PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017
144

ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION PROGRAMME AND ITS INFLUENCE IN DEVELOPING ENTREPRENEURSHIP KEY COMPETENCIES AMONG UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

James Edomwonyi Edokpolor
Benson Idahosa University, Nigeria
E-mail: jedokpolor@biu.edu.ng

Kayode Somorin
University of Benin, Nigeria
E-mail: olukayode.somorin@uniben.edu

Abstract

The intent of this research is to assess the implementation state of entrepreneurship programme and its influence in developing entrepreneurship key competencies among undergraduate students. The survey design was employed for the research. A total population of 8,101 undergraduate students from University of Benin was used. A sample of 382 undergraduate students was used for the research. A structured questionnaire, validated by two experts was used for the data collection. The Cronbach alpha statistical method was employed to determine the reliability of the instrument, which yielded the coefficient alpha value of 0.87. Twenty items questionnaire was administered to the respondents with the help of two trained research assistants. The data were analyzed using the mean, standard deviation, and t-test statistics. The research revealed that entrepreneurship programme is not properly implemented particularly at the university level. It also revealed that students are not well-equipped with entrepreneurship key competencies such as creative and innovative skills that would have helped them in starting and running their own business. It also revealed that there was no significant difference between the mean responses of Science and Arts/Humanity-based students regarding the implementation state of entrepreneurship programme. It further revealed that there was no significant difference between the mean responses of Science and Arts/Humanity-based students regarding the extent to which entrepreneurship programme has equipped students with creative and innovative skills. Consequently, the authors drew a useful conclusion for the subject matter. Providing sufficient amount of financial resources, involving employers of labour, sourcing for qualified teaching and non-teaching personnel, procuring the state-of-the-art infrastructural facilities, as well as utilizing appropriate instructional methods, that would help in equipping students with creative and innovative skills for starting and operating their own businesses were further recommended.
Keywords: *creative skills, entrepreneurship education, innovative skills, operating business, starting business, unemployment situation.*

Introduction

Across the globe, increasing numbers of people are realizing their dreams of starting and operating entrepreneurial ventures. Although, this statement may appear categorical, but there is an evidence supporting it, some of which is provided by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). One of the most comprehensive studies of the GEM conducted by Kelley, Bosma and

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

Amoros (2010) showed a significant gap in the rate of new venture formation in 59 countries, when measured by the Total Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA). The study found that about 110 million people between the ages of 18 and 64 were just starting their own businesses; about 140 million people were already operating their own businesses in less than three and one-half years ago. Taken together, about 250 million people were involved in early-stage entrepreneurial activity. In all, a sample of 10 countries was used for the study. These nations include Argentina, Brazil, China, France, Germany, Peru, Russia, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States. The rate of early entrepreneurial activity in Argentina were 14.2%, Brazil were 17.5%, China were 14.4%, France were 5.8%, Germany were 4.2%, Peru were 27.2%, Russia were 3.9%, Turkey were 8.6%, United Kingdom were 6.4%, and the United States were 7.6% (Kelley et al., 2010).

The rate of entrepreneurial activities pointed out above reflects a clear variation of how countries around the globe invest sufficient amount of resources (both human and material) for the effective implementation of entrepreneurship education. This effort appears to be the driving force for the development of entrepreneurship key competencies among their young youths. The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (2012) defined entrepreneurship key competencies as individual's abilities to turn ideas into action. It added that entrepreneurship key competencies include: creativity, innovation, risk-taking as well as the ability to plan and manage projects in order to achieve objectives. From the literature, it can be deduced that creativity and innovation provides the basis for the creation of new processes, new products, new markets, and new ways of managing (Schumpeter, 1934; Shane, 2000; Ward, 2004; Corbett, 2005). Related research findings support that creativity and innovation are the most important skills for youth entering the 21st century workplace. The research findings further suggest that institutions and organizations should focus on creativity and innovation as the two top priority attributes for youth skills development (Global e-Schools and Communities Initiative, 2013). One would, therefore, agree that creativity and innovation skills can help youths to exploit entrepreneurial opportunities and developing nations (including Nigeria) to solve their economic problems. This potential role on job creation and economic development informed why creativity and innovation skills are considered as the most important entrepreneurship key competencies for this research.

Entrepreneurship education may be seen as a programme of instruction that cuts across all academic disciplines aimed at equipping students with requisite attributes for wealth creation through the process of creating something new, or adding something new to an existing product, in the process helping to solve problems and discover entrepreneurial opportunities. Ekpenyong (2006) had remarked that the qualities of an entrepreneur include a set of personal attributes, such as: creativity, productivity, innovativeness, analytical ability, initiative, interpersonal skills, self-awareness, and need for achievement, among others. The broad goals of entrepreneurship education as stipulated by the European Commission (2008) shall be to: (1) develop personal attributes that form the basis of entrepreneurial mindsets and behaviour (sense of initiative, creativity, risk-propensity, independence, self-confidence, leadership, team spirit, et cetera); (2) raise the awareness of students about self-employment and entrepreneurship as possible career options; (3) use practice-based instructional approaches, where students are involved in project work or in activities outside the classroom (linking them with business world or with the local community); and (4) provide basic business skills for self-employment or self-management, and knowledge of how to start and operate a commercial, business or social venture successfully.

The function of education whether general or entrepreneurship can serve as an instrument for human capital development through the development of students creative and innovative capacities (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education, 1999; Shaheen, 2010; Lin, 2011). A number of scholars have argued the importance of creative and innovative skills development at the tertiary level. Most importantly, they pointed out that teachers play an

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

important role in promoting creative thinking through the use of appropriate approaches in the classroom (Kleiman, 2008; Young, 2009; Livingston, 2010). For instance, the introduction of entrepreneurship education at the university level in Nigeria is aimed at equipping students with creative and innovative skills that would inspire them to start and operate their own business and become self-reliant after graduation. This goal is reflected in University of Benin Strategic Plan of 2002-2012, which is to develop the human mind to be creative, innovative, research-oriented and competent in areas of specialization and skills in entrepreneurship and dedication to service. Other goals include to strengthening creative and innovative attributes as well as entrepreneurial capacities of humanities, education, sciences and law to make them more relevant to the national development processes (University of Benin, 2002). In order to achieve these goals, a Centre for Entrepreneurship Development (CED) was established, not only at the University of Benin, but also at every university across Nigeria. This effort has indicated that entrepreneurship education programme occupies a strategic position in every university across Nigeria. The important role of entrepreneurship education in developing creative and innovative skills among young youths has never been in doubt. It is on this account that the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) through the National Universities Commission (NUC) mandated all the universities in Nigeria to be teaching entrepreneurship so as to help in curbing the ever increasing rate of unemployment.

The term 'creativity' is often used interchangeably with terms such as 'innovation' and 'invention'. This is why creativity has been said to include creative thinking, inventiveness and innovation, which enables individuals to take something deficient or incomplete and turn it into something valuable and remarkable (Designer Reviver, 2009). It also includes diagonal thinking across creativity and entrepreneurialism in order to link creativity and business and develop businesses based on creativity (Skillset, 2011). Plesk (1997) see creativity as the connecting and rearranging of knowledge in minds of people, who will allow themselves' to think flexibly, to generate new, often surprising ideas that others judge to be useful. Accordingly, entrepreneurial creativity is seen as the generation and implementation of novel, appropriate ideas to establish a new venture (Amabile, 1997). In fact, one of the first to identify creativity as a major component of entrepreneurship was Joseph Schumpeter, who believed that opportunities are created as new resource combinations resulting in new or substantially superior products, services, or processes (DeTienne & Chandler, 2004). The notion of creativity as the driving force for entrepreneurship dates back to the term 'creative destruction' to describe economic development through innovation (Schumpeter, 1934, 1942, 1947). Innovation, on the other hand, can be described as a process of adding something new into an existing product or process (Okpara, 2007). It can also be seen as the implementation of ideas and the modification of products (Amabile, Conti, Coan, Lazenby & Herror, 1996; Bird, 1989; Amabile, 1983). This means that creativity is all about thinking new things, while innovation is all about doing new things. Creativity can therefore be seen as the pillar upon which innovation is built (Dundon, 2002; Ohly, Kase, & Skerlavaj, 2010).

Creativity and innovation have become core business skills and entrepreneurs lead the way in applying them and the best way to develop them is through entrepreneurship education. Based on this connection, entrepreneurship education can be seen as a fundamental source of creative and innovative skills development through which individuals create wealth by bringing together unique resources to exploit marketplace opportunities that lead to the birth of new enterprises or the renewal of established ventures (Hsiang-Yung, 2013). To crown it all, literature suggests that creative and innovative individuals are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities (Ward, 2004). This assertion has given credence to the proposition of Neoclassical Equilibrium theory (Khilstrom & Laffont, 1997) and the Psychological theory (Begley & Boyd, 1987; McClelland, 1961) who assumes that fundamental attributes of people determine who becomes entrepreneur.

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

From the earliest moment, questions that have been guiding creativity research include: (1) Can creativity be taught, learned or improved? (2) What kind of instructional approaches improve creativity? (3) Is everyone creative? Creativity researchers maintain that creativity can be learned, taught and improved (Fryer, 1996; Saracho, 2002; Scott, Leritz & Mumford, 2004; Davis, 2006) through a stimulating environment that induces ideas and creates solutions to problems (Karkockiene, 2005). Indeed, researchers have long argued that one can learn how to be creative through specific training and natural experience (Amabile, 1988; Isaksen, 1988; Torrance, 1980). Amabile (1988) opined that creativity depends on training, through which it may be explicitly taught, or simply on experience. Also, the new science of learning does not deny that facts are important for thinking and problem solving (National Academy of Sciences, 2000). Furthermore, researchers have argued that the most effective methods of teaching, learning and improving creativity focused on critical thinking and problem-solving (Scott, et al., 2004). Garg (n.d.) also ascertained that everyone is creative, but there are people who are demonstrably more creative than others. He argued that from the beginning of research on creativity, highly creative people have been distinguished from less creative people because of their intellectual attributes.

However, the lists of the possible variables identified with highly creative people can be clustered under the general headings of prior knowledge and cognitive properties (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000), willingness to take risk (Brockhaus & Horowitz, 1986), internal locust of control (Shane, 2000), tolerance of ambiguity (Begley & Boyd, 1987; Sternberg, 2007), need for achievement (McClelland, 1961), self-efficacy (Chen, Greene & Crick, 1998; Sternberg, 2007), and propensity to act (Shapero, 1975; Shapero & Sokol, 1982). Zimmerer and Scaborough (2005) remarked that creative attributes such as the ability to invent new products and services; develop new technology; discover new knowledge; improve existing products and services; and find different ways of providing more goods and services with fewer resources; motivates people to start and run their own businesses. In other words, finding new ways of satisfying customers' needs; inventing new products and services; putting together existing ideas in new and different ways; and creating new twists on existing product are the hallmarks of entrepreneurs. This means that the main goal of entrepreneurship education programme particularly at the university level is basically to prepare students to become creative thinkers, product innovators, and risk-takers.

If entrepreneurship educational programme is aimed at equipping young youths with the entrepreneurship key competence to act creatively and innovatively, the question becomes: 'Why is the rate of unemployment still increasing drastically in Nigeria?' However, it is interesting to note that in Nigeria where entrepreneurship education is integrated in the national curricula, there seems to be a negative perception that the programme is not yet satisfactory because there is still a gap to be filled. The reasons behind this gap may be that teaching methods are inappropriate; student's attitude toward the programme is poor; lecturers are not fully competent; entrepreneurs are not involved; practical element is missing; and programme is not linked to specific subjects.

An entrepreneurship guru, David Birch, in an interview argues that most entrepreneurship education programmes fall short in the increased use of mastery experiences in encouraging entrepreneurship, especially lengthy and meaningful apprenticeships. Birch stressed the need to develop a model were the apprentice follows an entrepreneur for 2 to 3 years, then the apprentice would know if he or she would really want to take entrepreneurial career path in life (Aronsson, 2004). Kirby (2002) also examined the challenges for the need to develop more entrepreneurs. The researcher argues that the traditional method of educational delivery is making students to feel bored and unable to think about new ideas, rather than equipping them with the requisite attributes and skills to become entrepreneurs. The researcher joins Birch and others in a collection of views that there is need to have education 'for' entrepreneurship and not educa-

tion 'about' entrepreneurship. Where the 'about' refers to the theory of business which is based on the analysis of practical experience, while the 'for' involves the ability to apply theoretical knowledge creatively and with initiative.

Gibb (2002) further argued against the need for the education 'about' entrepreneurship approach taking the stance that teaching method that relies on 'chalk and talk' approach is not as appropriate as a problem and experiential approach. This approach has long been supported by an influential educational philosopher, John Dewey, who viewed experience as an essential component of learning; that students learn best when actually experiencing the phenomena under scrutiny, creating commonly known expression of 'learning-by-doing' (Dewey, 1938). The more implementation of 'for' approach carried out in majority of entrepreneurship programmes, may simply impart 'creative and innovative skills' as a type of vocational training. Thus, experiential learning or learning-by-doing stimulated by real-world experiences may encourage independence of thought, and allows students to think creatively and implement innovative skills together with self-reliance. Also, Gibb (2002) is of the opinion that the teaching of entrepreneurship should not remain solely on the domain of business schools and argues for a move of the programme away from organized knowledge around business programmes. The historical delivery of programmes, with students knowing what to expect, does not excite students who thrive on risk-taking and fast decision making. Gibb (2002) also suggests that the entrepreneurship educational programmes should be equated in the context of change and innovation which gives permission to dilute the left brain analytic skills to encourage the right brain activity and which has been proven to be a key factor in entrepreneurial success towards stimulating the entrepreneurial imagination.

The Knowledge, Economy and Network and the University of Wolver-Hampton (2013) also pointed out that there is a shortage of teaching personnel for entrepreneurship programmes; hence, it is not possible to meet the demand for effective teaching fully. They added that action-oriented teaching is labour-intensive and costly, and requires a specific training. David Birch also noted that there are three skills that students offering entrepreneurship should know and master. These skills include: ability to sell, ability to manage people, and ability to create a new product or service, and Birch argues that none of these skills are integrated into the curriculum (Aronsson, 2004). Consequently, most graduates from our numerous universities will not be able to create the needed product or service, sell the product or service, or work with people, which may have often resulted in the increasing rate of unemployment and level of poverty in Nigeria.

Problem of the Research

In the year 2006, the Federal Government of Nigeria through the National Universities Commission (NUC) mandated all the universities in Nigeria to be teaching entrepreneurship. In the 2007/2008 academic section, entrepreneurship was fully introduced as a mandatory general studies. This outstanding effort of making entrepreneurship as one of the compulsory general studies across the country has been acknowledged as a positive step towards the development of creative and innovative skills among undergraduate students in particular. This would further help them to become self-reliant after graduation and the country at large to achieve faster economic growth, yet available evidence have shown that unemployment rate has been drastically increasing. For instance, the national unemployment rate which was about 21.4% in 2010, has increased to about 23.9% in 2011, increased to about 24.2% in the first quarter of 2015, increased to about 26.5% in the second quarter of 2015, increased to about 27.3% in the third quarter of 2015, increased to about 29.2% in the fourth quarter of 2015, and increased to about 31.2% in the first quarter of 2016 (National Bureau of Statistics, NBS, 2016). Using the previous report of the NBS, about 50% of Nigerians between the ages of 15 and 24, and living in

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

urban areas were unemployed in 2009, about 17.3% of those in the age group of 25 to 44 were unemployed in the same year, while 10% of those in the age group of 45 to 59, and living in the urban areas were unemployed in the same year (NBS, 2011). This report has however shown that the rate of unemployment is higher among young youths. To this end, there is need to find out if entrepreneurship education programme is capable of equipping undergraduate students with the creative and innovative skills to become entrepreneurs or not, especially at the university level.

The main aim of this research, therefore, is to assess entrepreneurship education and its influence in developing creative and innovative skills among undergraduate students. Based on the main aim of this research, the following research questions were raised to guide the research:

1. What is the current implementation state of entrepreneurship education programme at the university level?
2. To what extent has entrepreneurship education programme equipped students' with creative and innovative skills of starting and operating a business?

Methodology of Research

General Background of Research

The design for this research was quantitative research, by employing survey research design. Survey design is a non-experimental quantitative research design (Mitchell & Jolley, 2007) aimed at gathering data from group of persons by way of questionnaire, and the results are generalized to the population (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010). The population for the research comprised of 8,101 undergraduate students from University of Benin, Benin City who have participated in the entrepreneurship education programme in the 2015/2016 academic session.

Sample of Research

The research participants were selected from the 13 faculties in University of Benin, Benin City, using the proportionate stratified random sampling technique so that undergraduate students can be adequately represented in the research. To get a representative sample, the authors employed the Yaro Yamane formula, as cited in Uzoagulu (2011): $n = N/1+N\ (e)^2$. Where: n=sample size; N=total population; e=level of significance; and 1=Constant. Therefore, $n= 8101/1+8101(0.05)^2$ giving a sample size of 382 undergraduate students.

Instrument and Procedures

The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire, titled: "Entrepreneurship Education and the Development of Entrepreneurship Key Competencies among Undergraduate Students (EEDEKCUS)". 4-point scaled questionnaire (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree) as well as (Very High Extent, High Extent, Low Extent and Very Low Extent) was used. To ensure the reliability, the instrument was administered to 20 students in Faculty of Education, University of Benin, who were not part of the sample. Their responses were analyzed using Cronbach alpha formula, which yielded the coefficient alpha value of 0.87. The instrument was further administered to respondents by the researchers with the help of two trained research assistants. The questionnaire was retrieved as soon as they were completed.

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using t-test, mean and standard deviation statistics. The decision rule was based on any mean scores equal to or greater than 2.50 was regarded as agreed or high extent, while any mean scores less than 2.50 was regarded as disagreed or low extent. Also, any standard deviation value between .00 and .96 indicated that student's responses were very close. The value (p) was used to take decisions on the hypotheses. If the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05, the null hypotheses is rejected, and if p-value greater than 0.05, the null hypotheses is retained.

Results of Research

The data collected from the respondents was analyzed using the Mean ($\bar{x}$) and Standard Deviation (SD) and the results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Mean and standard deviation of current implementation state of entrepreneurship education programme.

S/N	Item Statements	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remarks
1.	There are quite enough lecturers who teach entrepreneurship in your institution.	3.15	.047	Agree
2.	Lecturers allow students to ask questions bothering their minds during the teaching of entrepreneurship courses	2.72	.162	Agree
3.	Once in a while lecturers mobilize students to visit business organizations outside the classroom for practical orientation	1.96	.979	Disagree
4.	There are quite enough classrooms and lecture halls for the instructional delivery of entrepreneurship	1.56	.653	Disagree
5.	Computer gadgets are always provided to students during the instructional delivery of entrepreneurship	1.48	.574	Disagree
6.	Lecturers always use projector slides to teach entrepreneurship in your institution	1.44	.645	Disagree
7.	Lecturers always give assignment to students after entrepreneurship class	2.14	.166	Disagree
8.	Entrepreneurship research centres are available whenever assignments are been given to students	1.58	.832	Disagree
9.	There are quite a number of entrepreneurship study materials in your faculty library	1.50	.680	Disagree
10.	Professors and other lecturers always provide encouragement to students regarding the importance of entrepreneurial careers	1.44	.700	Disagree
11.	Your school always invite resource persons (entrepreneurs) to share their experiences and success stories with students	1.55	.674	Disagree
12.	The teaching of entrepreneurship is always tied to a particular discipline or profession in your institution	1.82	.729	Disagree

The results of the data presented in Table 1 show the mean responses of students on the current implementation state of entrepreneurship education programme at the university level. The results revealed that out of 12 items, only 2 items had the mean scores that range from 2.72 to 3.15, while the values of standard deviation ranged from .047 to .162. The mean scores is an indication that there are enough lecturers who teach entrepreneurship and they allow students to ask questions that bother their minds during the teaching of entrepreneurship, while the values of standard deviation is an indication that respondents' opinions are very close irrespective of their different disciplines. However, 10 items had the mean scores that range from 1.14 to 1.96, while the values of standard deviation ranged from .166 to .979. The mean scores is an indica-

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

tion that entrepreneurship education programme is ineffectively implemented at the university level, while the standard deviation values is an indication that respondents' opinions are not very close.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation on extent to which entrepreneurship programme has equipped students' with creative and innovative skills.

S/N	Item Statements	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remarks
	To what extent has:			
13.	Entrepreneurship programme exposed you to an environment that gives you opportunity to think critically	1.97	.622	LE
14.	Entrepreneurship programme equipped you with the skills to create new products or services	1.73	.768	LE
15.	Entrepreneurship programme equipped you with the skills to improve on an existing products or process of production	1.61	.759	LE
16.	Entrepreneurship programme equipped you with the skills to produce goods and services with little or no financial resources	1.61	.752	LE
17.	Entrepreneurship programme equipped you with the skills to work with teams on a project	1.67	.799	LE
18.	Entrepreneurship programme equipped you with the skills to turn a new or existing product into a marketable product	1.63	.735	LE
19.	Entrepreneurship programme equipped you with the skills to develop a written document that describes the current state and presupposed future of an organization	1.57	.684	LE
20.	Entrepreneurship programme has equipped you with the skills to become an employer of labour in a self-owned enterprise	1.81	.711	LE

The results of the data presented in Table 2 show the mean responses of students on the extent to which entrepreneurship programme has equipped undergraduate students' with the creative and innovative skills of starting and operating a business. The results revealed that 8 items had the mean scores that range from 1.57 to 1.97, while the standard deviation value ranged from .622 to .799. The mean scores is an indication that undergraduate students' are not well-equipped with creative and innovative skills that will motivate them in starting and running their own business after graduation, while the values of standard deviation is an indication that the respondents' opinions are very close irrespective of their different disciplines.

Hypothesis 1: Science-based students do not defer significantly from arts/humanity-based students in their mean responses regarding the implementation state of entrepreneurship education programme at the university level.

Table 3. t-test analysis between science and arts/humanity-based students on the implementation state of entrepreneurship education programme.

		Aggregate						
Variable	**Respondents**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**t**	**p**	**Decision**
Entrepreneurship programme and its Implementation state					378	.057	.040	R
	Arts/humanities	221	1.90	.361				
	Science	159	1.82	.419				
	Total	380						

Source: Field Study, 2016 R: Rejected

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21st CENTURY
Vol. 75, No. 2, 2017

The results presented in Table 3 revealed that the aggregate mean responses of Science and Arts/Humanity-Based Students are 1.90 and 1.82 respectively. The corresponding values of the standard deviation are .361 and .419. The Table also indicates that the t-value is .057 at df of 378, while the p-value is .040. Testing at alpha level of .05, the p-value is significant, since the p-value (.040) is less than the alpha value (0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, the mean responses of Science-Based Students significantly differ from Arts/Humanity-Based Students regarding their opinion on the implementation state of entrepreneurship programme.

Hypothesis 2: Science-based students do not difffer significantly from arts/humanity-based students in their mean responses regarding the extent to which entrepreneurship education programme has equipped them with the creative and innovative skills of starting and operating a business.

Table 4. t-test analysis between science and arts/humanity-based students on the extent to which entrepreneurship education programme has equipped recipients with the creative and innovative skills.

		Aggregate						
Variable	**Categories**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**t**	**p**	**Decision**
Entrepreneurship Programme and Students Creative and Innovative Skills	Art/Humanities	221	1.74	.562	378	.538	.125	NR
	Science	159	1.65	.610				
	Total	380						

Source: Field Study, 2016 NR: Not Rejected

The results presented in Table 4 revealed that the aggregate mean responses of Science and Arts/Humanity-Based Students are 1.74 and 1.65 respectively. The corresponding values of the standard deviation are .562 and .610. The Table also indicates that the t-value is .538 at df of 378, while the p-value is .125. Testing at alpha level of .05, the p-value is not significant; since p-value (.125) is greater than the alpha value (0.05), the null hypothesis is retained. Therefore, the mean responses of Science-Based Students did not significantly differ from Arts/Humanity-Based Students regarding their opinion on the extent to which entrepreneurship education has equipped them with the creative and innovative skills of starting and operating a business.

Discussion

The aim of this research was, in the first place, to assess the implementation state of entrepreneurship education programme at the university level. In the second place, the research investigates the influence of entrepreneurship education programme in developing creative and innovative skills among undergraduate students. The crucial finding in this research is that entrepreneurship education programme is not adequately implemented. This is an important finding for scholars and educators. However, the inadequate implementation of entrepreneurship education programme, deserves a special discussion. From a scholarly perspective, the research suggests that the inadequate implementation of entrepreneurship education programme could be attributed to the inappropriate utilization of teaching methods; poor attitude of student's toward the programme; low competence of lecturers; lack of entrepreneur's participation; mismatch between theory and practical's; and lack of the programme linkage to specific subjects. From educator's perspective, the research suggests that inadequate implementation of entrepreneurship education could be traceable to its costly nature in terms of resources (Knowledge,

Economy and Network & University of Wolver-Hampton, 2013). This finding also suggests that the inadequate implementation of entrepreneurship education programme could be attributed to the theoretical nature of entrepreneurship education (Dewey, 1938; Gibb, 2002; Kirby, 2002; Aronsson, 2004).

The second finding in this research is that entrepreneurship education had no influence in equipping students' with the creative and innovative skills of starting and operating a business. This finding is in contrary with the results obtained by several authors (Shapero, 1975; Shapero & Sokol, 1982; Krueger, 1993; Krueger & Brazeal, 1994; Peterman & Kennedy, 2003; DeTienne & Chandler, 2004). The research conducted by these researchers revealed that entrepreneurship educational programme had the capacity of influencing student's perception towards starting and operating a business. Shapereo & Sokol (1982) also noted that student's positive interpretation of factors, such as exposure to role model advisers, the interactive and experience-based learning, and the supportive environment and infrastructure provided during enterprise or entrepreneurship educational experience would influence their propensity of starting and operating a business.

Conclusions

Nowadays, developing nations around the globe are increasingly investing huge financial capital for the effective implementation of their entrepreneurship programmes. These efforts appear to be the driving force for the development of entrepreneurship key competencies (creative and innovative capabilities) among their young youths. It was therefore found in this study that entrepreneurship education programme is not adequately implemented particular at the university level. It was also found that entrepreneurship education programme is not capable of equipping undergraduate students with creative and innovative skills of starting and operating their own business because of its theoretical nature of academic delivery. It is, therefore, concluded that if entrepreneurship education is properly implemented at the university level, it would further help in equipping students with the creative and innovative skills of starting and operating a business.

Based on the aforementioned findings of this research, it is, therefore, recommended that:

1. Government should endeavour to partner with private and civil society stakeholders in order to help in providing sufficient amount of financial resources so that competent staff, better facilities, and the state-of-the-art learning environment can be made available for effective delivery of entrepreneurship education programme at the university level.
2. Managers as well as administrators of universities should endeavour to make use of the appropriate instructional methods and resources in order for entrepreneurship education programme to be capable of equipping students with the creative and innovative skills to start and manage their own business.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial creativity through motivational synergy. *Journal of Creative Behaviour, 31,* 18–26.

Amabile, T. M. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity.* New York: Springer.

Amabile, T. M. (1988). From individual creativity to organizational innovation. In K. Gronhaug & G. Kaufmann (Eds.). *Innovations: A cross-disciplinary perspective*, 139-166, Oslo, Norway: Norwegian University Press

Amabile, T. M., Conti, T., Coan, H., Lazenby, J., & Herror, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 39* (5), 1154-1184.

Aronsson, M. (2004). Education matters-but does entrepreneurship education? An interview with David Birch. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 3* (3), 289-292.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th Ed.). United States: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Retrieved from www.modares.ac.ir/uploads/Agr.Oth.Lib.12.pdf.

Begley, T. M., & Boyd, D. P. (1987). Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and smaller businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing, 2,* 79–93.

Bird, B. J. (1989). *Entrepreneurial behavior*. Illinois, Scott Foresman and Co., Glenview.

Brockhaus, R., & Horowitz, P. (1986). The psychology of the entrepreneur. In D. Sexton & R. Smilor (Eds.). *The art and science of entrepreneurship.* Ballinger, Cambridge, MA.

Chen, C., Greene, P., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing, 13,* 295-316.

Corbett, A. C. (2005). Experiential learning within the process of opportunity identification and exploitation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29* (4), 473–491.

Davis, G. A. (2006). *Gifted children and gifted education: A handbook for teachers and parents.* Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.

Designer Reviver (2009). *10 essential skills every graphic designer should have*. Retrieved from http://designreviver.com/articles/10-essential-skills-every-graphic-designer-should-have/.

DeTienne, D. R., & Chandler, G. N. (2004). Opportunity identification and its role in the entrepreneurial classroom: A pedagogical approach and empirical test. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 3* (3), 242–257.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dundon, E. (2002). *The seeds of innovation: Creating the synergy that fosters new ideas.* Benin City: Self Improvement Publishers.

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (2012). *Entrepreneurship education at school in Europe: National strategies, curricula and learning outcomes*. Retrieved from: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice.

Ekpenyong, L. E. (2006). *Readings on entrepreneurship.* Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Benin, University of Benin Press.

European Commission (2008). *Entrepreneurship in higher education, especially in non-business studies: Final report of the expert group*. Retrieved from http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/entrepreneurship/support_measures/index.htm.

Fryer, M. (1996). *Creative teaching and learning.* London: Paul Chap-man Publishing Ltd.

Global e-Schools and Communities Initiative (2013). *Development of 21st century skills for innovation and enterprise: Exploring the role of Informal learning environments in the development of skills and aptitudes for the digital creative media industries*. Retrieved from http://gesci.org/fileadmin/user_upload/2_Youth_Skills_Enterprise_Files/AKE_research_-_21C_Skills_Full_Report_-_2012_.pdf.

Garg, M. C. (n.d). *Entrepreneurial development*. Retrieved from http://www.ddegjust.ac.in/studymaterial/mba/cp-401.pdf.

Gibb, A. (2002). In pursuit of a new 'enterprise' and 'entrepreneurship' paradigm for learning, creative destruction, new values, new ways of doing things, and new combinations of knowledge. *International Journal of Management and Review, 4* (3), 233-269.

Hsiang-Yung, F. (2013). A case study on creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship education of the university in Taiwan. *Being a Paper Presented at the International Conference on Management, Knowledge and Learning, Held in Zadar Croatia between 19 – 21 June 2013*. Zadar.

Isaksen, S. G. (1988). Educational implications of creativity research: An updated rationale for creative learning. In K. Grønhaug & G. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Innovation: A cross-disciplinary perspective*, 167-203. England: Page Bros (Norwich) Ltd. Retrieved from http://www.cpsb.com/research/articles/creativity-research/Educational-Implications Creativity-Research.pdf.

Karkockiene, D. (2005). Creativity: Can it be trained? A scientific educology of creativity. *International Journal of Educology*, 51-58. Retrieved from http://www.era-usa.net/images/article_5_Daiva.pdf.

Kelly, O., Bosma, N., & Amoros, J. E. (2010). *Global entrepreneurship monitor. Global Report*. Babson College, Babson Park, MA, United States and Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile. Retrieved from http://www.av-asesores.com/upload/479.PDF.

Khilstrom, R. J., & Laffont, J. (1997). A general equilibrium entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion. *Journal of Political Economics, 87* (4), 719-748.

Kirby, D. A. (2002). *Entrepreneurship.* Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Kleiman, P. (2008). Towards transformation: Conceptions of creativity in higher education. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *45* (3), 209-217. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703290802175966.

Knowledge, Economy and Network and University of Wolver-Hampton (2013). Entrepreneurial education and innovation: Developing entrepreneurial mindset for knowledge economy. *Analytical Compendium*, United Kingdom, Wolver Hampton.

Krueger, N. (1993). The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 18* (1), 5-21.

Krueger, N., & Brazeal, D. V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 18* (3), 91-104.

Lin, Y. S. (2011). Fostering creativity through education: A conceptual framework of creative pedagogy. *Creative Education*, *2* (3), 149-155. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2011.23021.

Livingston, L. (2010). Teaching creativity in higher education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *111* (2), 59-62. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632910903455884.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand Co.

Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2007). *Research design explained* (6th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth. Retrieved from www.steporebook.com/book/research-design-explained-6th-edition-96693-pdf.html.

National Academy of Sciences (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Washington, D.C: National Academic Press.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2011). *2011 Annual Socio-Economic Report.* Retrieved from: http://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/uploads/latestRelease/2ff063b27de8aa15b35f1a6fb04bf472c658d939.pdf.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2016). *Unemployment and under-employment watch: First quarter of 2016*. Retrieved from: www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/download/397.

National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE). (1999). *All our futures: Creativity, culture & education.* Sudbury, Suffolk: Department for Education and Employment.

Ohly, S., Kase, R., & Skerlavaj, M. (2010). Networks for generating and for validating ideas: The social side of creativity. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice, 12* (1), 41-52.

Okpara, F. O. (2007). The value of creativity and innovation in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability*, *3* (2). Retrieved from http://www.asiaentrepreneurshipjournal.com/AJESIII2Okpara.pdf.

Peterman, N., & Kennedy, J. (2003). Enterprise education: Influencing Students' Perceptions of Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 28* (2), 129-144.

Plesk, P. E. (1997). *Creativity, innovation and quality*. Milwaukee, ASQC Quality Press.

Saracho, O. N. (2002). Young children's creativity and pretend play. *Early Child Development & Care, 172* (5), 431-438.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development.* Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy.* UK: Routledge.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1947). The creative response in economic history. *The Journal of Economic History, 7* (2), 149–159.

Scott, G., Leritz, L. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2004). The effectiveness of creativity training: A quantitative review. *Creativity Research Journal, 16* (4), 361–388.

Shaheen, R. (2010). Creativity and education. *Creative Education, 11* (3), 166-169. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2010.13026.

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

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

Shapero, A. (1975). The displaced, uncomfortable entrepreneur. *Psychology Today, 133,* 83-88.

Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). Social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In C. Kent, D. Sexton, & K. Vesper (Eds.). *The encyclopedia of entrepreneurship.* Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall.

Skillset (2011). *Sector skills assessment for the creative media industries in the UK.* Oxford, London.

Sternberg, R. J. (2007). Creativity as a habit. In A. G. Tan (Ed.), *Creativity: A handbook for teachers*, 3-26. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific Publishing.

Torrance, E. P. (1980). Georgia studies of creative behaviour: A brief study of activities and results. In M. K. Raina (Ed.). *Creativity research: International perspective*, 253 – 271. New Delhi, India: National Council of Educational Research and Training.

University of Benin (2002). *Strategic plan 2002-2012,* Benin City: University of Benin Press.

Uzoagulu, A. E. (2011). *Practical guide to writing research project report in tertiary institutions*. Enugu: Cheston Ltd.

Ward, T. B. (2004), Cognition, creativity, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *19,* 173-88.

Young, L. P. (2009). Imagine creating rubrics that develop creativity. *English Journal, 99* (2), 74-79.

Zimmerer, T. W., & Scarborough, N. M. (2005). *Essentials of entrepreneurship and small business management.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Received: *March 18, 2017* Accepted: *April 15, 2017*

James Edomwonyi Edokpolor	Assistant Lecturer, Department of Social Science Education, Faculty of Education, Benson Idahosa University, P.M.B.1100, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. E-mail: jedokpolor@biu.edu.ng
Kayode Somorin	Graduate Assistant, Home Economics Education Unit, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Faculty of Education, University of Benin, P.O. Box 1154 Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. E-mail: olukayode.somorin@uniben.edu