asian Social Sciences* 3,5: 1180-1195
- Anyaogu, R.O. 2009. Managing Entrepreneurship Education at Tertiary Level: A Panacea to Unemployment. *African journal of Education Research and Development*. 3,2: 99-107.
- Arasti, Z. Falavarjani M.K., and Imanipour, N. 2012. A Study of Teaching Methods in Entrepreneurship Education for Graduate Students. *Journal of Higher Education Studies*. 2, 1: 1-10.
- Durosaro, D.O. and Adegoke, A.A. (Eds.) Higher Education and Globalization. Ibadan: Stirling –
- Fayolle, A. and Gailly, B. 2008. From Craft to Science: Teaching Models and Learning Processes in Entrepreneurship Education. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32,7:569-593 Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090590810899838>

Federal Republic of Nigeria. 2013. National Policy on Education Abuja NERDC Press.

Fiet, J.O. 2000. The Pedagogical Side of Entrepreneurship Theory. *Journal of Business Venturing* 16, 101-117.

Fosu, R. and Boateng, R.E. 2013. The Scottish University level Entrepreneurship Education Initiative: Lessons for Ghana in Dealing with Graduate Unemployment. *Journal of Education and Practice* 4, 24: 143-151 retrieved from <http://www.iiste.org> journal 17th October, 2015.

Gabadeen, W.O. and Raimi, L. 2012. Management of Entrepreneurship Education in Nigerian Higher Institutions: Issues, Challenges and Way Forward. *Abuja International Journal of Education and Management Science*. 1,2: 224-261.

Hindle, K. 2007. Teaching Entrepreneurship at the University: from the wrong building to the right philosophy. In Fayolle, A (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education* 1 Chetelham (UK): Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hytti, U. and O' Gorman, C. 2004. What is "enterprise education" An analysis of the objective and methods of enterprise education programme in four European countries *Education and training* 46, 11-23. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00400916410518188> [accessed 23/4/16].

Ibrahim I. 2011. Nigeria, a Divided Country. *Newswatch*, 53, 18 19-22.

Inegbebebor, A.U. 2005. Education for Entrepreneurship: Experience at the University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria. Paper Presented at the Inaugural Conference of the Academy of Management, Nigeria. Held at Abuja 22nd-23rd November 2005.

Lartey, O. 2011. Four burnt alive, 45 Prison Inmates released in Kaduna. *The Punch*, Wednesday, 20. April.

Lee, L., and Wong, P. 2007. Entrepreneurship Education – A Compendium of Related Issues, in Zoitan J. Acs and David 3. Audretsch. *International Handbook Series on Entrepreneurship* 3: 79-105. The life cycle of Entrepreneurial Ventures. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-32313-8>.

Lonappan, J. 2013. Pedagogical Innovations in Teaching Entrepreneurship, *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 2, 2: 241-243. Available: <https://www.worldwidejournals.com/ijssr/filephp?...2013...ee5e5>

Mwasalwiba, E.S. 2010 Entrepreneurship Education: A Review of its Objectives, Teaching Methods, and Impact Indicators (J) *Education + Training* 52, 1: 22-47.

Myrah, K.K. and Currie, R.R. 2006. Examining Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Education, *Journal of Small-Business and Entrepreneurship*. 19, 3: 233-253. Available: www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0827633.2006.10593369 journalcode=rsbe20-

National Bureau of Statistics 2016. Nigeria Unemployment rate. Available www.tradingeconomics.com/nigeria/unemployment vale.

Nwekeaku, C. 2013. Entrepreneurship Education and Challenges to Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3: 51-56. Available: [Pakacoelemiisseach.com/.../51-56%20vol%204,%20N.0%203%16/3/1620\(293\)](http://Pakacoelemiisseach.com/.../51-56%20vol%204,%20N.0%203%16/3/1620(293)).

Nwosu, B. and Ohia, A. 2009. Managing Entrepreneurship Education at the University Level in Nigeria: A Panacea for Graduate Self-Employment. *African Journal of Education Research and Development*, 3, 2: 49-53

Obanya, P. 2002. Revitalizing Education in Africa. Ibadan: Stirling Horden.

Obanya, P: 2007. Thinking and Talking Education. Ibadan: Evans Brothers Limited.

Obioma, G. 2012. Entrepreneurship Education: Curriculum Content and its Imperatives for National Development. *Abuja International Journal of Education and Management Science* 1, 2: 39-58.

Oduwaiye, R.O., Abdulkareem, A.Y. and Oyeniran, S.O. 2011. Implementation of Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria Universities: Way Forward. In D.O. Durasoro and A.A. Adegoke (Eds.) *Higher Education and Globalization. A Publication of the Collaboration of Education Faculties in West Africa (CEFWA)*. Ibadan: Stirling – Horden Publishers Limited.

Okafor, E.E. 2011. Youth Unemployment and Implication for Stability of Democracy in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*. 13, 1 358-373.

Okiti, A.F. 2009. University Lecturers' Perception of Entrepreneurship Education at the Tertiary Levels of Education. *African Journal of Education Research and Development*, 3, 2: 79-85.

Olatunji, S. and Abioye, O. 2011. Lecturers, Students and others killed in Kaduna. *The Punch* Wednesday 20 April.

Olorundare, A. S. and Kayode, D. J. 2014. Entrepreneurship Education in Nigeria Universities: A Tool for National Transformation. *Asia - Pacific Journal of Education and Education*. 29: 155-175.

- Onuoha, C. 2011. Unemployment: NUC Tasks Varsities on Entrepreneurship Education. The Mirrow Newspaper
- Schwab, K. 2009. Educating the Next Wave of Entrepreneurs. Unlocking Entrepreneurship Capabilities to meet the Global Education Initiative. Switzerland: World Economic Forum, April.
- Suleiman, M.L. and Wan-Fauziah, W.Y. 2015. Relevant Educational Qualification for Entrepreneurship Lecturers in Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs): A Study of HLIS in Malaysia and Nigeria SSRG *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2, 3: 60-66.
- Uzoegwu, P.N. and Egbe, C. I. 2014. Inclusion of Entrepreneurship Education to the Curriculum of Nigerian Universities for self-Reliance: Challenges and Prospects. *International Journal of English and Literature*. (IJEL) 4, 6: 95-104
- Zhang, L.E. and Sternberg, R.J. 2008. Learning in a Cross – Sectional Diversity. In T.Husen and I.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.) *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: Elsevier