IMPERATIVES OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT STUDIES ON UNIVERSITY REPUTATION IN NIGERIA

Mercy Ejovwokeoghene Ogbari, Covenant University
Maxwell Ayodele Olokundun, Covenant University
Ayodotun Stephen Ibidunni, Covenant University
James Nwonye Obi, Covenant University
Chinenye Akpoanu, Covenant University

ABSTRACT

The influence of entrepreneurial studies on the passion of students and the image of tertiary institutions has a positive and progressive effect on post-training career choice. This current work as designed, examined the effect of entrepreneurship development studies on the reputation of tertiary institutions in Nigeria. In line with this assertion, two hundred and thirty (230) students from Covenant and Bell`s Universities in Ogun State were purposively random sampled. Regression analysis was used in authenticating the hypothesis. Findings inferred that Curriculum content affects research output of institutions and as well teaching approach enhances corporate reputation positively. It was recommended that Institutions should ensure that entrepreneurial education are course agnostic and also take on steps to begin teaching entrepreneurial skills not just for the sake of improving their corporate image, but also to create really empowered entrepreneurs who in turn would power the economy with skills and knowledge acquired through learning.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Education, Research, Curriculum Content, University, Performance.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship development in education no doubt has turned the entire world into a global community. Entrepreneurship education devices different means of achieving opportunities hidden in different idea creation as Drucker (2014) argued that entrepreneurship is a practice and an entrepreneur should not only be innovative but must also be creative enough to birth new ideas and see opportunities in different ways and as such entrepreneurship is a practice that can be learned and also taught in a formal or informal settings hence universities have also become aware of the importance of entrepreneurial development on the passion of students and the image of the institutions involved. Previous studies (Izedonmi et al., 2007; Izedonmi, 2010; Doğan, 2015; Moses et al., 2016) have been carried out on entrepreneurship studies and students entrepreneurial intentions, however these studies have failed to research on the effect such entrepreneurship education has on the corporate reputation of tertiary institutions especially institutions that have produced successful entrepreneurs. Therefore, this study seeks answers as to how the corporate reputations of these universities are enhanced by the study of entrepreneurship. The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To examine the effect of curriculum content (CC) on the research output (RO) of institutions.
2. To evaluate the significant effect of teaching approach (TA) and the corporate reputation (CR) of a tertiary institution.
3. To assess the effect of competence of the educator (CE) and students' performance (SP).

LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

According to Ocho & Nwangwu (2005), improving entrepreneurship education involves individuals participating in the growth and development of the society and community at large by actively engaging themselves in different works and businesses, thereby contributing immensely in driving innovative productivity and employment. Hence tertiary institutions that have welcomed the idea of entrepreneurship have indeed progressed in curbing the problem of unemployment among her graduates and with the development of entrepreneurship education in various institutions, there is a high possibility for students to desire to be self-actualized as entrepreneurs thereby sustaining the growth of entrepreneurship (Alakbarov, 2010; Olokundun et al., 2017).

Curriculum Content and Research Output

Curriculum offered by educational institutions denotes specialization in specific subjects is a combination of context and exam (Olokundun, 2017). Every curriculum should make available the design of different courses, subject matter, examination, educational experiences, learning styles, work programs, learning and teaching strategies in order to enhance the quality of education received by students (Harden, 2012). In the absence of a certified curriculum, the quality of entrepreneurial education received reduces the image of such institution and her research output on the other hand is left incomplete. Each curriculum content must reflect the quality of education received. Hence every institution is charged with the responsibility of increasing her corporate image by assessing its impact on the students and the quality and kind of graduates produced, curriculum does not include only formal teaching or learning (Hamunyela & Iyamu, 2014; Ogbari et al., 2016). It also makes room for other areas of human development. The strength of every curriculum lies in the long-term quality of its research output, which is obtained from the institution in question. Every academic staff in line with the design of every course should depict clear and well implemented procedures for the validation of courses which in turn paves way for a reputable research output (Hamunyela & Iyamu, 2014). There are two approaches to the process of curriculum development. One of which is performance-based approach. This approach places emphasis on improving and controlling entrepreneurship education. It looks more into the students as final products of the institution that is what sort of entrepreneurs they will produce as an institution. It gives less room for input process needed but rather focuses on the output of the outcome-based education.

In this approach, the educational results achieved are easily understood and clearly defined. This approach comprises of the teaching, methods, learning styles, teaching strategies, courses offered, assessment, evaluation, examination, curriculum timetable, etc. the outcome-based approach focuses more on curriculum assessment and evaluation. It covers the learning guide to be adopted by students and teachers and how these learning guides should be implemented.

Research output in institutions has witnessed an increase as seen in presentations and posters given and displayed respectively at major educational conferences with emphasis on

entrepreneurship studies. Such activities enhance and make the educational processes of institutions to stand out by showing the external forces the quality of work done in such institutions which is often regarded as high quality. For every research output, three important components are affected or are as a result of the content of the curriculum of the institution. According to researcher, curriculum of an institution is being emphasized on more than before. Levin (2008) stated that curriculum content regardless of the time of its formulation, changes with the political and governmental changes made usually in the phase of renewing such curriculum during the budget review of the educational sector (Bobbo et al., 2015). Schleicher (2011) stated that high performance in educational systems is as a result of the depth of knowledge acquired. Hence the first hypothesis is formulated thus:

H_{01}: *Curriculum content (EC) does not affect the research output (RO) of institutions.*

Teaching Approach (Pedagogy) and Corporate Reputation

Pedagogy is seen as the process of developing learners with care the intention of bringing the essence of life into learning process. Pedagogic education no doubt is a matter of the head, hand, and heart (Brühlmeier, 2010). Altrichter et al. (2013) says teaching is the central activity of education and every institutional body responsible for offering the service of teaching is charged with responsibility of visualizing all what is taught and ensuring that what is learnt makes an impact in the society at large. This in turn leads to an increase in the corporate reputation of such institution. Various pedagogic approaches to learning are being adopted but for the corporate reputation of any institution to be further enhanced, the problem-based learning approach should be effectively utilized. The corporate reputation of any institution is focused on its image and identity and these reflect in the teaching approach adopted there in (Bennett & Kottasz, 2000). These qualities include financial stability, investment worth or valuation, corporate assets, innovativeness, quality of management team, quality of education received, quality of graduates, ability to attract renowned scholars, social responsibility (Fosnot, 2013). However, corporate reputation is linked to corporate credibility (Jahanzeb et al., 2013). Therefore, the question is: how does the study of entrepreneurship affect the corporate image of these universities? Hence the next hypothesis was formulated thus:

H_{02}: *There is no significant relationship between teaching approach (TA) and the corporate reputation (CR) of a tertiary institution.*

Competence of the Educator and Students Performance

Competence is measured from the view point of outcome achieved or input used. From the basis of output gotten, the competence of the teacher is seen in test scores, happy students/classroom, engagement of students etc. According to Hamilton-Ekeke & Frank-Oputu (2013), teachers' competence is defined as the correct way, process or method of passing on knowledge and skills to students, who are on the receiving end. A great feature of a teacher to motivate, encourage and assist students in reflecting and meditating on different factors that mould their lives. Competent teachers are also characterized as individuals who attend conferences, workshop and seminars. Such teachers put in so much effort into conveying knowledge to student Ojeifo (2013) posits that the academic performance of the student is a cardinal point of the competence of the teacher. Such performance of students is demonstrated in the ability of the students to display specific attributes like how well they understood what was

taught, and this is seen partly in their continuous assessments and assignments and examinations. According to Olaewe & Campus (2003), the performance assessment of every student is measured in 3 ways which diagnostic, formative and summative evaluation or assessment. The diagnostic approach is evident in courses, how the class is when the course is being taught. The formative approach is based on the period test and continuous assessments are given whether at announced times or impromptu times. Lastly, the summative approach deals with how the teachers and other examination bodies grade the students. It is against this background that we hypothesized that:

H_{03}: *There is no relationship between the competence of the educator (CE) and students' performance (SP).*

METHODOLOGY

The study employed descriptive research design. A combination of 300-500 levels of students as well as staff of two private universities from south west Nigeria. The sampled universities both had easy access and as well engage in entrepreneurial studies although at different levels respectively. Data was collected using a survey instrument. The questionnaires were administered to the 300, 400 and 500 level students of Covenant University and to the 200 level students of Bells University after a purposive sampling was carried out to ensure that the questionnaires were filled by those concerned in the study. Then simple random sampling technique was observed to ensure they all had equal chance of attending to the instrument. A total of two hundred and thirty (230) students from the sampled universities took part in the study. The Cronbach's alpha reliability test was employed specifically (0.904) while content and expert validity were engaged (Table 1). The measurement model, therefore, has high reliability. The hypotheses were tested using correlation and multiple regression analysis with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23 software.

Table 1 RELIABILITY STATISTICS	
Cronbach's Alpha	**n of Items**
0.904	21

RESULTS

H_{01}: *Curriculum Content does not affect the research output of institutions.*

Table 2 MODEL SUMMARY OF CURRICULUM CONTENT ON RESEARCH OUTPUT OF INSTITUTIONS									
Model	**R**	**R^2**	**Adjusted R^2**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Change Statistics**				
					R Square Change	**F Change**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig. F Change**
1	0.608[a]	0.37	0.367	0.57539	0.37	114.539	1	195	0.000

Note: a=Predictors: (Constant), Educators Competence.

Table 3
ANOVA[a] (CURRICULUM CONTENT ON RESEARCH OUTPUT OF INSTITUTIONS)

Model 1	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	14.345	1	14.345	22.468	0.000[b]
Residual	124.501	195	0.638		
Total	138.847	196			

Note: a=Dependent Variable: Research Output; b=Predictors: (Constant), curriculum Content.

Table 4
COEFFICIENTS[a] (CURRICULUM CONTENT ON RESEARCH OUTPUT OF INSTITUTIONS)

Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.427	0.341		4.187	0.000
Curriculum Content	0.405	0.085	0.321	4.74	0.000

Source: Field Survey, 2016.
Note: a=Dependent Variable: Research Output.

Interpretation 1

The tables shown above (Tables 2-4) are the model summary, ANOVA and the coefficients table. The model summary table shows the relationship between Entrepreneurship Education and Curriculum Content on Research Output with correlation (R) value of 0.370 shows that about 37.0% of variations in Research output can be attributed to changes in Entrepreneurial Education and Curriculum Content, this explains 0.6% of the variance in research output, with a standard error of (0.57539) and an adjusted R square of 0.367. It shows that there are many other factors responsible for Research output of the universities which cannot be explained fully by the curriculum.

The ANOVA table tests the null hypothesis to determine if it is statistically significant. From the results, the model in the table is statistically significant (F=22.468, p=0.000) and hence the null hypothesis should be rejected because it is less than 0.05 significance level.

From the coefficient table, the unstandardized beta coefficient shows a positive value of 0.405 and a significant value of 0.000. The sig (P-value) being less than the 0.05 level implies that the hypothesis is statistically significant and therefore curriculum content affects research output.

Decision: From the foregoing, the null hypothesis H_0 of this study will be rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted. This implies that H_{01}: curriculum content affects the research output of institutions although the effect is weak.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between teaching approach and the corporate reputation

This hypothesis was tested by regressing the responses Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy (Teaching approach) and corporate reputation constructs of the questionnaire. The statistics below explain further.

Table 5
MODEL SUMMARY OF TEACHING APPROACH AND THE CORPORATE REPUTATION

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.394[a]	0.155	0.151	0.53762	0.155	35.859	1	195	0.000

Note: a=Predictors: (Constant), Teaching Approach.

Table 6
ANOVA[a] (TEACHING APPROACH AND THE CORPORATE REPUTATION)

Model 1	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	10.364	1	10.364	35.859	0.000[b]
Residual	56.361	195	0.289		
Total	66.725	196			

Note: a=Dependent Variable: Corporate Reputation; b:=predictors:(constant), Teaching Approach.

Table 7
COEFFICIENTS[a] OF (TEACHING APPROACH AND THE CORPORATE REPUTATION)

Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.522	0.269		9.382	0.000
Teaching Approach	0.41	0.068	0.394	5.988	0.000

Source: Field Survey, 2016.
Note: a=Dependent Variable: Corporate Reputation.

Interpretation 2

The model summary above (Tables 5-7) shows a value of 0.394 indicating that there is a positive but weak relationship between Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy corporate reputation. Although this relationship is weak, it is positive indicating that the better the teaching approach as perceived by both the students through means such as their result in courses taken the higher the reputation of the university. The table also holds the value of R Squared (0.155) which implies that about 15.5% of variations in the corporate reputation of universities are attributable to variations in the teaching methods of the educators. This explains 0.5% 0f the variance in corporate reputation, with a standard error of (0.53762) and an adjusted R square of 0.151.

The ANOVA table tests the null hypothesis to determine if it is statistically significant. From the results, the model in the table is statistically significant (F=35.859, p=0.000) and hence the null hypothesis should be rejected because it is less than 0.05 significance level.

From the coefficient table, the unstandardized beta coefficient shows a positive value of 0.410 and a significant value of 0.000. The sig (P-value) being less than 0.005 level implies that the hypothesis is statistically significant and therefore teaching approach affects corporate reputation.

Decision: Based on the analyses above for which all the calculated values are below the critical values, the null hypothesis *H₀: There is no significant relationship between teaching*

approach and corporate reputation is therefore rejected while the alternative hypothesis H_{02}: there is significant relationship between teaching approach and corporate reputation is accepted.

> *H_{03}: There is no relationship between the competence of the educator and students' performance.*

To test the third hypothesis of this study, the third and sixth construct from the questionnaire was regressed against each other. The tables from the analyses are given below (Tables 8-10).

Table 8
MODEL SUMMARY OF COMPETENCE OF THE EDUCATOR AND STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE

Model	R	R²	Adjusted R²	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.608[a]	0.37	0.367	0.57539	0.37	114.539	1	195	0.000

Note: a=Predictors: (Constant), Educators Competence.

Table 9
ANOVA[a] OF COMPETENCE OF THE EDUCATOR AND STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE

Model 1	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	37.921	1	37.921	114.539	0.000[b]
Residual	64.56	195	0.331		
Total	102.481	196			

Note: a=Dependent Variable: Student Performance; b=Predictors: (Constant), Educators Competence.

Table 10
Coefficients[a] of competence of the educator and students' performance

Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.468	0.227		6.470	0.000
Educators Competence	0.627	0.059	0.608	10.702	0.000

Source: Field Survey, 2016.
Note: a=Dependent Variable: Student Performance.

Interpretation 3

The above model summary shows that there is a positive and strong relationship between the competence of the educators and students' performance. This is indicated by the correlation (R) value of 0.608, adjusted value of 0.367 and standard error of (0.57539). The R Square value also shows of 0.370 shows that about 37.0% of variations in student performance can be attributed to changes in Competence of Educators. Showing a linear increase in student's performance when competence of educator improves.

The ANOVA table test shows the result that the model is statistically significant (F=114.539, p=0.000) and hence the null hypothesis H_0 should be rejected because it is less than 0.05 significance level.

Also, from the coefficient table, the important metric here is the Sig. value. The unstandardized beta coefficient shows a positive value of 0.627 and a significance value of

0.000. This indicates that the hypothesis is statistically significant even at a 0.000 level. We can then conclude that university image and academic performance depend significantly on the competence of educators.

Decision: Based on the analysis above for which all the calculated values are below the critical values, the null hypothesis:

H_0: There is no relationship between the competence of the educator and students' performance is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis.

H_{03}: There is a relationship between the competence of the educator and students' performance is accepted.

DISCUSSION

The findings from H_{01} depicts that curriculum content affects the research output of institutions although the effect is weak. This is in line with the study of Harden (2012); and Sahlberg (2011) who argued that each curriculum content must reflect the quality of education received and that in the absence of a certified curriculum, the quality of entrepreneurial education received reduces, the image of such institution decreases and her research output on the other hand is left incomplete. For every curriculum, the student-centered approach used in creating the academic session usually involves key subjects with entrepreneurship studies as a compulsory requirement. Therefore, weak nature revealed by the results could be enhanced by amending the curriculum in order to take knowledge sharing by means of research output to public platforms which is a vital aspect of the learning process incongruence with the works of (Harden, 1999:2005).

Discoveries from H_{02} indicated that there is significant relationship between teaching approach and corporate reputation. This shows that a better perception of teaching approach leads to an increased perception of a good corporate reputation. Although this response does not answer how this teaching approach affects corporate reputation of institutions as posed in the research question, it gives a peek into both factors as positively related. This aligns with the study of (Chun & Davies, 2006) showing that the corporate reputation of any institution is focused on its image and identity and these reflect in the teaching approach adopted there in. and also with the works of Altrichter et al. (2013), emphasizing that teaching is the central activity of education and every institutional body responsible for offering the service of teaching is charged with responsibility of visualizing all what is taught and ensuring that what is learnt makes an impact in the society at large. This in turn leads to an increase in the corporate reputation of such institution.

The findings from H_{03} showed that there is a relationship between the competence of the educator and students' performance this indicates that there is a positive link between students' perception towards the competence of the educators and how well they perform academically. Therefore, as confidence in the ability of the educators increase, the performance of students increases alongside. This supports the study of Hamilton-Ekeke & Frank-Oputu (2013) and Olokundun et al. (2018) which showed that from the basis of output gotten, the competence of the teacher is seen in test scores, happy students/classroom, and engagement of students.

CONCLUSION

Entrepreneurship education from the findings of this study can be taught in institutions, and in cases were some have shown a natural keenness to take on entrepreneurial risks, such natural abilities if existing can only be enhanced via education from competent educators using the right curriculum. It therefore, behooves universities to get highly skilled/trained educators to develop the creativity of the learners and by practical demonstration help build real entrepreneurs. It is also concluded that institutions that have taken up the role of giving entrepreneurial education would have a better corporate image than other institutions not involved in entrepreneurship development. In the case of research output from institutions involved in entrepreneurial education, this study found that curriculum content has a positive but weak relationship with the research output of universities, proving that more focus and importance needs to be placed writing and publishing research works as a means of knowledge sharing.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the research questions posed at the outset of this study is: what policy recommendations will this study offer which corporate organizations and policy makers will find beneficial when implemented? This question is answered with the following recommendations. Institutions should ensure that entrepreneurial education are course agnostic. When students who take on courses that are far related to concepts of entrepreneurship, for instance in the sciences, ideas from non-business disciplines can then be garnered for investments aimed at economic growth and development. This will impart into students the required broad knowledge base and entrepreneurial skill to become self-reliant. Institutions should also take on steps to teaching entrepreneurial skills not just for the sake of improving their corporate image, but to create empowered entrepreneurs who would power the economy with skills and knowledge acquired through learning. Since it has been seen that entrepreneurship can be taught, it is recommended that policies be put in place so that from an earlier stage in the education cycle entrepreneurship should be taught. So as to increase the opportunity of every student to have thoroughly imbibed the skill needed for entrepreneurial activities. More emphasis should be placed on writing and publishing research works. More efforts should also be put in place to increase the number of platforms to publish research work while students are helped to make publishing of their research easier. This will increase the sharing of knowledge and help in opening new ideas that can be explored for gains. It is also imperative that educators be helped with the resources needed to teach effectively in order to take ideas from its inception to implementation.

REFERENCES

Alakbarov, I. (2010). *Azerbaijan's success story on sustainable entrepreneurship development through adoption of policies, financing and innovative strategies.* International Conference on Policies to Address Financing and Entrepreneurial Challenges in High-growth Innovative Firms (2-4 June 2010), Helsinki.

Altrichter, H., Feldman, A., Posch, P., & Somekh, B. (2013). *Teachers investigate their work: An introduction to action research across the professions*. Routledge.

Bennett, R., & Kottasz, R. (2000). Practitioner perceptions of corporate reputation: an empirical investigation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *5*(4), 224-235.

Bobbo, H., Ali, A.M., Garba, I., & Salisu, M. (2015). The prospects and challenges of incorporating earth construction techniques (ECT) in the Nigerian educational curriculum. *Prospects*, *2*(8).

Brühlmeier, A. (2010). *Head, heart and hand: Education in the spirit of Pestalozzi*. Open Book Publishers.

Chun, R., & Davies, G. (2006). The influence of corporate character on customers and employees: Exploring similarities and differences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *34*(2), 138-146.

Doğan, E. (2015). The effect of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions of university students in Turkey. *Ekonometri ve İstatistik e-Dergisi*, (23), 79-93.

Drucker, P. (2014). *Innovation and entrepreneurship*. Routledge.

Fosnot, C.T. (2013). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Hamilton-Ekeke, J.T., & Frank-Oputu, E.A. (2013). Influence of home on study habits of secondary school students in kolo-creek development centre of Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Secondary Education*, *1*(1), 1-6.

Hamunyela, S., & Iyamu, T. (2014). The process-oriented implications in the development of health informatics curriculum for teaching and learning. *WorldCIST,* (2), 341-353.

Harden, R.M. (1999). What is a spiral curriculum? *Medical Teacher*, *21*(2), 141-143.

Harden, R.M. (2005). *Curriculum planning and development*. A Practical Guide for Medical Students.

Harden, R.M. (2012). *How is your curriculum designed?* International Handbook of Medical Education: A Guide for Students.

Izedonmi, P.F. (2010). The effect of entrepreneurship education on students' entrepreneurial intentions. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, *10*(6), 49-60.

Izedonmi, P.F., Moses, C., & Ogbari, M.E. (2007). Examining the relationship between entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurial action: implications for academic entrepreneurship. *Nigerian Journal of Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Management*, *2*(1), 1-9.

Jahanzeb, S., Fatima, T., & Mohsin, B.M. (2013). How service quality influences brand equity: The dual mediating role of perceived value and corporate credibility. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *31*(2), 126-141.

Moses, C.L., Olokundun, M.A., Akinbode, M., Agboola, M., & Inelo, F. (2016). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: The moderating role of passion. *The Social Sciences*, *11*(5), 645-653.

Ocho, L.O., & Nwangwu, I.O. (2005). *Issues and Concerns in Education & Life*. Institute for Development Studies.

Ogbari, M.E., Oke, A.O., Ibukunoluwa, A.A., Ajagbe, M.A., & Ologbo, A.C. (2016). Entrepreneurship and business ethics: Implications on corporate performance. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *6*(3S), 50-58.

Ojeifo, S.A. (2013). Entrepreneurship education in Nigeria: A panacea for youth unemployment. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(6), 61-67.

Olaewe, O.O., & Campus, N. (2003). *Concepts of evaluation and its models, case of semantic clarification*. College Review, Osun State College of Education.

Olokundun, A. (2017). Perceptions of students on entrepreneurship curriculum contents and open mindedness: implications for business idea generation of Nigerian University students. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 23*(2), 1-10.

Olokundun, M., Moses, C.L., Iyiola, O., Ibidunni, S., Ogbari, M., Peter, F., & Borishade, T. (2018). The effect of nontraditional teaching methods in entrepreneurship education on students' entrepreneurial interest and business startups: A data article. *Data in Brief, 19*, 16-20.

Olokundun, M.A., Ibidunni, A.S., Peter, F., Amaihian, A.B., & Ogbari, M. (2017). Entrepreneurship educator's competence on university students' commitment to learning and business plan writing. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *16*(2), 1-10.

Retrieved from www.slo.nl/downloads/

Sahlberg, P. (2011). The fourth way of Finland. *Journal of Educational Change*, *12*(2), 173-185.

Schleicher, A. (2011). Lessons from the world on effective teaching and learning environments. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(2), 202-221.