

Entrepreneurship Education as a Viable Tool for the Reduction of Poverty

E.E. Nwokolo¹, M. Dywili² and T. Chimucheka³

*University of Fort Hare, Department of Industrial Psychology, Private Bag X1314,
Alice, 5700 Eastern Cape, South Africa*
E-mail: ¹<echetimber@gmail.com>, ²<mdywili@ufh.ac.za>,
³<tchimucheka@ufh.ac.za>

KEYWORDS Entrepreneurship. Poverty. Development. Job Creation. Promotion

ABSTRACT The paper investigated entrepreneurship education as a viable tool for the promotion of entrepreneurship among university students for poverty reduction in South Africa. The paper adopted quantitative research design and the data was collected using a self-administered questionnaire. The respondents were selected using a simple random sampling method where a sample size of 374 was selected from a sample frame of 13,331 students. The paper employed descriptive statistics, Chi-square tests and independent t-test as the data analysis methods. The results revealed that entrepreneurship education plays a pivotal role in promoting entrepreneurial competencies, entrepreneurship culture and promoting self-reliance and self-independence among university students in order to reduce poverty rate in South Africa. Recommendations to reduce poverty rate in South Africa using entrepreneurship education were suggested to government agencies, institutions of higher learning, policymakers and private businesses.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is globally recognized as a strategic mechanism or the driving force of sustainable economic growth, through innovation, creativity and job creation as well as its welfare effects on poverty incidence across international boundaries (Herrington and Kew 2014). It is pertinent for economic growth both in developed and developing countries (Hansson 2010). A good number of academic studies have shown that entrepreneurial endeavors have the capability of pulling people out of poverty, whether they start their own business or being employed by another entrepreneur (Silvinski 2012). He further explained that the consistent experience of being self-employed is the most effective strategy for economic mobility. However, an increased rate of entrepreneurship in a nation translates to drastic declines in the rate of poverty.

Kareem (2015) believes that entrepreneurship takes the center stage in promoting prosperity by creating new jobs, reducing unemployment and poverty as well as increasing economic growth of a nation. Kareem added that entrepreneurship boosts productivity by introducing new innovations and fast-tracking structural changes thereby forcing existing businesses to reform and increase competition. This position is supported by Dempsey (2009) who argued

that entrepreneurship promotes the growth and development of the economy, social development, economic competitiveness and job creation as well as the enhancement of social welfare and poverty reduction.

In line with this paper, poverty is viewed as social evil that affects the economic growth and development of different countries (Umar et al. 2016). Similarly, “poverty is globally singled out as a socioeconomic problem that is so prevalent as a result of the high rate of unemployment which threatens most of the developing countries of the world” (Adofu and Ocheja 2013). Poverty is seen as a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon, which transcends social, psychological and economic dimensions (Misturelli and Heffernan 2008). It is a well-known fact that the consistent increase in poverty is viewed as the major roadblock militating against the utilization of human resources for both social and economic development of nations (Misango and Ongiti 2013).

The poverty situation in South Africa has been an issue of great concern. This is as a result of the historicity and depth of inequality in assets, income and opportunities (Ravillion 2009). Previous studies indicated that South African total entrepreneurial activity from 2002 to 2012 was below average (Turton and Herrington 2013). Moreover, South Africa is home to about forty percent of people who believe in

entrepreneurial intentions and fourteen percent of those who possess this entrepreneurial intention, which is a very low percentage when compared to other sub-Saharan African countries (Turton and Herrington 2013). Thus, poverty, income inequality, shortage of skills and high unemployment rates among the youths, continue to pose huge threats to South Africa as a nation (Ramutloa 2014).

Nevertheless, these problems could lead to crimes such as youth restiveness, prostitution, armed robbery, drug abuse and kidnapping amongst others (OECD 2010). These vices could be detrimental to investment promotion, economic growth and consequently have a negative feedback effect on employment. Morotoba (2014) added that the absence of sustainable economic growth and job creation, which are considered very instrumental in poverty reduction and improvement of living conditions are the pressing challenges facing South Africa today.

As reported by Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2014), low level of youth entrepreneurship is another major challenge confronting South Africa today, and a major reason for this appears to be the attitude of South African university graduates and youths towards entrepreneurship activities. The GEM (2014) report revealed a general lack of interest among the youths to engage in new venture creation and entrepreneurial endeavors. In this position, Lennox (2013) reiterated the crucial role of youth entrepreneurship in promoting development goals, curbing the inflating unemployment and poverty rates as well as curbing the major socioeconomic challenges.

Ani et al. (2016) posited that education is the acquisition of knowledge, skills, values, beliefs, and habits. They added that education serves as a tool for securing employment and emancipation of people through the acquisition of the necessary skills and knowledge. Ani et al. (2016) gathered that the only visible channel towards the reduction of unemployment and poverty rate is by investing heavily in infrastructure and human capital. Human capital development is further enhanced through a well-structured academic curriculum that is entrepreneurial focused. Akpomi (2009) argued that entrepreneurial focused tertiary education plays a very crucial role in the development and growth of economy of any nation because the more the number of self-dependent and self-employed university gradu-

ates produced, the more the poverty and unemployment are eradicated and the faster the nation moves towards self-sufficiency.

Furthermore, enormous attention has been given to the promotion of entrepreneurship through education globally, and several attempts have also been made through researches, teaching of entrepreneurship courses in both institutions of higher learning and entrepreneurship research centers for the purpose of developing entrepreneurship spirit of culture (Adejimola and Olufunmilayo 2009). In other words, frantic efforts have to be amplified to mobilize, harness and enhance entrepreneurial activities, which will subsequently be of benefit to individuals, government, and the society at large (Akpomi 2009).

In this accord, "entrepreneurship education is adjudged as the system of education that is responsible for equipping individuals with requisite skills, creativity and innovativeness needed to become entrepreneurs". This helps reduce the number of people who are unemployed by providing them the opportunity to be self-employed in order to escape poverty (Ediagbonya 2013). Lending credence to this, Anho (2013) argued that entrepreneurship education paves way for the building of good human and personal relations needed to address personal and social challenges such as poverty and unemployment. Olawolu and Kaegon (2012) added, "Entrepreneurship education transforms youths to be responsible and enterprising individuals, who become entrepreneurs or entrepreneurial thinkers by exposing them to real life learning experiences." In this position, they will be required to think, take risks, manage circumstances and incidentally learn from the outcome.

According to Sasaki (2006), entrepreneurship education has proven its relevance in the promotion of self-employment and poverty alleviation among the citizenry. This is supported by Silas and Ayuba (2009), who described "entrepreneurship education as a process that provides trainees with knowledge, skills and attitudes to create wealth and jobs for poverty reduction and self-employment." Ememe (2011) added that, "Entrepreneurship education allows youths to seek for success in ventures through one's effort." The significance of entrepreneurship education and training for motivating university students for self-employment is recognized by development economists, planners and policymakers, as well as governments of most

countries of the world (Bolaji and Nneka 2012). In the opinion of Suleiman (2010), “entrepreneurship education equips people particularly the youths with skills and knowledge, which transform them into enterprising individuals by immersing them in real life learning experiences whereby they can take risks, manage results and learn from the outcomes.” Owoseni (2009) concurred by stating that, “Entrepreneurship education promotes skill acquisition, competencies, and development of skills, ideas, managerial abilities and capacities for self-employment.”

Based on the above previous literatures on entrepreneurship education, it is crystal clear that entrepreneurship education serves as a major weapon that reduces the worrisome, untamed and ever rising problems of unemployment and poverty in the society. Therefore, the paper sought to investigate whether entrepreneurship education serves as a viable tool for the promotion of entrepreneurship among university students for poverty reduction. The paper raised several objectives, which are discussed in the next section.

Objectives

The objectives of this paper are to determine whether entrepreneurship education promotes the level of entrepreneurial competencies among university students, determining whether entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurship culture among university students and determining the extent to which entrepreneurship education promotes self-independence and self-reliance among university students in order to reduce the poverty rate in South Africa. In the same vein, several hypotheses were formulated in this paper, which indicate that entrepreneurship education does not improve entrepreneurial competencies among university students, entrepreneurship education does not promote entrepreneurship culture among university students and entrepreneurship education does not promote self-reliance and self-independence in order to reduce poverty rate.

Literature Review

Various researches have been conducted on entrepreneurship education as regards to entrepreneurship and poverty reduction. As the re-

search conducted by Ibrahim and Soufani (2002) revealed, “Entrepreneurs who received entrepreneurship courses tend to exhibit the high propensity of starting their own business in comparison to those that received other business courses or did not receive any courses at all”. In the same regard, Owusu-Ansah and Fleming (2002) confirmed research by stating that “entrepreneurship education is critical to success in venture creation and business survival of most entrepreneurs.”

In line with the above literature, Ladzani and Van Vuuren (2002) argued, “Entrepreneurship education plays a crucial role in supporting small businesses.” They recommended, “Entrepreneurship education should take a center stage in all the basic requirements for starting and managing businesses.” They further advised that educational institutions should facilitate the introduction and strengthening of entrepreneurship education. The study by Ibrahim and Soufani (2002) revealed, “Most entrepreneurial traits can be identified in individuals’ early in life, while the ability to predict entrepreneurial traits draws attention to the significant role of entrepreneurship education and development in pre and early adulthood.”

The study by Sullivan (2000) on “entrepreneurial learning and mentoring” revealed that entrepreneurs believe that the underpinning knowledge gained in taking part in theoretical management courses has been critical when faced with real life incidents and is of the opinion that it enabled them to reflect on the incidents and intellectualize any learning that took place. This means that the ability to dissect, reflect, learn and act on a critical incident was seen to be of great importance. Similarly, the study by Henry et al. (2005) revealed that through the study of entrepreneurship, aspiring entrepreneurs are able to benefit from learning an innovative approach to problem solving, adapt more readily to change, become more self-reliant and develop their creativity.

The study by Blokker and Dallago (2008) argued that an enterprising culture is required today to boost entrepreneurship and the emergence of enterprising behavior among young people especially university students depends on the emphasis placed on entrepreneurship education and methodologies that encourage “learning by doing” and “just in time learning”. According to Mugione (2011), the chief entre-

preneurship advisor, in the 2011 United Nations conference on Trade and Development, “entrepreneurship education at the university level should not be limited to those at the business school alone, since students in other programs could also become entrepreneurial in their field of study.” Schoof (2006) argued, “Entrepreneurship education is not only a means to foster youth entrepreneurship but also a channel to equip young people with entrepreneurial attitude and skills.”

More empirical findings, suggest that early entrepreneurship education has significant positive effects on the promotion of entrepreneurial activity (Athayde 2004; Lewis 2005; Peterman and Kennedy 2003). The study by Peterman and Kennedy (2003) measured the perceptions of a sample of secondary school learners enrolled in the Young Achievement Australia (YAA) enterprise program. They concluded, “Perceptions of the participants concerning desirability and feasibility of entrepreneurship had increased astronomically, in turn providing support for the implementation of enterprise education programs in secondary schools.” Recent study by Undiyaundeye (2015) argued, “Entrepreneurship education serves as a vehicle to ride off the endemic problem of poverty, hunger and youth empowerment.” She concluded, “When the youths are provided with the right raining in practice, they explore opportunities in their immediate environment instead of chasing shadows in the cities.”

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The research approach adopted in this paper was a descriptive approach particularly using quantitative research design. The population of this paper comprised thirteen thousand, three hundred and thirty-one (13,331) registered students at the university of Fort Hare in Alice Eastern Cape, South Africa. In order to achieve accurate result from this paper, five percent margin of error and ninety percent confidence level as well as fifteen percent response distribution, and a Raosoft sample size calculator was used to produce the sample size of 374 respondents of this research. The paper adopted a simple random sampling due to the availability of the sample frame. The paper also employed a structured questionnaire because of its tendency of yielding most satisfactory range of reliable data.

Some of the statements in the structured questionnaire were culled from the General Measure for Enterprising Tendency Test (GET2 Test) developed by Sally Caird (Caird 2013). The questionnaire was distributed to experts to test the validity before it was administered on the respondents. In testing the reliability of the instrument, the paper used the internal consistency technique by employing Cronbach Alpha Coefficient test for testing the research tool.

Data Collection Method

The data collection methods employed in this paper were secondary and primary data collection methods. The secondary data was collected using online database sources such as Google Scholars, Springer Link, Wiley, Science Direct, JSTOR, Emerald full text, Scopus and EBSCO HOST to name but a few. The primary data was collected through the administration of the research questionnaire on the respondents in different faculties and departments. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to the respondents and obtained the names and phone numbers of some of the respondents to follow up on the completion of the questionnaires. In ensuring that the respondents completed the questionnaires, repeated callbacks were made to them.

Data Capturing and Analysis

Data was coded and captured on Microsoft Excel. All the proposed hypotheses were tested and analyzed using statistical methods such as descriptive statistics, one sample t-test, independent t-test as well as Chi-square test. The data was imported into SPSS for statistical analysis to take place. When the data was imported into SPSS, Chi-square tests were conducted to discover if there was an association between the tested variables.

RESULTS

In this section, the key findings of this paper such as the demographic information of the sample are presented. Subsequently, the main findings and results relating to the hypotheses of this paper are also presented.

Demographic Information of the Sample

This section presents the demographic findings of the paper which comprise of nationality, faculty, departments, study level, gender and marital status.

Table 1: Nationality of the respondents

Nationality	N	%
South Africans	328	87.7
Non- South Africans	46	12.3
Total	374	100.0

Table 1 results indicate that a large proportion of the respondents were South Africans, which comprises 87.7 percent while the meager 12.3 percent were non-South Africans. This simply means that more students of South African origin participated in the research more than non-South African students. This helped achieve the objectives of this research, since the paper focused on using entrepreneurship education to promote entrepreneurship among university students to help reduce poverty in South Africa.

Table 2: Faculty of the respondents

Faculty	N	%
Management and Commerce	149	39.8
Social Science and Humanities Education	93	24.9
Education	28	7.5
Science and Agriculture	104	27.8
Total	374	100.0

In Table 2, different faculties were represented, the result clearly indicates that 39.8 percent of the respondents belonged to the faculty Management and Commerce, 24.9 percent of the respondents came from the faculty of Social Science and Humanities, 7.5 percent of the respondents were from the faculty of Education, while 27.8 percent of the respondents were from the faculty of Science and Agriculture, which sums up the total number of the respondents that participated in the research. From the result, four faculties were represented, and this will help put to rest the continuous concentration of most previous researchers mainly on management disciplines leaving other disciplines at bay. This

has gone a long way in helping achieve the objectives of this paper.

Table 3: Departments of the respondents

Departments	N	%
Development Studies	20	5.3
Industrial Psychology	41	11.0
Information Technology	27	7.2
Economics	30	8.0
Business Management	31	8.3
Psychology	17	4.5
Communication Studies	15	4.0
Social Work	17	4.5
Political Sciences	19	5.1
Sociology	11	2.9
Criminology	14	3.7
Physics Education	8	2.1
Mathematics Education	6	1.6
Human Social Science	8	2.1
Science Education	6	1.6
Geology	9	2.4
Crop Science	7	1.9
Geography	9	2.4
Agricultural Economics	44	11.8
Microbiology	10	2.7
Soil Science	15	4.0
Agronomy	10	2.7
Total	374	100.0

In Table 3, the demographic profile indicates that 5.3 percent of the respondents belonged to the department of Development Studies, eleven percent belonged to Industrial Psychology, 7.2 percent of the respondents were from Information System, eight percent belong to Economics, and 8.3 percent were from the department of Business Management while 4.5 percent of the respondents were from the Psychology department. Another four percent of the respondents were from the department of Communication, 4.5 percent of the respondents came from the department of Social Work while 5.1 percent were from Political Science. Furthermore, 2.9 percent belong to Sociology department, 3.7 percent belong to Criminology department, and 2.1 percent belong to Physics Education while 1.6 percent was from the department of Mathematics Education. 2.1 percent of the respondents belong to Human Social Science, 1.6 percent belongs to Science Education, 2.4 percent of the respondents belong to Geology department, and 1.9 percent was from Crop Science. Another 2.4 percent of the respondents belong to Geography while 11.8 percent of the respondents were from the department of Agricultural Economics.

The department of Microbiology recorded 2.7 percent of the respondents, Soil Science has four percent of the respondents and Agronomy department has 2.7 percent of the respondents that took part in this study. From the figures, it can be deduced that almost all the departments were duly represented. With this, the researchers are suggesting that entrepreneurship education teachings and curricular should be taken beyond management sciences or disciplines in the universities.

Table 4: Study level of the respondents

<i>Level of study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Undergraduate	308	82.4
Postgraduate	66	17.6
Total	374	100.0

As can be seen in Table 4, large proportion of the respondents which comprises 82.4 percent of the overall respondents were undergraduates while the remainder 17.6 percent of the respondents were postgraduates. This shows that there were more undergraduate students who were represented in this paper compared to their postgraduate counterparts. This is important because it will help identify the red flags and determine where improvements are needed in the delivery of entrepreneurship education in the universities.

Table 5: Gender of the respondents

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	178	47.6
Female	196	52.4
Total	374	100.0

Table 5 indicates that a greater proportion of the respondents were female, which consist of 52.4 percent of the respondents while their male counterpart comprised 47.6 percent of the respondents. The profile showed that there were more female students in the university where the research was conducted. This is in tandem with the demographic profile of the Eastern Cape, where there are more women than men (StatsSA 2012). This serves as a recommendation to the government agencies, policymakers and private businesses on the need of using entrepreneurship education to promote entrepreneurship among female students in universities and empower them with requisite skills and innovation.

Table 6: Marital status of the respondents

<i>Marital status</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Single	362	96.8
Married	9	2.4
Divorce	2	.05
Widow	1	.03
Total	374	100.0

In Table 6, marital status of all the respondents in this paper indicates that a large proportion of the respondents were singles, which constitute 96.8 percent 2.4 percent were married, 0.5 percent were divorced while 0.3 percent were having the status of widow. Since the majority of the respondents are singles, these respondents can be regarded as youth population, which is the group this research is targeted at, and this will also help in achieving the objectives of this paper and provide recommendations to the relevant bodies for onward implementation.

Results from Tested Hypotheses

The result in Table 7 indicates the final findings of the first hypothesis of this paper, which stated that entrepreneurship education does not improve entrepreneurial competencies among University students. The result of the Chi-square test for hypothesis 1 shows a Pearson chi-square value of 364.394 with 21 degree of freedom and P-value of .000, which is less than alpha value. Since the p-value (probability) of .000 is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This illustrates that there is a significant association between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial competencies, which actually means that entrepreneurship education improves and promotes entrepreneurial competencies.

Table 7: Chi-Square test for hypothesis one

	<i>Value</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Asymp Sig (2-sided)</i>
Pearson Chi-Square	364.394a	21	0
Likelihood ratio	493.438	21	0
Linear-by-linear association	322.519	1	0
N of valid cases	374		

In Table 8, results of independent t-test performed to test if hypothesis one was rejected.

Table 8: Independent t-test for hypothesis one

	<i>Leven's test for Equality of Variances</i>				<i>t-test for equality means</i>			<i>95% confidence interval difference</i>	
	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean difference</i>	<i>Std. error difference</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
Equal variances assumed	15.116	.000	48.751	372	.000	11.523	0.236	11.059	11.988
Equal variances no assumed			45.986	258.113	.000	11.523	0.251	11.030	12.017

The result indicates a t-value of 48.751 and 372 degree of freedom with p-value of .000. Since P-value (probability) is less 0.05, this also confirms that the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurial competencies among university students.

Hypothesis Two Tested Results

The results in Table 9 indicate the final findings of the second hypothesis for this paper, which states that entrepreneurship education does not promote entrepreneurship culture among university students. This table, which represents the Chi-square test for hypothesis two, shows a Pearson Chi-square value of

Table 9: Chi-Square test for hypothesis two

	<i>Value</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Asymp Sig (2-sided)</i>
Pearson Chi-square	370.110a	19	0
Likelihood ratio	500.971	19	0
Linear-by linear association	344.226	1	0
N of valid cases	374		

Table 10: Independent t-test for hypothesis two

	<i>Leven's test for Equality of Variances</i>				<i>t-test for equality means</i>			<i>95% confidence interval difference</i>	
	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean difference</i>	<i>Std. error difference</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
Equal variances assumed	70.559	.000	66.71	372	.000	14.014	0.21	13.601	14.427
Equal variances not assumed			61.504	229.887	.000	14.014	0.228	13.565	14.463

370.110 with 19 degree of freedom and P-value of .000, which is less than alpha value. Since the p-value (probability) of .000 is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurship culture among university students.

Similarly in Table 10, it shows that an independent statistics was also performed to test if hypothesis two is rejected. As can be seen, the result indicates a t-value 66.710 and 372 degree of freedom with a probability of .000. In addition, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was also tested and satisfied via Levene's F test = 70.559 and P=.000. Since the P-value of .000 is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of alternative hypothesis. This suggests that entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurship culture.

Hypothesis Three Tested Results

The results in Table 11 indicate final findings of the third hypothesis for this paper, which states that entrepreneurship education does not promote self-independence and self-reliance among university students and thus will not reduce the high rate of poverty. The table result shows that an independent t-test was also per-

Table 11: Independent sample t-test for hypothesis three

	<i>Leven's test for Equality of Variances</i>		<i>t-test for equality means</i>				<i>95% confidence interval difference</i>		
	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean difference</i>	<i>Std. error difference</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
Equal variances assumed	87.717	.000	20.9	372	.000	6.789	0.325	6.151	7.428
Equal variances not assumed			19.31	232.367	.000	6.789	0.352	6.097	7.482

formed to test if the third hypothesis is rejected. As can be seen in the table, the result illustrates t-value of 20.900 and 372 degree of freedom with probability of .000. Since P-value (probability) is less than 0.05 the null hypothesis is rejected.

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis One

Having tested the first hypothesis, which states that entrepreneurship education does not improve entrepreneurial competencies among university students, using statistical tests, the null hypothesis was rejected in the favor of the alternative hypothesis. This reveals that there is a significant association between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial competencies. This actually means that entrepreneurship education improves and promotes entrepreneurial competencies among university students. The result is buttressed by Moberg et al. (2012) who posited that, "Entrepreneurship education equips university students with latent business knowledge, entrepreneurial competencies, which include creativity, initiative, tenacity, teamwork, understanding of risk and a sense of responsibility and social resilience." They added that acquisition of entrepreneurship education makes them more employable and more entrepreneurial in their work within existing organizations and in starting new businesses thereby kicking unemployment out of the way. This will go a long in slashing the poverty cycle in the society.

Lending credence to this, Djordevic (2013) advised that exposing the increasing number of university students to entrepreneurship education is adjudged as the effective strategy to improve the level of soft skills among all types of

graduates. This implies that when graduates acquire soft skills, they start their own businesses thereby trickling down the poverty rate. This notion is supported by Suleiman (2010) who posited that "entrepreneurship education equips people particularly the youths with skills, competencies and knowledge to be enterprising individual, who become entrepreneurs by immersing them in real life learning experience whereby they can take risks, manage result and learn from the outcome." Concluding this, Chiaha and Agu (2008) believes that "entrepreneurship education can make university students more entrepreneurial by equipping them with core traits like diligence and hard-work, confidence, risk-taking, decision making, interpersonal skills, leadership skills and goal getting skills to improve." This implies that "even if one lacks interest in entrepreneurial activities, the same can develop entrepreneurship competencies having been exposed to the education."

Hypothesis Two

In testing the second hypothesis, which states that entrepreneurship education does not promote entrepreneurship culture among university students, some statistical tests were applied, after which the null hypothesis was rejected. This suggests that there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurship culture. In other words, entrepreneurship education promotes the culture of entrepreneurship among university students. This result is buttressed by Ngosiane (2010) who revealed, "Entrepreneurship education promotes the culture of entrepreneurship through the formation of entrepreneurial clubs at the various universities." Dickson et al. (2008)

added, "Entrepreneurship education serves as a precondition for the development of entrepreneurship culture particularly in a place where the spirit and culture of entrepreneurship is very minimal." Akuegwu and Nwi-ue (2016) supported by stating that entrepreneurship culture is inculcated through entrepreneurship education, which is aimed at changing students' state of behaviors and even intentions that makes them understand entrepreneurship, to become entrepreneurial and to become an entrepreneur." This can finally result in the formation of new businesses as well as new job opportunities to improve the standard of living as well as poverty reduction. In other words, when students develop entrepreneurship culture, wealth creation is possible, jobs are created, and individuals' and collective wellbeing becomes a reality.

Hypothesis Three

In the third hypothesis, the null hypothesis was also rejected having undergone some statistical testing. Therefore, entrepreneurship education promotes self-reliance and self-independence among university graduates and is perceived to reduce the high rate of poverty. In addition, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was also tested and satisfied through Leven's test for equality $F=87.717$, $P=.000$, and this also shows that the p-value is less than 0.05. The findings of this statistical test is supported by Ogundele et al. (2012) who argued that "entrepreneurship education comprises the philosophy of self-reliance and self-independence such as creating a new cultural and productive environment, promoting new sets of attitudes and culture for the attainment of future challenges and tackling of poverty." Djordevic (2013) concurred by stating that "entrepreneurship education develops the right skills for the jobs being created, whether in formal employment or self-employment and also involves encouraging creative thinking and promoting a strong sense of self-worth and empowerment that will pull people out of poverty."

In addition, Anho (2013) stated that entrepreneurship education is perceived to ultimately reduce the high rate of poverty. He added that basic and functional entrepreneurship education paves way for the building of good human and personal relations thereby addressing personal and social challenges such as poverty and

unemployment. Lending credence to this, Edigbonya (2013) argued that "entrepreneurship education equips individuals with the requisite skills, creativity and innovativeness to become entrepreneurs, thereby reducing the number of people who are unemployed by giving them the opportunity to be self-employed in order to escape poverty."

CONCLUSION

A thorough and well-developed entrepreneurship education paves way for the building of good human and personal relationship thereby addressing personal and social challenges such as poverty and unemployment. In light of this, the paper investigated whether entrepreneurship education would serve as a viable tool for the promotion of entrepreneurship among university students for poverty reduction. The paper also raised some objectives, which are to determine whether entrepreneurship education promotes the level of entrepreneurial competencies among university students, to determine whether entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurship culture and to determine the extent to which entrepreneurship education promotes self-independence and self-reliance among university students in order to reduce the poverty rate in South Africa.

Having tested the three hypotheses generated in this paper, using statistical tests such as descriptive statistics, Chi-square test and the independent t-tests, the objectives of this paper were realized as solutions to the problems identified in the paper. The first objective was realized as the paper concluded that entrepreneurship education promotes the level of entrepreneurial competencies among university students. The second objective was also realized as the paper concluded that entrepreneurship education promotes entrepreneurial culture among university students. Likewise the third objective, which also concluded that entrepreneurship education promotes self-reliance and independence, which ultimately reduces the rate of poverty. The paper cleared the confusion of whether entrepreneurship can be taught or learned. In sum, the paper makes it clear that entrepreneurship education promotes the level of entrepreneurial competencies among university students, inculcates entrepreneurship culture in individuals, and promotes the spirit of

self-reliance and independence among university graduates/youths for poverty reduction. This is to say that a continuous experience of entrepreneurial endeavors, self-reliance/independence and entrepreneurial culture through entrepreneurship education results in self-employment, which could be the most effective strategy for economic mobility. Indeed, a higher average rate of entrepreneurship in a nation translates to drastic declines in poverty rate. Therefore, entrepreneurship education forms part of the effective solutions to the real challenges of unemployment and poverty confronting South Africans today.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Some vital recommendations have been provided and suggested to government and policymakers, institutions of higher learning, private organizations as well as government agencies. The paper recommends that the government of South Africa should adopt successful strategies for encouraging entrepreneurship and small business such as changes in tax policy, regulatory policy, access to capital, and the legal protection of property rights. It recommends that government agencies should collaborate and work closely with the banks to ease access to finance by SMMEs through the provision of grants to these small-scale businesses. The paper recommends that South African universities need to develop a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship, which will permeate through all parts of the society to transform South Africa into an entrepreneurial nation in the near future. It recommends that the development of curriculum must be a continuing process involving a collaboration of higher education institutions, secondary education institutions, and government agencies.

The paper also recommends that secondary education institutions need to be fully involved in this process, as they will influence the early interest or motivation of the youth to study entrepreneurship. This will ensure that there is congruence in the knowledge, skills and values imparted to students to what the market currently needs. Finally, the paper recommends the existence of collaboration between private organizations and institutions of higher learning. These collaborations or linkages between the institutions of higher learning and private businesses

can open up avenues for internships and on-site training as well as provide consulting opportunities for third year or postgraduate students as part of their corporate social responsibility.

LIMITATIONS

The major limitation of this study was unavailability of funds for transportation and other logistics. Due to this problem of finance, the study was limited to the University of Fort Hare only.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wants to use this medium to acknowledge all those who made this paper a reality, for their encouragement and unalloyed support throughout the period this paper was written. Ultimately all glory goes to the almighty God for the wisdom, strength and divine health he granted the researchers throughout this period.

REFERENCES

- Adofu I, Ocheja A 2013. Alleviating poverty through the use of entrepreneurship skill acquisition in Kogi State, Nigeria. *International Open Journal of Economics*, 1(2): 14-23.
- Akpomi ME 2009. Achieving Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through teaching entrepreneurship education in Nigeria Higher Education Institution. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1): 152-159.
- Akuegwu BA, Nwi-ue FD 2016. Developing entrepreneurship culture among university students in South-South, Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 7(2S1): 315-324.
- Anho JE 2013. Recreating the Management and Administration of Adult and Non-formal Education vis-a-vis Entrepreneurship Education for Unemployment and Poverty Eradication. *Paper Presented at the Conference of Association of Nigeria Teachers (ASCONT)*, Enugu.
- Ani AO, Chikaire JU, Orusha JO, Nwaigwe MO, Onogu B, Uchegbu DC 2016. Extension education, guide for entrepreneurship promotion in rural areas for poverty reduction and wealth/ employment creation in Nigeria. *Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology*, 4(1): 7-15.
- Athayde R 2004. Measuring enterprise potential in young people. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2): 481-500.
- Blokker P, Dallago B 2008. *Youth Entrepreneurship and Local Development in Central and Eastern Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bolaji AB, Nneka N 2012. Tackling employment through vocational education. *Advances in Arts, Social Sciences and Education*, 2(3): 2.

- Caird S 2013. GET Test, Sally Caird's Own Webpage. From <<http://get2test.net/index.htm>> (Retrieved on 22 March 2016).
- Chiaha GTU, Agu RA 2008. Assessment of the influence of entrepreneurship education for sustainable development in Nigeria: Function of educational background and gender. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning*, 8(1): 245 – 257.
- Dempsey I 2009. The Entrepreneurial Dialogues: State of Entrepreneurship in South Africa. From <www.gibs.co.za> (Retrieved on 10 November 2016).
- Dickson PH, Solomon GT, Weaver KM 2008. Entrepreneurial selection and success does education matter. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(2): 239- 258.
- Djordjevic J 2013. *Why Becoming Large Matters: How Scalable, High Growth Entrepreneurs Can Help Solve the Jobs Crisis*. Endeavor, Omidyar Network, Aspen Network: 6.
- Ememe ON 2011. *Entrepreneurship Education in the University in the Eastern Nigeria; Implications for Higher Education Administration*. PhD Dissertation, Unpublished. Nigeria: University of Port-Harcourt.
- Ediagbonya K 2013. The roles of entrepreneurship education in ensuring economic empowerment and development. *Journal of Business Administration and Education*, 35-46.
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2014. Global Report. From <<http://www.gemconsortium.org>> (Retrieved on 10 May 2016).
- Hansson A 2010. Tax policy and entrepreneurship: Empirical evidence from Sweden. *Small Business Economics Journal*, 38: 495. DOI: 10.1007/s11187-010-9282-7.
- Henry C, Hill C, Leitch C 2005. Entrepreneurship education and training: Can entrepreneurship be taught? Part 1. *Education and Training*, 47(2): 98-111.
- Herrington M, Kew J 2014. GEM South Africa 2013 Report. From <<http://www.gemconsortium.org/docs/3336/gem-south-africa-2013-report>> (Retrieved on 30 October 2016).
- Ibrahim AB, Soufani K 2002. Entrepreneurship education and training in Canada: A critical assessment. *Education and Training*, 44(8/9): 421-430.
- Kareem RO 2015. Impact of entrepreneurship on poverty alleviation. *Journal of Business Administration and Education*, 7(1): 1-16.
- Ladzani WM, Van Vuuren JJ 2002. Entrepreneurship training for emerging SMEs in South Africa. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 40: 154-161.
- Lennox N 2013. South Africa Must Up Its Entrepreneurial Game. From <<http://m.news24.com/fin24/Entrepreneurs/News/SA-must-up-its-entrepreneurial-game-20130315>> (Retrieved on 25 September 2016).
- Lewis K 2005. The best of intentions: Future plans of Young Enterprise Scheme participants. *Education and Training*, 47(7): 470-483.
- Misango SB, Ongiti OK 2013. Do women entrepreneurs play a role in reducing poverty? *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2: 87-103.
- OECD 2010. Economic Surveys in South Africa, July 2010. Archived from the original P.38. From <<http://www.treasury.gov.za>>. (Retrieved on 6 March 2016).
- Ogundele OJK, Akingbade WA, Akinlabi HB 2012. Entrepreneurship training and education as strategic tools for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(1): 148-156.
- Olawolu OE, Kaegon LES 2012. Entrepreneurship Education as a Tool for Youth Empowerment Through Higher Education for Global Workplace in Rivers. *A Paper Presented at the Seventh Regional Conference on Higher Education for a Globalized World. Higher Education Research and Policy Network (HERPNET)*, held at the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria, 19 to 21 September.
- Owoseni TA 2009. Entrepreneurship as a Catalyst for Wealth Creation and Employment Generation. *A Paper Presented at the 1st Conference on Effective Implementation of Federal Government Seven-Point Agenda* held at NUC, Abuja, 4-6 February.
- Owusu-Ansah W, Fleming P 2002. The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Business Venturing: A Longitudinal Survey of Irish Graduates. *Paper Presented at IntEnt2001 Internationalizing Entrepreneurship Education and Training Conference*, Dublin, Ireland, 13 June 2001, pp. 91-111.
- Peterman NE, Kennedy J 2003. Enterprise education: Influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(2): 129-144.
- Ramutloa L 2014. Youth Unemployment, Still a Huge Challenge in South Africa-Labor. From <<http://www.labour.gov.za>> (Retrieved on 6 January 2017).
- Ravallion M 2009. Why Don't We See Poverty Convergence? *Policy Research Working Paper No. 4974*, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Sasaki S 2006. Promoting Youth Employment through Entrepreneurship Education. From <<http://www.110.org/public/english/religion/asro/beljing/download/speech/>> (Retrieved on 19 August 2015).
- Schoof U 2006. Stimulating Youth Entrepreneurship: Barriers and Incentives to Enterprise Start-Ups by Young People. ILO, SEED Working Paper No. 76. From <<http://www.ilo.org/youthmakingithappen/PDF/WP76-2006-Rev.pdf>> (Retrieved on 15 July 2016).
- Silas E, Ayuba G W 2009. *Entrepreneurship, Education and Teacher Preparation for National Development; Entrepreneurship: Education and Teacher Training/Preparation*. Jos: Faculty of Education, University of Jos.
- Silvinski S 2012. Entrepreneurship is Key to Poverty Reduction. Goldwater Institute, November 13, 2012. From <<http://www.ncpa.org>> (Retrieved on 4th January 2017).
- Statistics South Africa 2012. Quarterly Labor Force Survey. From <<http://www.statssa.gov.za>> (Retrieved on 29 October 2016).
- Suleiman H 2010. Youth entrepreneurship education for national development. *International Journal of Education Studies*, 1(1): 47-50.

- Sullivan R 2000. Entrepreneurial learning and mentoring. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 6(3): 160 -175.
- Turton N, Herrington M 2013. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2012 – South Africa. From< <http://www.gemconsortium.org/docs/2801/gem-south-africa-2012-report>> (Retrieved on 20 November 2016).
- Umar FM, Mohamad AI, Ratnaria W 2016. Politics of poverty alleviation programme in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4: 311-317.
- Undiyaundeye FA 2015. Entrepreneurship skills acquisition and the benefits amongst the undergraduate students in Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 5(1).

Paper received for publication on October 2016
Paper accepted for publication on December 2016