



**JIBM**

Journal of International Business and Management  
Journal Homepage: <https://rpajournals.com/jibm>

## **Entrepreneurial Intention of University Students: A Comparison among Undergraduate Students of Nigerian Universities**

Bukar Ali Bularafa<sup>1</sup>

Abdul Rashid Abdullah<sup>2</sup>

Yobe State College of Administrative and Business Studies, Nigeria  
Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

### **Abstract**

Due to the persistent increase in unemployment among university graduates. Entrepreneurship today is beyond just opportunity, but a necessity. The aim of this study is to determine and compare the level of entrepreneurial intention among undergraduate students of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University (ATBU) Bauchi, Modibbo Adama University of Technology (MAUTECH) Yola and the University of Maiduguri in North-eastern, Nigeria. The study used survey research by means of a questionnaire. A sample of 383 students was chosen from the population of 3024. Data were analysed by means of descriptive statistics and Analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings of the study indicate on average a significantly high level of intentions towards entrepreneurship among the university students, except students for the University of Maiduguri which showed low entrepreneurial intention. The findings further indicates differences between students of the University of Maiduguri and students of ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola, but no significant differences observed between students of ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola at .05 level. However, it is recommended there is need to encourage university graduates to consider entrepreneurship as a career instead of relying on government and the private sector for a job. Furthermore, further studies need to conduct on the role of culture on entrepreneurial intentions.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurial intentions, university, undergraduate students, unemployment, Nigeria.

\*Corresponding author: Bukar Ali Bularafa

Email: [abbularafa@gmail.com](mailto:abbularafa@gmail.com)

Submission Date: 23 May 2019

Acceptance Date: 01 July 2019

### **Introduction**

Due to the persistent increase in unemployment among university graduates. Entrepreneurship today is beyond just opportunity, it is now a necessity. Entrepreneurship and venture formation contribute significantly to a country economic growth and development through job creation, income generation, improvement in the standard of living, as well as positive social development (Dana Léo-Paul, 2014; Kelley, Singer, & Herrington, 2016). Therefore, entrepreneurial intentions, attitudes, and actions need to be appreciated in order to understand entrepreneurship (Krueger & Norris F, 2007).

Entrepreneurial intention is important, it helps to understand the entrepreneurship process, hence it precedes any effort in entrepreneurship behaviour (Arendt & Brettel, 2010; Chrysostome & Lin, 2010) and it is regarded as the most outstanding predicting variable of entrepreneurship behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Fitzsimmons & Douglas, 2011; Shapero & Sokol, 1982). Therefore, understanding the factors having an effect on entrepreneurial intention is significant in explaining

entrepreneurial behaviour (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Hence, the choice of a person to be self-reliant or to rely on others for employment depends on some factors. Various literature indicates how these factors play a greater role in encouraging or discouraging individuals to take self-employment as a career.

Although researchers often point to the relationship between entrepreneurship intention and some individual factors like self-efficacy, risk-taking propensity, the locus of control, innovation, and need for achievement. The individual is equally influenced by some contextual factors, such as university entrepreneurship and government support programmes. Therefore, individual characteristics cannot be separated from other environmental involved in entrepreneurship (Prakash, Jain, & Chauhan, 2015). Extent literature link self-efficacy with entrepreneurial intention, self-efficacy is about a measurement of an individual's capability in executing a particular task. Self-efficacy refers to an individual belief about his knowledge, abilities, and capabilities in the performance of a certain behaviour (Indrasari, Purnomo, Syamsudin, & Yunus, 2018; Ünlü & Dökme, 2018). Risk taking propensity concern with how an individual handles risk and uncertain situations and ability to bear them. The risk-taking propensity is an individual characteristic that indicates the tendency and willingness to take risks (Karabulut, 2016). Entrepreneurship activities involved taking the risk, therefore, the risk-taking ability has a relationship with entrepreneurship. The risk-taking propensity is the situation that one take or avoid risks.

Entrepreneurial activity has been constantly linked with risk bearing (Ozaralli & Rivenburgh, 2016). The locus of control is an individual trait which indicates the stage of feeling controlled. According to Karabulut (2016) locus of control is the extent of control of an individual regarding his or her actions in life. Internal locus of control refers to a situation where an individual believes his or her success in life depends on his or her action while the external locus of control refers to situation where an individual's attributed such action to other external variables within the environment which are beyond his or her control and they attributed such to destiny, fate, luck. Therefore, this shows that individuals having an internal locus of control decide on the career they want to choose in life, and eventually leading entrepreneurial decision and subsequently business formation. Entrepreneurship and innovation are closely interrelated concepts. According to Ayalew and Zeleke (2018), innovation is a process of introducing something new to an existing product or process (Ozaralli & Rivenburgh, 2016) it is the way of changing knowledge, skills, and ideas into a strange value by means of creativity. Therefore, individuals regarded as innovators are more likely to become entrepreneurs. Need for achievement is a situation people strive for achievement, however, according to Maina (2014) individuals having a higher need for achievement are known to have a high need for success, also with the high fear of failure. This kinds of individuals dare to be challenged, set a merely difficult task for themselves, adopt a genuine method in handling risk and prefer to take personal responsibility in getting job executed. Individuals having kinds of behaviours confirmed to choose entrepreneurship as a career.

External factors have a significant effect on individual entrepreneurial intention. Universities are institutions that provide direct support to the development of entrepreneurship also positively influence the development of entrepreneurship and self-employment of students as career options in progress, or after graduation (Mustafa, Hernandez, Mahon, & Chee, 2016). The current tasks of universities today are to create entrepreneurship attitudes and to build creative ideas (Žur, 2014), and also inculcating entrepreneurship intention in the minds of the students (Kuehn, 2008). Entrepreneurial education is not just significant in the development of entrepreneurship attitudes, it stimulates entrepreneurial activities generally (Daszkiewicz, 2014; Urbaniec, 2014). In this context, various studies showed a close relationship between university entrepreneurship educations with the emergence of entrepreneurs. Government support may include a conducive environment for entrepreneurship growth such as legislation, through good government policies, delivery of training and backing and efficient infrastructure rises entrepreneurship intention (Thamahane & Chetty, 2017). Consequently, availability of favourable business climate such as securing property right, effective implementation of contracts, rule of law, qualitative and non-arbitrary, regulation constant and foreseeable government policy, elimination of corruption and administrative bottleneck, good

tax policy system for business and prospects for greater absorption of control of the market (Ramadani, Gërguri, Dana, & Tašaminova, 2013). Therefore, the paper is organised as follows; the first section of the paper is the introduction. The second section is a literature review on entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial intentions and the theoretical model for the study. The third section discusses the methodology. The fourth section is results and discussion of findings, and lastly the fifth section conclusion, which concludes the study.

## **Literature Review**

### **Entrepreneurial Intention**

To have a vivid understanding of the concept of entrepreneurial intention, it is essential to understand the meaning of the term entrepreneurship. Various definitions of the term “entrepreneur (ship)” found in literature, leading to considerable definitions about the term. Hence, these definitions are not consistent as a result of people perception about the concept. Therefore, the term entrepreneurship has been defined in many ways depends on the idea of an individual about the concept. For example, according to Parker (2009), the concept of entrepreneurship was first originated from the French term as ‘*entreprendre*’ which means to ‘begin’ or ‘undertake’. However, it was Schumpeter (1934) who first came with the term entrepreneur to mean an individual who added value to the economic system with the influence of a new way of thinking. This definition evolves over time together with changes in the economy and business globally. Recently, the entrepreneur is defined as an individual who exploits opportunities, usually by means of the re-combination of existing resources, and as well endure uncertainty in the process of execution (Gümüşay, 2015). Although many people agreed that entrepreneur is an individual who has an exceptional and distinct mindset, inspirations, and visions, with the power, will, and ability to conceptualise ideas and execute business plans (Putra, Tridayanti, & Sukoco, 2018). Hence, entrepreneurship can be defined as any activity that involved business opportunities searching by individuals, group or government for purpose of promoting economic growth and development (Ramadani, Dana, Ratten, & Tahiri, 2015).

Therefore, the entrepreneurial intention is viewed as the intention to establish a new venture (Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005), the intention to possess a business (Crant, 1996), or the intention to be self-reliant (Douglas & Shepherd, 2002). According to Remeikiene, Startiene, and Dumciuviene (2013) Entrepreneurial intention is seen as the creating awareness of the mind that an individual wants to establish a new business or form a new essential value in an existing establishment. Hence, intention can predict the behaviour and, intention itself is predicted by “certain specific attitude” (Ajzen, 1991). However, many models (Ajzen, 1991; Krueger, Norris F, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000; Shapero & Sokol, 1982) have been proposed to explain the relationship between an individual’s personality traits and subsequent intentions. The study utilizes the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) by (Ajzen, 1991) to explain the relationship the individual’s characteristics and intention to behave in a particular manner. Therefore, according to TPB, behavioural intentions depended on three antecedents which include; attitudes, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control. Attitudes toward the behaviour, concerned with the attitudes towards the outcome connected with the behaviour and the perceptions of social norms with regarding the behaviour, the two factors reflect the desirability and the anticipated incidence of such a behaviour. While perceived behavioural control reveals the individual perception of the capability to regulate the behaviour. Theory of planned behaviour is one of the most known theory in entrepreneurial intentions studies (Karimi, Biemans, Lans, Chizari, & Mulder, 2016; Lima, Lopes, Nassif, & da Silva, 2015).

### **Research Methodology**

The study was conducted in three selected universities thus, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Bauchi, the Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola and the University of Maiduguri in North-eastern Nigeria. The survey covered final year undergraduate students in the faculties of Agriculture, Engineering, and Management Science from the three universities selected for the study. A total population of 3024 of final year undergraduate students used in the study.

## Sample

Data for the study was collected using a survey through a questionnaire. The subjects are undergraduate students from three universities in North-eastern Nigeria. Students that are in the final year of their undergraduate study took the survey within a three-week period. There are 383 responses used for the analysis. The study used a probability method by means of the systematic sampling method. Among them 105 were female. However, 46% of the respondents are below 25 years old.

## Instrument

In research, especially in social sciences, instrumentation is a set of instruments (for instance, questionnaires, interviews, observations and data from the document) that measures and which assist researchers to collect data (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Therefore the instruments for the study was adopted from the original instrument developed. The instruments divided into three sections. Section 1 on demographic profile, section 2 on independent variables, consisting of seven parts A-G. Part A- on self-efficacy, B- risk-taking propensity, C- the locus of control, D- innovation, and E need for achievement, F- university entrepreneurship education, and G- government support programmes. Lastly, section 3 on the dependent variable – entrepreneurial intention. Thus, the instruments were prepared on the basis of five points Likert Scale, ranges from 1 Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree.

**Table 1 Shows Constructs, Items, Statements and Sources of Instrument Used in the Study**

Construct	Items	Statement	Sources
Self-efficacy	6	Example 'I feel confident in my skills and abilities in doing things'; 'I can tolerate unexpected changes in business conditions'.(Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998)	Chen et al. (1998); De Noble (1999)
Risk taking propensity	6	Example, 'I like to take a venture which is risky'; 'Risk does not affect my choice of becoming an entrepreneur'.	Kolvareid L. and Isaksen E. (2006)
Locus of control	6	Example, 'Whether I achieve a goal or not mainly depends on me and my behaviour'; 'When I get what I want, it is usually because I worked hard for it'.	Rotter Julian (1966)
Innovation	6	Example; 'I can successfully identify new business opportunities', "I am able to create new products/services/markets"	Levenson (1973)
Need for achievement	6	Example, 'I want to be successful', I like to improve my status and prestige'.	Chye Koh (1996)
University environment	10	Example, 'I feel that entrepreneurship education provide me with the knowledge required to start a new business', 'I agree that entrepreneurship education taught at my university encourages me to develop creative ideas'.	Saleh and Salhieh (2014)
Government support programmes	10	Example, 'I agree that government is providing financial support for start-up businesses, 'I believe that policies related to business instituted by government encourage new business formation'.	Saleh and Salhieh (2014)
Entrepreneurial intention	11	Example, 'Being an entrepreneur would entail a great satisfaction for me', 'I prefer to be an entrepreneur rather than to be an employee in a company/an organisation'.	Liñán and Chen (2009); Autio, H. Keeley, Klofsten, GC Parker, and Hay (2001).

## Procedure

Instruments were adopted from the original instrument developed by previous authors. The survey was conducted from May 2017 to August 2017. Thus, the survey was done in the third semester 2016/2017 academic session for the MAUTECH Yola and the University of Maiduguri, while ATBU Bauchi was in their second semester 2016/2017 academic session. The questionnaire was administered in a lecture hall immediately after lecture session. This was done by the researcher and two research assistant. Furthermore, it took the respondent's maximum of 2 hours maximum to respond to the questions. This allows the respondents to critically respond to questions on the

instrument. There are no significant biases revealed regarding the time they answered the questionnaire. Hence, conducting the survey in a lecture hall during a lecture session is an efficient and practical method of administering a questionnaire involving students such as university students. This procedure is often seen as convenient because it allows researchers a great deal of control over the data collection process (Wang, Prieto, & Hinrichs, 2010).

## Results and Analysis

### Demographic factors of the respondents

Descriptive statistics were used to analysed the demographic factors (gender, age, marital status, university, faculty, parents involved in business, siblings involved in the business) of the respondents. For the purpose of clarity the demographic factors were categorised into groups gender was categorised into two (2) male and female, while faculty was categorised into four (4) (1 Agriculture, 2 Engineering, 3 Management science, the rest were categorised into 4).

Table 2 below indicates 72.6% of the respondents were male, while 27.4% were female. This indicates that most of the respondents were male. The age indicates 45.4% are below 25 years, 44.4% are respondents ages between 25 – 30 years, and 10.2% are respondents above 30 years old. This indicates that respondents in the age bracket below 25 years old constitute the majority of the respondents, followed by respondents in the age bracket (26-30years) and age bracket of above 30 years old with the least respondents. In terms of marital status, the analysis revealed that 68.9% were single, and 24.5% were married, while 6.5% were either divorced or widowed. This shows that majority of the respondent are not married. In addition the analysis further indicates 31.1% were respondents from ATBU, Bauchi, 35.0% from MAUTECH, Yola, while 33.9% from the University of Maiduguri, the analysis also, indicates that 14.6% of the respondents were from the faculty of Agriculture, and 28.2% were from the faculty of Engineering, while 57.2% were respondents from the faculty of Management science. The result indicates that majority of the respondents are from the faculty of management science, then followed by the faculty of engineering and faculty of Agriculture with the least respondent.

**Table 2 Summary of the Demographic Factors of the Respondents**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Frequency (n = 383)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Male	278	72.6
Female	105	27.4
<b>Age (in years):</b>		
Below 25 years	174	45.4
Between 25 – 30 years	170	44.4
Above 30 years	39	10.2
<b>Marital status:</b>		
Single	264	68.9
Married	94	24.5
others	25	6.5
<b>University</b>		
Maiduguri	130	33.9
ATBU, Bauchi	119	31.1
MAUTECH, Yola	134	35.0
<b>Faculty:</b>		
Agriculture	56	14.6
Engineering	108	28.2
Management Science	219	57.2
Others	00	00.0
<b>Parents involved in business:</b>		
Yes, both of them	58	15.1
Yes, one of them	110	28.7
No, none of them	215	56.1
<b>Siblings involved in business:</b>		
Yes, my brother(s)	70	18.3
Yes, my sister(s)	106	27.7

However, to determine the level of the student's entrepreneurial intention also, descriptive statistics were used, the variables were analysed and categorised into three (3) using Mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of scores thus (High, Moderate, and Low). The summary is provided in Table 3.

**Table 3 Summary of Students' Level of Perception Entrepreneurial Intention**

Variable	Frequency(n=383)	Percentage	Mean	SD
<b>Entrepreneurial Intention</b>				
Low (1 - 2.339)	106	27.7		
Moderate (2.34 - 3.67)	9	2.3		
High (3.68 - 5.00)	268	70.0	3.7232	1.23080

As showed in Table 3 above, the student's scores mean was employed for the analysis of the dependent variable. The mean of the scores was categorised into three levels (High, Moderate, and Low) and their frequencies, mean and standard deviation obtained. The cut-off point, which is the maximum score minus the minimum score of the dependent variable, then divided by the number of desired categories (in this case 3). To obtain the students' level of entrepreneurial intention, the mean scores were recorded into three categories: High (3.68 - 5.00), moderate (2.34 - 3.67), and low (1 - 2.339). Therefore, the descriptive analysis reveals that 70.0% of the respondents indicate a high level of entrepreneurial intention, and 2.3% indicates a moderate level, while 27.7% indicates low level. This shows that majority of the respondents 72.3% indicates a high and moderate level of entrepreneurial intention. In general, looking at the significant percentage (72.3%) at the high and moderate level, the students in this study indicates a high and moderate level of entrepreneurial intention.

Therefore, in order to examine whether differences exist among students of the three universities studied the researcher used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to examine if differences exist in students' entrepreneurial intention towards business creation among the three universities under the study. Table 4 below present the analysis of variance between the three universities.

## Multiple Comparisons

**Table 4 ANOVA**

Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

Tukey HSD

(I) University	(J) University	Mean (I-J)	Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>ATBU Bauchi</b>	Maiduguri	-1.1710	.15015	.000	-1.5243	-.8177	
	MAUTECH Yola	-.8607	.14569	.000	-1.2035	-.5179	
<b>MAUTECH Yola</b>	Maiduguri	1.1710	.15015	.000	.8177	1.5243	
	ATBU Bauchi	.3103	.14907	.095	-.0405	.6610	
<b>Maiduguri</b>	ATBU Bauchi	.8607	.14569	.000	.5179	1.2035	
	MAUTECH Yola	-.3103	.14907	.095	-.6610	.0405	

Based on the observed means.

The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 1.401.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4 shows significant differences exist among the universities regarding entrepreneurial intentions of the students. The ANOVA Table indicates a significant difference observed ( $F = 1273.873$ ,  $p = .000$ ) at .05 level between in entrepreneurial intentions towards starting a new business

after graduation among the students of University of Maiduguri and students of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Bauchi and the students of Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola. However, the analysis further indicates there is no significant difference observed between the students of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Bauchi and the students of Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola regarding the student's intentions towards start-up of new business after graduation ( $F = 1273.873, p = .095$ ) at .05 level of significance. Hence, this difference among the students of the University of Maiduguri and the other two universities (ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola) may be due to the fact that the University of Maiduguri is a conventional University while ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola are Technology based and therefore they are technologically oriented which make them prefer to be self-reliant.

## Discussion

Previous literature has discussed entrepreneurial intentions, but little examined entrepreneurial intentions from two dimensions (psychological and institutional factors), available records indicate high concentration on the individual traits only (Mwiya, 2014). The aim of this study is to determine and compare the level of entrepreneurial intention among undergraduate students of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University (ATBU) Bauchi, Modibbo Adama University of Technology (MAUTECH) Yola and the University of Maiduguri in North-eastern, Nigeria. The study's descriptive results indicate that the respondents are of varying age range, different gender, also, they of different marital status, different institutions, faculties, also, they are different in terms of parents' and siblings' occupational background. This shows that undergraduate students of universities in North-eastern, Nigeria are heterogeneous in terms of composition, this is in line with earlier findings from (Mekonnin, 2015) that individual respondent came from different backgrounds and they can be distinguished from their demographics and personal characteristics. Although some of the individual respondents came from or are of the same age or gender class as a result of peer influence or other related factors, findings from this study indicate they are of different backgrounds.

The results of this study indicate that most of the respondents were male with 72.6% as against female counterpart with 27.4% this result was consistent with the study of (Gwija, Chuks, & Chux, 2014), also, the results indicate that respondents in the age bracket below 25 years old are the majority of the respondents with 45.4%, followed by respondents in the age bracket (26-30years) with 44.4%, and age bracket of above 30 years old with the least respondents of 10.2% this was similar with the previous studies of (Keat & Ahmad, 2012). Furthermore, the study indicate that 68.9% of the respondents were not married (single), and 24.5% were married, while those that were either divorced or widowed constituted only 6.5% this shows that majority of the respondent are not married, as found similar in (Juračak & Tica, 2016). However, with regard to institutional type, the findings of the study shows that 33.9% are from university of Maiduguri, 31.1% are from ATBU Bauchi, while 35% are from MAUTECH, Yola, this indicate that majority of respondents are from MAUTECH, Yola. The result of the study also, indicate that majority of the respondents are from faculty of management science with 57.2% followed by faculty of engineering with 28.2%, and faculty of Agriculture with 14.6%.

The study also, revealed respondents based on the parents involvement in business, those respondents that none of their parents involved in business constitutes the majority with 56.1%, followed by those that one of their parent involved in business with 28.8%, and those that both of their parents involved in business constitute only 15.1%, this shows majority of respondents falls in the category that none of the parents involved in business, the result collaborated with the study of (Gwija et al., 2014; Marques, Ferreira, Gomes, & Gouveia Rodrigues, 2012), contrary to this assertion Kume, Kume, and Shahini (2013) found students with parents involved in entrepreneurship show significantly more positive intentions compared to those whose parents have not involved in entrepreneurship.

While respondents with siblings involved in business, those indicated none of their brothers or sisters involved in business were 54%, followed by the respondents that their sisters were involved in business with 27.7%, and those with their brother were involved in business formed 18.3% of the

respondents therefore, the result shows that the majority of respondents that indicate entrepreneurial intention are those that none of the siblings was involved in business, and this is in line with the study carried out by (Marques et al., 2012). Furthermore, this study also found majority of the respondents are at the high level and minimal number at a moderate level of entrepreneurial intentions this shows that there is a high level of entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students of universities in North-eastern, Nigeria, this was consistent with the earlier findings by (Malebana Justice, 2014; Malebana & Swanepoel, 2015), that indicate a high level of entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students of universities in South African rural university students. Moreover (Malebana & Swanepoel, 2015), found that entrepreneurial intentions are at the high level among undergraduate students of universities despite their level of socio-economic status, parent's and sibling's background and psychological perceptions. This is an indicator towards reiterating the importance of entrepreneurship towards job creation and poverty reduction among the university undergraduate students.

The analysis of the ANOVA indicate the levels of entrepreneurial intentions among the undergraduate students of universities in North-eastern, Nigeria varies, this shows that majority of the respondents from University of Maiduguri indicate low level of entrepreneurial intention, while respondents from Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi and Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola respondents indicate high levels of entrepreneurial intentions. However, this differences among the respondents of these universities may be attributed to differences in their cultures as indicated in the study of (Lawan & Zanna, 2013) and also, the institutions type as University of Maiduguri is a conventional university while Abubakar Tafawa university Bauchi and Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola are technology based universities most of their programmes were based on self-reliance.

## Conclusions

The study attempted to determine the level of entrepreneurship intentions and the differences in entrepreneurial intention among undergraduate students of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Bauchi, Modibbo Adama University Yola and the University of Maiduguri. There were a number of factors have an influence on students entrepreneurial intentions considered in this study. However, it is important to determine the level of entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students of the university and also, to examine whether any variations obtainable in their entrepreneurship intentions, in order to be able to make contextually suitable entrepreneurial programmes. Therefore, based on the analysis, the researcher made the following conclusions.

The descriptive statistics indicate that there is a high level of entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students of ATBU Bauchi, followed by students of MAUTECH Yola, while undergraduate students of the University of Maiduguri indicate low entrepreneurial intentions. Overall the analysis indicates a high level of entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students. This result can be due to the differences between the universities. For example, the University of Maiduguri is conventional university while ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola are technology-based universities, coupled with cultural differences that existed. Second, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) also, indicate that significant differences existed between the universities in terms of students' entrepreneurial intentions. However, the ANOVA showed that there is a significant difference in students' entrepreneurial intentions between undergraduate students of the University of Maiduguri and ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola. But no significant differences observed between ATBU Bauchi and MAUTECH Yola as indicated by the ANOVA.

Finally, the study proffers some policy as well as theoretical recommendations, the researcher recommends that stakeholders should create awareness that graduates should not rely on the government for employment rather should use the knowledge acquired to create a job for himself and to others. The graduates should also, be encouraged through support and assistance to able to become self-employed instead of relying on government and private sectors for the job. Further studies should be conducted to integrate many entrepreneurship models to examine this issue. Also, a study should be conducted to include among other universities to include diverse and larger sample



in order to improve on the generalisation of the findings. In addition, further studies need to be conducted to examine the role of culture on student's entrepreneurial intention.

## References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Arendt, S., & Brettel, M. (2010). Understanding the influence of corporate social responsibility on corporate identity, image, and firm performance. *Management Decision*, 48(10), 1469-1492.
- Autio, E., H. Keeley, R., Klofsten, M., GC Parker, G., & Hay, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial Intent among Students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, 2(2), 145-160.
- Ayalew, M. M., & Zeleke, S. A. (2018). Modeling the impact of entrepreneurial attitude on self-employment intention among engineering students in Ethiopia. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 7(1), 1-27.
- Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy Distinguish Entrepreneurs from Managers? *Journal of business venturing*, 13(4), 295-316.
- Chrysostome, E., & Lin, X. (2010). Immigrant entrepreneurship: Scrutinizing a promising type of business venture. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 52(2), 77-82.
- Chye Koh, H. (1996). Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics: A study of Hong Kong MBA students. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 11(3), 12-25.
- Crant, J. M. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of small business management*, 34(1996), 42-49.
- Dana Léo-Paul. (2014). *Asian Models of Entrepreneurship—From the Indian Union and Nepal to the Japanese Archipelago: Context, Policy and Practice*: World Scientific.
- Daszkiewicz, N. (2014). Education as a Stimulating Factor for Entrepreneurship Development. *Horyzonty Wychowania*, 13(26), 165-177.
- De Noble, A., Jung, D., & Ehrlich, S. . (1999). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: The development of a measure and its relationship to entrepreneurial action. In R.D. Reynolds, W.D. Bygrave, S. Manigart, C.M. Mason, G.D. Meyer, H.J. Sapienze, & K.G. Shaver (Eds.), *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research*, Waltham, MA: P& R Publication Inc., 73-78.
- Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2002). Self-employment as a career choice: Attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 26(3), 81-90.
- Fitzsimmons, J. R., & Douglas, E. J. (2011). Interaction between feasibility and desirability in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of business venturing*, 26(4), 431-440.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (Vol. 7). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gümüşay, A. A. (2015). Entrepreneurship from an Islamic perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(1), 199-208.
- Gwija, S. A., Chuks, E.-E., & Chux, G. I. (2014). Challenges and prospects of youth entrepreneurship development in a designated community in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Journal of Digital Knowledge*, 1(2014), 10-20.
- Indrasari, M., Purnomo, R. B., Syamsudin, N., & Yunus, E. (2018). Development Entrepreneurship Intention Among Students. *IJEED (International Journal Of Entrepreneurship And Business Development)*, 1(2), 146-154.
- Juračak, J., & Tica, M. (2016). Graduate students' opinions about entrepreneurship as an employment opportunity. *Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, 10(1), 23-30.
- Karabulut, A. T. (2016). Personality traits on entrepreneurial intention. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229(2016), 12-21.
- Karimi, S., Biemans, H. J., Lans, T., Chizari, M., & Mulder, M. (2016). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education: A Study of Iranian Students' Entrepreneurial Intentions and Opportunity Identification. *Journal of small business management*, 54(1), 187-209.

- Keat, Y., & Ahmad, S. (2012). A study among university students in business start-ups in Malaysia: Motivations and obstacles to become entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(19), 181-192.
- Kelley, D., Singer, S., & Herrington, M. (2016). 2015/16 global report. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*, available at: [www.gemconsortium.org/report](http://www.gemconsortium.org/report) accessed 10 June 2018.
- Kolvereid L., & Isaksen E. (2006). New business start-up and subsequent entry into self-employment. *Journal of business venturing*, 21(6), 866-885.
- Krueger, J., & Norris F. (2007). What lies beneath? The experiential essence of entrepreneurial thinking. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 31(1), 123-138.
- Krueger, J., Norris F, Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of business venturing*, 15(5-6), 411-432.
- Kume, A., Kume, V., & Shahini, B. (2013). Entrepreneurial Characteristics amongst University Students in Albania. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 9(16), 206-225.
- Lawan, L. A., & Zanna, R. (2013). Evaluation of Socio-cultural Factors Influencing Consumer Buying Behaviour of Clothes in Borno State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Science*, 1(3), 519-529.
- Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 41(1973), 397-404.
- Lima, E., Lopes, R. M., Nassif, V., & da Silva, D. (2015). Opportunities to improve entrepreneurship education: Contributions considering Brazilian challenges. *Journal of small business management*, 53(4), 1033-1051.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Development and Cross-Cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(3), 593-617.
- Maina, S. (2014). The role of entrepreneurship education on job creation among youths in Nigeria. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 15(4), 87-96.
- Malebana Justice. (2014). Entrepreneurial Intentions of South African Rural University Students: A Test of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Journal of Economics and Behavioural Studies*, 6(2), 130-143.
- Malebana, M., & Swanepoel, E. (2015). Graduate Entrepreneurial Intentions in the Rural Provinces of South Africa. *Southern African Business Review*, 19(1), 89-111.
- Marques, C. S., Ferreira, J. J., Gomes, D. N., & Gouveia Rodrigues, R. (2012). Entrepreneurship education: How psychological, demographic and behavioural factors predict the entrepreneurial intention. *Education and Training*, 54(8/9), 657-672.
- Mekonnin, R. (2015). Determining Entrepreneurial Motivation of Undergraduate Students in Ethiopian Higher Learning Institutions: A Case of Haramaya University. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*, 1(14), 4-19.
- Mustafa, M. J., Hernandez, E., Mahon, C., & Chee, L. K. (2016). Entrepreneurial intentions of university students in an emerging economy: The influence of university support and proactive personality on students' entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 8(2), 162-179.
- Mwiya, B. M. K. (2014). *The impact of entrepreneurship education on the relationships between institutional and individual factors and entrepreneurial intention of university graduates: Evidence from Zambia*. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ozaralli, N., & Rivenburgh, N. K. (2016). Entrepreneurial intention: antecedents to entrepreneurial behavior in the USA and Turkey. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(1), 1-32.
- Parker, S. C. (2009). Why do Small Firms Produce the Entrepreneurs? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(3), 484-494.
- Prakash, D., Jain, S., & Chauhan, K. (2015). Supportive Government Policies, Locus of Control and Student's Entrepreneurial Intensity: A Study of India. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 5(1), 1-15.

- Putra, B. A., Tridayanti, H., & Sukoco, A. (2018). The Role of Entrepreneurship Education in Cultivating Student's Entrepreneurial Intention. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Development (IJEED)*, 1(2), 120-130.
- Ramadani, V., Dana, L.-P., Ratten, V., & Tahiri, S. (2015). The context of Islamic entrepreneurship and business: Concept, principles and perspectives. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 15(3), 244-261.
- Ramadani, V., Gërguri, S., Dana, L.-P., & Tašaminova, T. (2013). Women entrepreneurs in the Republic of Macedonia: waiting for directions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 19(1), 95-121.
- Remeikiene, R., Startiene, G., & Dumciuviene, D. (2013). *Explaining entrepreneurial intention of university students: The role of entrepreneurial education*. Paper presented at the International Proceedings of the Management, Knowledge and Learning International Conference 2013.
- Rotter Julian. (1966). Generalised Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1-28.
- Saleh, W., & Salhieh, L. (2014). An investigation of entrepreneurial intention amongst Arab University students. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(12), 197-209.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The Schumpeter: Theory of economic development*: Harvard University Press.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship.
- Thamahane, T. C., & Chetty, N. (2017). Factors that influence entrepreneurship in university students: A case study of two departments at the university of the Western Cape (Republic of South Africa). *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 6(6), 1-30.
- Ünlü, Z. K., & Dökme, İ. (2018). Multivariate Assessment of Middle School Students' Interest in STEM Career: A Profile from Turkey. *Research in Science Education*, 1(2018), 1-15.
- Urbaniec, M. (2014). Modern Challenges for Entrepreneurship in Higher Education. *Horizons of Education*, 13(26), 209-230.
- Wang, L., Prieto, L., & Hinrichs, K. T. (2010). Direct and indirect effects of individual and environmental factors on motivation for self-employment. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 15(04), 481-502.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(6), 1265-1272.
- Žur, A. (2014). Exploring the Role of Inspiration in Entrepreneurship Education. *Horyzonty Wychowania*, 13(26), 179-194.