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Abstract

The purpose of the paper was to assess Nigeria’s tertiary education programme with regard to entrepreneurship education/studies that has not been embedded as a distinct and separate curriculum, and the need to provide generic and transversal skills for self-employment, economic empowerment, reduction in tertiary education graduate unemployment, wealth creation, entrepreneurial spirit, mindset and culture. The study found that entrepreneurship education/studies considered as catalyst for national development is offered in the nation’s higher institutions but in a superficial, fragmented and disconnected manner. It was also found that no distinct entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum and policy exist in higher education; inadequate funding, decaying infrastructure and transparency in governance were also found to hinder the achievement of the desired objectives. The Multiple Contexts of Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum and Instruction that is deep, holistic, integrated and connected, together with other recommendations was, therefore, considered appropriate for implementation in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.
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1. Introduction

Since launching the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) (FRN, 2005) document aimed at attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in Nigeria, the subject of entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial development and its many themes and sub-themes have attracted attention by the nation’s academic community and professional associations/organisations. Other stakeholders are not left out in the discussions. Literature indicate that these themes and sub-themes, discussions, findings, conclusions, recommendations and communiqués have centred on skills acquired through education and training, and entrepreneurship for sustainable national development through self-employment, employment generation and diversification of the national economy, among others.

While education has been linked with entrepreneurship for national development, not much has been seen by embedding it holistically into the nation’s tertiary/higher education curriculum. The Nigerian tertiary education sector requiring reforms has been the focus of sustained and incremental policy (Silbeck, 2001) and public criticisms over the years. This led to the National Policy on Education (FRN, 2004), first introduced in 1977. These reforms can be regarded as modernization agenda that are ambitious but lack sustainability. The reforms are also wide-ranging; identifying change requirements at macro, meso and micro levels (Kenny, Conroy and McNamara, 2006) and structural systems levels; macro actor level or individual academic, students, workers and real life experience levels.

There seems to be a problem in the interface between the bureaucratic rhetoric of structure and the agency of the actors as well as the dynamics of the structure agency (Giddens, 2004). That the interface is fundamental to the positive or negative applications, utilization and real life experience of entrepreneurship education is, no doubt, problematic. According to Kenny, Conroy and McNamara (2006), the interface and the complex social dynamics in the Nigeria’s quest for sustainable national development through entrepreneurship education/studies that is not well-grounded in the country’s tertiary education curriculum is the theme of this paper.

1.1 Approach

The ‘interpretative’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998) paradigm approach located in the Weberian concept of ‘Verstenhen’ understanding, explaining and/or constructing meaning from entrepreneurship education that makes the individual self-reliant for life was utilized in the paper (Hughes and Sharock, 1997). The paper also utilized the mixed methods found in focused literature review and document analysis (Crewswell, 2005), critical self-reflection (Barnett, 1997) and the lived experience of the authors as actors in higher education in Nigeria (Green, 2003). As an innovative entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum, the mixed method approach adopted by Ali and Baig (2012) in their study on Community-Oriented Medical Education (COME) in Pakistan, also influenced the paper.

2. Conceptual Classifications

2.1 Concepts of Entrepreneurship Education

To Pendergast (2004), entrepreneurship is inextricably linked with new venture creation hence, it is not an event but a process which may take several years to evolve in order to come to fruition (Mazzare, Volery, Doss and Thein, 1999). Entrepreneurship is the ability to successfully organize a business opportunity; harnessing human and material resources and using them to exploit the business opportunity. It is the process of creating something new that has value or utility with all the accompanying risks and benefits (Nickels, McHugh and McHugh, 2003). Entrepreneurship
entails various activities dealing with the establishment and operation of a business that others dread, and the taking of risks.

Colin and Jack (2004) see entrepreneurship education as the sum total and process of providing individuals with the ability and skills to recognize business opportunities; the insight and necessary skills to act on them. Akineseinde (2011) succinctly stated that entrepreneurship education is about transforming an idea into reality. Entrepreneurship education can also be conceptualized as the building of required knowledge and skills either about, or for the purpose of entrepreneurship beginning at the primary, secondary and tertiary education levels respectively.

Many nations have recognized the importance of entrepreneurship education in national development and sustainability (World Economic Forum, 2009). This is highly indicative that both developed and developing countries are very much involved in entrepreneurship education. Martinez, Levie, Kelley, Saemumson and Schott (2010) also presented a report which shows that a large proportion of these countries believe that:

... while education is one of the most important foundations for economic development, entrepreneurship is a major driver of innovation and economic growth. Entrepreneurship education plays an essential role in shaping attitudes, skills and culture, from primary level up ….

Albert, Sciascia and Poli (2004) defined entrepreneurship education as a structured formal conveyance of entrepreneurship competencies which carries with it, the concept of skills and mental awareness. In their studies, the authors placed much emphasis on the benefits of entrepreneurship education which include the acquisition of skills, abilities and competencies that yield to self-reliance, and playing leading roles in societal development.

Entrepreneurship education is consistent with self-reliance and self-employment (Anyakoha, 1997) in order to solve economic empowerment problem; it provides the entrepreneur/entrepreneur-in-training or student with skills, ideas, capacities and managerial competencies necessary for successful entrepreneurship (Okoh and Emehi, 2008). Agreeing with Anyakoha (1997), Osuala (2004) stated that entrepreneurship education is a specialized education offered to students of vocational and technical education with which to acquire relevant abilities, competencies and capabilities for self-employment instead of roaming the streets for unavailable paid employment. It prepares and equips individuals with entrepreneurial skills to start a business, create wealth and the ability to cope with the attendant financial risks (Azih, 2010). The concept of entrepreneurship education makes the case that regards it as a missing variable for industrial and economic development such as in Nigeria (Uwameiye and Aduwa-Iguegbaen, 2005).

Several dichotomies now surround entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurship (entrepreneur). Ebiloma (2008) observed that this is due to the continuous growth in the number of institutions offering entrepreneurship education courses and other related issues. There is the controversy as to whether or not entrepreneurship can be taught, and whether entrepreneurs are born and not made; entrepreneurial qualities are born and cannot be developed by education, training or any other means. This myth is no longer true; it is now evidently proved that some qualities can be developed and improved by education, training and support assistance. This is because to become an entrepreneur, the individual needs some inborn (innate) qualities such as high need for achievement, motivation and common sense but still there are many qualities like management techniques that come only through learning. Many entrepreneurial qualities are certainly acquired from learned knowledge. Onojetah (2008) noted that scholars’ debate on whether entrepreneurs emerge from nature or nurture is supported by some studies which identified the presence of
inherent personality traits and related psychological factors such as locus of control and risk propensity as the basis for entrepreneurship prowess and that acquired characteristics like entrepreneurial cognition, such as mental models, heuristics, intuition and self-regulatory skills are key factors in entrepreneurship.

Similarly, there is the controversy as to the degree to which entrepreneurship education can be taught, and if so, how (Bechard and Gregoire, 2005). Arguing, Onojetah (2008) pointed out that if one accepts that key attributes of entrepreneurship come from personality traits (Steward, Watson, Carland and Carland, 1999), entrepreneurship education may not have a fundamental impact as it is unlikely to alter the personality of the individual. Conversely, if it is generally accepted that entrepreneurial cognition and skills are largely acquired through experience (Neck, Neck and Godwin, 1999), it means that entrepreneurship education is most likely to have a profound impact on decision-making and other key aspects of entrepreneurship that are considered to be inevitable.

Aganbi (2010), citing the study conducted by McClelland in India tagged “KAKINAD” in which youths were put in a six months’ training programme with a view to being motivated to see fresh goals, stated that entrepreneurship education cannot be ignored under any circumstance. The study found that entrepreneurship education could provide the necessary motivation for the entrepreneur or entrepreneurship. This led to the establishment of Entrepreneur Development Programme (EDP) providing opportunities for learners to be trained in order to fully understand the processes and procedures for venturing into small and medium-scale businesses (Khanka, 2002).

Rae and Carswell (2001) and Shepherd and Douglas (1997) argued that there is a distinction between the teachable and non-teachable elements of entrepreneurship. The key to a successful entrepreneurship education, therefore, is to find the most effective way to manage the teachable skills and identify the best method of achieving students’ needs and teaching techniques (Katz, 1991). This agrees with Vesper (1971)’s study that the debate should not be on how entrepreneurship can be taught but how it can best be taught. Without doubt, the teaching of entrepreneurship will certainly be both a “science” and an “art” where the former concerns the functional skills required for business start-up that is teachable while the latter refers to the creative aspects of entrepreneurship that are not teachable (Jack and Anderson, 1998). A unanimous agreement exists among entrepreneurship educators that there is the necessity to shift emphasis from the scientific to the artistic and creative teaching of entrepreneurship (Shepherd and Douglas, 1997).

2.2 Concepts of Curriculum

Curriculum is derived from the Latin word currere or race course, meaning the course to be run, referring to the course of deeds and/or actions (whether overt or covert) and experiences which people (learners) pass through before graduating from an educational programme. The concept of curriculum was used in the English-speaking tradition as equivalent to the French concept programme d’études. The concept of curriculum has evolved and gained in importance. Increasingly, it is used universally within the framework of globalization, the theory of pedagogy and the sociology of education. At the same time, the concept acquired such an importance that since the 1990s certain authors underscored the risk of an invading epistemology (that is, the concept being used to indicate all dimensions of the educational process without allowing any differentiated analytical approach to its complexity). Curriculum is the set of courses and their contents offered in a school or higher institution.

Curriculum may be considered in the broader sense as all the social and emotional experiences an individual has in school as well as the academic learning experiences and
achievements suitable not only for the individual, but also for the society generally. Curriculum is influenced by history, social and political concerns. Technology has also now become a driving force in curriculum issues. There exist two types of curriculum, the core curriculum and the open curriculum (Wikipedia, 2010). While the core is mandatory for all students in an institution or environment as it is the case at the University of Chicago, USA, the open gives students the opportunity of choosing the course(s) they prefer. For the purpose of this paper, the core curriculum is the focus as it is designed to foster critical skills and competencies in a broad range of academic and non-academic disciplines that are required for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial success most desired in Nigeria today.

The term, curriculum according to Braslavsky (1999) is mostly used to refer to the existing contract between society, the State and educational professionals with regard to the educational experiences that learners should undergo during a certain phase of their lives. For the majority of authors and experts, the curriculum defines: (i) why; (ii) what; (iii) when; (iv) where; (v) how; and (vi) with whom to learn. The four questions raised by Tyler (1949) - what should be taught, how should it be taught, how should it be organized and evaluated – are in line with these definitions.

In the word of Kliebard (1989), it is important to faithfully reflect the nature of the enterprise by expanding the notion of curriculum development beyond the commonsensical definition of curriculum as the subjects of study and even the topics and sub-headings that fall under them. To that extent, there are some problems and issues associated with curriculum definition as a field of study implying some principal considerations one of which is that above the criterion of effectiveness in teaching, there is the problem of interrelatedness, that is, relatively independent studies have to come together to form an integrated whole. Bloom (2006) refers to all these as selected concepts of curriculum which translates to a deep, holistic and connected curriculum suitable for Nigeria’s Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum (see Appendix 1).

It should be noted that conceptually integrated approaches to curriculum that encourage student-centred mergence tend to result in deeper, holistic, high interconnected and integrated understandings by students as depicted by Bloom (2006). Agreeing with Kliebard (1989), Caswell (1952) raised some issues and problems in curriculum development that centre on what to teach hinged on several approaches thus raising some fundamental questions. Some of these are the content debate – based on different approaches as a result of needs, whether the curriculum should be an integrated whole or interrelatedness. How the curriculum should be related to the problems and conditions of the environment, in this case, Nigeria whose tertiary education has been under searchlight for not being able to address self-employment and youth unemployment in an endowed country with abundant human and material resources. There is the problem of the education curriculum not being able to draw from the experience of the United States of America that developed and implemented a curriculum in response to the depression of the 1920s, similar to the nation’s depressed economy following the economic meltdown.

Caswell (1952) considered some approaches to curriculum development and stated that the curricular contents should also ultimately and directly enhance the ability of graduates with autism to function in a variety of general society and vocational environments that are ever-changing. The use of this framework for organizing curricular contents has been referred to as the domain strategy.

3. The Curriculum

3.1 The Curriculum as a Process

The concept of the curriculum as a product became associated more and more with the concept of curriculum development being a process (Bloom, 2006; Braslavsky, 1999). In some
cases, the curriculum development process proceeds from the top downwards. The most usual term to indicate this type of process is the English expression “top-down” by which curriculum development processes can be defined through four phases: (i) the curriculum presented to teachers; (ii) the curriculum adopted by teachers; (iii) the curriculum assimilated by learners; and (iv) the evaluated curriculum. In other cases, the curriculum development process proceeds from the bottom upwards (a “bottom-up” process). With this, four different phases can be identified: (i) what the society or the parents want; (ii) responses provided by teachers in the schools; (iii) the collection of these responses and the effort to identify some common aspects; and (iv) the development of common standards and their evaluation. For the purpose of this paper, the bottom-up process was adopted without necessarily relegating the top-bottom as it responds more to (i), (iii) and (iv), and this is the type of entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum required in Nigeria today. Appendix 2 typifies top-bottom/bottom-up curriculum suitable for entrepreneurship education in Nigeria as it were:

3.2 New Approach to Curriculum Development

The current trend should be to promote networked curriculum development with several interactions (top-down and bottom-up), while trying to take into account, the needs - not only of educational requirements (Braslavsky, 1999) - and to rebuild the way of conceptualizing reality especially in the context of Nigeria and tertiary education system, but also because of curriculum development dynamics.

3.3 Basic Curriculum Design Concepts and Approaches

Eisner (1985) describes five different curriculum orientations including personal relevance where the curriculum is based on what will benefit students. This view is held by educators who believe that learning is a developmental process hence, educational situations are constructed based on students’ needs such as self-employment provided by entrepreneurship education. There is also the social perspective which is aimed at developing a critical consciousness among students of the major issues of society; there are myriad of such issues that can be solved by entrepreneurship education. Such curriculum focuses on contemporary social issues like high rate of unemployment (in Nigeria); the immediate and remote causes and the attendant social vices, and it is designed to encourage students to take an active role in improving the society in which they live. Another is the curriculum that has technological orientation; stressing a scientific approach using measurable goals and objectives, and planned in a sequential and orderly manner by specifying a list of sequential objectives with tests that demonstrate the students' mastery of each objective.

There is also the ecological approach (Eisner, 1985) considered invaluable. It requires that the curriculum contents should ultimately and directly enhance the abilities, competencies and skills of students to function in a variety of general and vocational environments that are ever-changing. The use of this framework for organizing curriculum contents has been referred to as the domain strategy.

4. Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum Model Proposed for Nigeria

Mention has been made as to the various approaches adopted for this paper. These approaches have also influenced the choice of Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum Model proposed for Nigerian tertiary education delivery if the country is to have a breakthrough and also attempt to catch up with what entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education/studies is doing
in the countries referred to, as models for the paper. The model chosen for this paper is the “Model of Multiple Contexts of Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum and Instruction” (see Appendix 3). Attributes/features of the asterisks (*) in Appendix 3 are provided as follows:

a) **Politics:** Entrepreneurship (local, state, federal, international, tertiary institutions, stakeholders, students/students’ unions; academic and non-academic staff and their unions, financial institutions, organized private sector and its various associations, national politics and governance. Government policy and entrepreneurship education/studies, entrepreneurship, favourable conditions for the development, growth and sustainability of entrepreneurship; small and medium enterprises; industrial, economic, monetary and fiscal policies. Labour policies. Education budget by the three tiers of government; entrepreneurship education/studies budget).

b) **Institutional and Legal Framework:** National Policy on Entrepreneurship Education/Studies that is sustainable, Act of the National Assembly, Policy backed by law that promotes the production and consumption of home-made goods and services; more of export and less or minimal import.

c) **Philosophical Orientation(s):** Entrepreneurship, curriculum (entrepreneurship – learner-centred) national views, world views and individual views.

d) **Theoretical Framework(s):** Learning, entrepreneurship, industrialisation, development

e) **Subject Matter(s):** National curriculum, academic standards, contents (inter/multi-disciplinary, contemporary, deep, holistic connected), concepts, theories, teaching methods, teaching strategies (based more on skills/competencies and less of theories), learner-centredness, involvement of experts/professionals who are not teaching staff, internship/attachment to entrepreneurs (local and overseas), school firms where students are in-charge, establishment of Entrepreneurship Village as in French Village for French Education courses, adoption of the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies approach where students have to tour the country for a better understanding of the country. Collaboration with overseas institutions/agencies with track record of success in entrepreneurship, notably the Asian Tiger nations, US, Europe; case studies, in-basket, conferences, seminars, workshops, symposia, exhibitions, trade fairs, interactive sessions.

f) **Sustainable Funding:** Programme, research, school administration, projects, infrastructure, instructional facilities, training and retraining of teaching and non-teaching staff, remuneration.

g) **Students:** Needs, orientation, attitude, aptitude, competencies/skills, life-long/life-coping, life expectations (based on needs and realities, coping with emergent issues).

h) **Teachers:** Professionalism and certification, competencies/skills, experience, adaptiveness, knowledge, orientation, values.

i) **National (State) Characteristics:** National philosophy, community characteristics, economic realities, social, cultures, values, orientations, state/level of economic and industrial development; emergent issues (global economy/economic depression, technology, level of unemployment, self-employment, diversification of the economy, production of indigenous skilled manpower, indigenous technology, copy-cat technology, entrepreneurial spirit/mindset/culture).

j) **Classroom/Community:** Social/technical skills and competencies, atmosphere, procedures, interactions (level/type), relationships.

k) **Globalization:** Issues, challenges, politics.

l) **Dichotomies/Problems:** Whether entrepreneurship is an art or a science, teachable or non-teachable, nature or nurture. Problems of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education/studies.
5. Importance of a National Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum for Nigeria’s Tertiary Education

The current practice where entrepreneurship education is offered in the country’s higher institutions in a manner that will not make meaningful impact is the first rationale worthy of consideration. A careful look at Nigeria’s tertiary institutions suggests that entrepreneurship education/study is taken as a course of study in only one semester with varying descriptions or titles. The course is also seen to be domiciled in the Departments of Business/Vocational Education, Business Administration or General Studies. Besides, there now exists Centres for Entrepreneurial Studies or Centres for Entrepreneurship and Development Research (CEDR) across the nation’s higher institutions, and the Joseph Ayo Babalola’s University, christened “The First Entrepreneurial University in Nigeria” which had its Fourth Convocation Ceremonies from Monday, 26th to Friday, 30th November, 2012 (Aderibigbe, 2012). These, no doubt, have minimal impact; they are not national in outlook, not integrated and not holistic (Babalola, 2011). They are also not deep, connected and integrated; they are superficial, fragmented and devoid of quality assurance.

The need for a national tertiary institution entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum as distinct from what obtains throughout the country at the moment becomes imperative as it will be the only means of making entrepreneurship education/studies a specialist field of study of its own whereby recipients will be awarded B.Sc. degree/Higher National Diploma (HND) up to doctorate degree in Entrepreneurship Education for those who will be in academics to facilitate researches in entrepreneurship, and B.Sc. degree/HND in Entrepreneurial Studies for those who will practice entrepreneurship. However, whether degree or HND in Entrepreneurship Education or Entrepreneurial Studies, the idea is not compartmentalized; holders should be able to practice or teach as the case may be. By so doing, there will be compliance with minimum academic standards (MAS), quality assurance, benchmark, best practices and uniformity aimed at meeting national requirements and international competitiveness. With this, there will be a uniform examination as it is the case at the Nigeria Law School.

Emergent issues in the country calls for the envisaged curriculum that will impart generic skills regarded as transversal on recipients and not through skill acquisition training and manpower training programmes (Olayinka, 2012; Keshi, 2012) common in the country that cannot provide the type of entrepreneurship that transforms nations as found in the Asian Tiger Nations. These issues include employment generation and wealth creation; curbing graduate and youth unemployment, self-employment, social vices, the state of the nation’s economy influenced by the economic meltdown and its conspiratorial consequences. The need for the production and consumption of home-made goods and services and for export as well as the concepts of inward looking and diversification of the economy is inevitable. Attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS) and Vision 20: 2020; the provisions of the 1999 Constitution (FRN, 1999) and the National Policy on Education (FRN, 2004) aimed at providing for a vibrant economy, the development and production of indigenous entrepreneurs and technology that can compete favourably internationally cannot be ignored.

It is conceived that a national entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum will contribute in no small measure to provide money for general and entrepreneurship education/studies when there is less dependence on government jobs that are not available hence, there will be reduction in government work force and invariably reduce government wage bill. The curriculum will provide the impetus and orientation for entrepreneurial spirit and culture that are the driving forces in what entrepreneurship is doing in the Asian Tiger Nations. Additionally, entrepreneurship
education/studies curriculum will facilitate and sustain what the authors describe as “supra-higher level of entrepreneurship” that is credible. Contemporary entrepreneurship education/studies has for a long time engaged the attention of business scholars and management practitioners because of the recognition that it can present entrepreneurship to students as a possible career choice, in addition to acting as a general advocate for the mindset.

The need for an emergent national post-secondary entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum is urgent because as Onwukwe (2009) asserted, there are over 100 universities in Nigeria producing more than 200,000 graduates yearly. These exclude polytechnic and college of education graduates in a country with more than 140 million people and unemployment level of about 75% for its university graduates (excluding millions of unemployed school leavers at other levels of education). As Onwukwe (2009) further noted, Nigerian universities will soon reach a crisis level with regard to their exclusive and independent curricular content arrangements, input-output and employability of their graduates, unless some drastic measures by way of curriculum tinkering, inclusion and exclusion in favour of entrepreneurship education/studies are put in place. The idea of Onwukwe (2009) is supported in this paper as anything short of that still leaves the nation in the status quo.

A purposeful admission policy based on aptitude and ratio of the same number of males and females will be necessary because when women are empowered, they are able to overcome some of the limitations imposed on them by a male-dominated society. Besides, several reports and studies carried out, including a Technical Report (FRN, 2001), both on HIV/AIDS, the Nigerian government came up with an HIV Sero-prevalence statistics demonstrating irrefutably that the major casualty are mainly women. Udenwa, Ekpo, Ekanem, Inem and Etkidem (2004) also found in their study of the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria, for example, that there were HIV/AIDS pandemic and poverty and the sufferers were mainly women; see also UNAIDS (2000). It can be argued, therefore, that a national tertiary institutions’ entrepreneurship education/studies curriculum that sincerely takes care of the female gender for economic empowerment will be a welcome development.

6. Problems of Curriculum Change

The national entrepreneurship education curriculum model presented is emerging from the bottom-top approach indicating that there are attendant problems. Of course there has been no curriculum without its problems. According to a study carried out by Ali and Baig (2012) on the introduction and implementation of Community-Oriented Medical Education (COME), an innovative medical curriculum in Pakistani universities, certain fundamental problems were identified. Some of these problems, inclusive of those that prevail in Nigeria, are:

i. The willingness and determination of the National Assembly to enact the enabling law, and the determination of the Nigerian Government to approve a distinct National Policy on Entrepreneurship Education/studies that is holistic, integrated and dynamic;

ii. The willingness of governments at all levels to provide the enabling environment for the model to work;

iii. Continuity of related policies (Shasore, 2012) and commitment by the three-tiers of governments;

iv. Acceptance and religious implementation of the model by all the states that make up Nigeria, unlike the 6-3-3-4 education system and curriculum which, when introduced in 1980, only the National Party of Nigeria (NPN)-controlled states and the NPN Federal Government introduced and implemented it until after some years before states controlled by other parties introduced and implemented it;
v. Shared vision by all stakeholders (participation and involvement – academics and their unions, university administrators and their unions, government technocrats and bureaucrats, government agencies, students and their unions, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), parents/guardians and the organised private sector to mention but a few);

vi. Sustainable technical support; effective monitoring and effective leadership;

vii. Adequate and sustainable funding; provision and maintenance of adequate infrastructure and instructional facilities that are functional;

viii. Enthroning and maintaining quality assurance mechanisms (internal and external);

ix. Resentment by stakeholders because initiating, implementing and sustaining change which the paper is advocating has always not been easy. In the view of Bland, Starnaman, Wesal, Moorhead-Rosenberg, Zonia and Henry (2000), successful curricular change occurs only through the dedicated efforts of change agents;

x. Good governance and transparency in every sphere of national life, insecurity;

xi. The influence, resentment and lack of co-operation by the developed economies of the world as well as the international financial institutions which believe that peripheral states such as Nigeria should remain backward, under-developed and dependent upon them – another form and round of neo-colonialism;

xii. The prevalent status in Nigeria that works against entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial activities and entrepreneurial development unlike the reverent status in Asia, Europe and America that is favourable (Onojetah, 2011);

xiii. How and when to imbibe the entrepreneurial spirit and culture.

7. Conclusion

Entrepreneurship education/studies has been identified as a catalyst for national development because it teaches generic skills that are transversal, life-coping and life-longing. It has the capabilities of reducing unemployment, social vices and being able to solve many of the other challenges that face a developing country such as Nigeria. Literature suggests that this type of education can be offered in a nation’s tertiary education delivery with the right curriculum. Nigeria’s tertiary education system allows individual institutions to run entrepreneurship education/studies programme that are superficial, fragmented and disconnected partly because there is no distinct National Policy on Entrepreneurship Education/Studies. There is also no separate national curriculum for the programme; entrepreneurship education/studies has not been made a career choice where degrees/Higher National Diplomas are awarded to graduates of the programme as it is in law, medicine, engineering and science, to mention but a few.

Nigeria has also not taken a cue from what obtains in the Asian Tiger Nations, Europe and America where entrepreneurship is transforming their economies in view of the importance governments attach to the programme. It therefore becomes imperative to implement an Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum in the nation’s tertiary education that meets the requirements of an emergent programme, such as the Model of Multiple Contexts of Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum and Instruction argued in this paper. As an innovation, the identified curriculum will naturally face some problems that are surmountable with sincere commitment if the nation is to compete in a global and competitive arena.

8. Recommendations

i. The Model of Multiple Contexts of Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum and Instruction canvassed in the paper can make positive contributions to national development
especially as it breaks from the existing approaches. Therefore, government at the centre should approve the Model with a distinct National Policy on Entrepreneurship Education/Studies with provisions making the programme a specialist one leading to the award of degrees up to the doctorate degree as it is the case like law, medicine and engineering, among others.

ii. Appropriate legislation should be enacted by the National Assembly; an enabling environment should also be provided by government at all levels for the curriculum and policy to thrive, allowing for the ‘reverent status’ which promotes entrepreneurship in the developed economies to evolve and abide in the country and not the ‘prevalent status’ that is antithetic to entrepreneurship existing in Nigeria. The security challenge should also be tackled.

iii. The model of curriculum should be introduced and implemented in all the nation’s tertiary institutions, whether federal, state or private, at the same time, and all stakeholders should be committed to it.

iv. There should be adequate and sustainable funding as well as the provision of adequate and functional infrastructure and instructional facilities to meet the demands of the model that is deep, holistic and connected.

v. Mechanism for ensuring quality assurance that should not, and cannot be manipulated – both internal and external – should be put in place.

vi. There should be professionalism and certification among teachers that will implement the curriculum, and there should be training and retraining of teaching and non-teaching staff.

vii. There should be an elaborate collaboration with the organised private sector, and the nations where entrepreneurship is the hub of development leading to the adaption of the ‘copy-cat technology’.

viii. Policies that promote the consumption and use of home-made goods and services; more of exports and less of imports, should be put in place, implemented religiously and backed by appropriate legislation.
References


**APPENDIX 1**

An Integrated Curriculum Along a Continuum from Imposed to Emergent, and from Emergent, Superficial, Fragmented and Disconnected to Deep, Holistic and Connected Curriculum (Bloom, 2006).

**APPENDIX 2**

Top-Bottom/Bottom-Up Entrepreneurship Education  
APPENDIX 3

Model of Multiple Contexts of Entrepreneurship Education/Studies Curriculum and Instruction

Source: Adapted from Bloom (2006). Multiple Contexts Affecting the Context of Curriculum and Instruction