

**ACCEPTABILITY OF AN EXPERIENTIAL
LEARNING LABORATORY FOR ASPIRING
ENTREPRENEURS IN SAN BEDA COLLEGE
ALABANG**

**Caryl Charlene E. Jimenez, MBA &
Cynthia A. Zarate, DBA**

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship education requires a supportive environment that is conducive to learning. Essentially, the teaching style is action-oriented and accompanied by the practical application of the concepts and theories discussed in the classroom. The practical or applied learning is a key component to the improvement of an entrepreneurial environment in an educational institution. One of the more popular manifestations of applied learning in entrepreneurship education is through experiential learning laboratories or more popularly called student enterprise centers.

There is now a proliferation of experiential learning laboratories in many colleges and universities all over the world. In the Philippines, Ateneo de Manila University has successfully put up a student enterprise center in its Loyola campus. It is in this light that the researchers studied the acceptability of concretizing and improving an entrepreneurial environment in San Beda College Alabang through the conversion of the gazebos located in the college parking area to stalls or kiosks managed by the college students.

The 9-item acceptability indicators for the proposed student enterprise center reveal positive results. The students approved the proposed student enterprise center based on their willingness to test their business

skills in a hands-on environment. Majority of the students also agreed to convert the gazebos into stalls or kiosks to be managed by them.

Majority of the students would like to engage in the food business and are willing to pay a rent between 15,000-20,000 per month, on a semestral basis.

Majority of the students are willing to devote their time and financial resources for the business, submit their business proposals and comply with business requirements.

The projected demand and supply of the proposed student enterprise center on a five-year period shows the potential to succeed if it will push through.

There is a significant relationship between the year level of students and the following acceptability indicators: being business-minded, willing to engage in a hands-on environment, conversion of the gazebos to kiosks, the kind of business they are going to put up, the willingness to rent the kiosk and pay the amount of lease.

Keywords: experiential learning laboratory/student enterprise center, entrepreneurship education

INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing interest in building and creating an entrepreneurial culture among countries in the different parts of the world. This is based on the context of job creation, company survival, technological change and economic and political stability.

In the academe, there is a marked increase in entrepreneurship education in many colleges and universities all over the world. Thus, they have designed their curricula specifically for entrepreneurial learning. In recent years, entrepreneurship education has never gone this far, for example, more than 1500 schools in the US have offered entrepreneurship courses (Lim, Lee and Cheng 2012).

Entrepreneurship education requires a supportive environment that is conducive to learning. Essentially, the teaching style is action-oriented and accompanied by the practical application of the concepts and theories discussed in the classroom. The practical or applied learning is a key component to the improvement of an entrepreneurial environment in an educational institution.

One of the more popular manifestations of applied learning in entrepreneurship education is through experiential learning laboratories or more popularly called student enterprise centers. For example, the Columbia University has established its own student enterprise, which dates back to 1965 when students created their own businesses to offset the cost of tuition fees. Today, these businesses provide employment opportunities to around two hundred Columbia students each year.

Meanwhile, the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom also encourages entrepreneurship through learning and business start-up support, which students transfer knowledge from classrooms and laboratories to market opportunities.

In fact, there is a growing interest in the aspect of academic entrepreneurship in Asia wherein both technological and economic progress is attributed to the University's role and impact of a supportive

environment of entrepreneurship. According to the research of Wong, Ho and Singh (2011), the NUS Entrepreneurship Center (NEC) embarked on a multi-comparative study of university technology transfer and commercialization funded by the Sasakawa Peace Foundation of Japan. Researches from major universities around Asia examined the emerging role of selected universities in their national and regional innovation systems. Spanning a two-year period, this study brings together researches from Japan, China, India, Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore to study 13 selected leading universities in these economies that contributed richer insights on how each individual university contributes to its national and regional innovation system while at the same time draw policy implications for senior university administrators taking into account the diversity of Asian universities and their national contexts.

The results of the research identified physical infrastructure support programmes such as incubator facilities and even large scale science park developments while others have highlighted support programmes that involve “software” and other intangibles, including entrepreneurship education programmes targeted at fostering students and faculty interest in commercializing their invention and equipping them with relevant knowledge on entrepreneurial start-up formation. Other commercialization supporting activities identified include seed-funding programmes, schemes for mentoring and informal networking and university-owned enterprises to market the university’s knowledge assets directly.

In the Philippine context, academic entrepreneurship is still underperforming as compared to its Asian counterparts as entrepreneurial development initiatives are not fully supported by the university and its administrators. However, there are also visionary

universities such as the Ateneo de Manila University (ADMU) who pioneered in its program, the John Gokongwei School of Management (JGSOM) Student Enterprise Center, wherein it supplements its entrepreneurship program with a commercial building which houses nineteen food stalls in Ateneo de Manila University campus. These food stalls are all managed exclusively by students. It is a business laboratory which provides the opportunity for budding student entrepreneurs to hone their skills in food, merchandise or services in a real life setting, just like how actual business operations are done inside a mall.

It is in this light that the researchers studied the acceptability of concretizing and improving an entrepreneurial environment and culture in San Beda College Alabang through the conversion of the gazebos located in the college parking area to stalls or kiosks managed by the college students.

The history of entrepreneurship education dates back in 1938 when Shigeru Fijii, who was the teaching pioneer at Kobe University, Japan, initiated education in entrepreneurship (Alberti, Sciascia et al.2004). However, entrepreneurship courses and programs were introduced in American universities (Franke and Luthje 2004;Raichaudhuri 2005). Entrepreneurship education, according to Binks (2005), refers ‘to the pedagogical process involved in the encouragement of entrepreneurial activities, behaviors and mindsets. Entrepreneurship has created and increased awareness as well as promote self- employment as a career choice among young people (Clayton 1989; Fleming 1996).

Thus, entrepreneurship education is tasked to build an entrepreneurial culture among the youth which, in turn, would improve their career choices towards entrepreneurship (Deakins, Glancey et al. 2005). The objectives therefore of entrepreneurship education are to

change the students' behavior towards entrepreneurship. It is also the intention of entrepreneurship education to form new businesses as well as new job opportunities (Fayolle and Gailly 2005; Hannon 2005; Venkatachalam and Waqif 2005). In achieving this, the design of entrepreneurship education curriculum needs to be creative, innovative and imaginative and most importantly, to tie up academic learning to the real world (Robinson and Haynes 1991).

In the Philippines, entrepreneurship education in the tertiary level is best achieved in a well-designed curriculum, effective teaching model founded on experience-based learning and strong institutional support (Gatchalian, 2010).

Entrepreneurship can be explained through David McClelland's achievement motivation theory (McClelland, 1971, cited in Srivatsava, 2011). According to McClelland, entrepreneurial growth can be explained in terms of the need for achievement motivation, which is a major determinant of entrepreneurial development. According to McClelland, achievement motivation is a desire of a person to achieve. This motivation is imbued in one's culture in terms of values, norms and beliefs.

Evertt Hagan's approach to entrepreneurial development is similar to McClelland's theory. (Hagan, 1964 cited in Srivatsava, 2011). Hagan's theory presents the concept of a creative personality as a characteristic of entrepreneurs. They are interested in accelerating the change and are driven by a motivation to achieve.

To produce students who are capable to deal with real entrepreneurial activity which can create a creative personality and a desire to achieve, entrepreneurship education should transform students'

entrepreneurial competencies. Brown (1999) indicates the core structure of entrepreneurial activities in the school which should draw on the following: a. critical thinking, b. reliance on experience and c. thinking about entrepreneurship as a career.

Vesper (2004) indicates four kinds of knowledge useful in entrepreneurship education:

- a. Business-general knowledge which applies to new firms including new ventures;
- b. Venture-general knowledge which applies to most start-ups but not so much to going firms;
- c. Opportunity-specific knowledge is about the knowledge about the existence of an un-served market and how the resources need to be ventured in; and
- d. Venture-specific knowledge is about the knowledge on how to produce a particular product or goods.

To be involved in an enterprise activity is not only about starting a business. It is also about learning and developing skills that students can use in various ways both inside and outside the workplace. The experiential learning laboratory is a business incubator not only for business students but also for students in other non-business courses who may consider entrepreneurship as an alternative career to being an employee. The students may learn to acquire an entrepreneurial spirit which showcases such traits as innovative and creative flair, initiative, hardwork, determination, flexibility, perseverance, time management and strong communication skills. These skills can make anybody stand out and succeed in the work environment.

Exposure in the real life entrepreneurial setting will help students be equipped with all the abovementioned traits. Whatever the students' motivation is at the

moment, the experiential learning laboratory can help students to be prepared in their future entrepreneurial activities.

The main problem of this study is the acceptability of an experiential learning laboratory in the form of a student enterprise center by converting the gazebos located in the college parking area to stalls or kiosks managed by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) students of San Beda College Alabang.

Specifically, the researchers seek answers to the following questions:

1. What is the acceptability level of the students in the College of Arts and Sciences in the proposed student enterprise center?
2. What is the projected demand and supply on a 5-year period of the proposed student enterprise center?

Based on the main and sub-problems stated, the researchers have come up with the following null hypothesis of the study. There are no significant relationships between the year level of the respondents and the acceptability indicators of the proposed student enterprise center.

METHOD

The researchers used the descriptive research design using a survey questionnaire. The purpose of the survey is to determine the feasibility of establishing a student enterprise center in the vicinity of the College of Arts and Sciences by converting the gazebos located in

the college parking area to stalls or kiosks managed by college students.

The study was conducted during the 2nd semester of SY 2012-13 where the total population of the College of Arts and Sciences is 1,962. Using Slovin's formula with a margin of error of 5%, the total sample size was 333 students.

Using stratified sampling, the table below shows the breakdown of the student-respondents per course.

Table 1
Frequency of respondents per course

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| BACMS | 46 | 13.81 |
| BAIST | 46 | 13.81 |
| BAPSYC | 30 | 9.01 |
| BSED | 3 | 0.90 |
| BSA | 27 | 8.11 |
| BSBA-FM | 40 | 12.01 |
| BSBA-HRDM | 9 | 2.70 |
| BSBA-MM | 56 | 16.82 |
| BSE | 23 | 6.91 |
| BSLM | 23 | 6.91 |
| BSIT | 30 | 9.01 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

As previously mentioned, the acceptability of the student enterprise center is not confined solely to business students but is also open to non-business students. Thus, the total sample size of 333 students

represents the total population of the CAS for the 2nd semester 2012-13.

The survey questionnaire was distributed across the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year levels which are broken down as follows:

Table 2
Year level of respondents

| Year level | Frequency | Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|
| 1st | 152 | 45.60 |
| 2nd | 152 | 45.60 |
| 3rd | 29 | 8.80 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

The survey questionnaire consists of nine questions denoting acceptability indicators such as being business minded, being in a hands-on environment, willingness to engage in a business, rent, submit proposals, among others.

The questionnaire was distributed to the students and then retrieved, tallied and analyzed. Statistical tools such as factor analysis, regression and t-test were applied on the data gathered.

Secondary data were gathered through books, journals and electronic materials.

RESULTS

Based on statement of the problem number 1, the following tables show the responses of students on the acceptability indicators for the proposed student enterprise center.

Table 3
Acceptability indicators (questions 1-4)
on the proposed student enterprise center

| 1. Are you business minded? | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
| Yes | 266 | 79.88 |
| No | 67 | 20.12 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 253 | 75.98 |
| No | 58 | 17.42 |
| no answer | 22 | 6.61 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

3. If the gazebos will be converted to commercial stalls or kiosks, are you willing to engage in a business of your choice?

| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 234 | 70.27 |
| No | 99 | 29.73 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

4. If yes, what kind of business are you going to put up?

| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Food | 212 | 63.66 |
| non food | 48 | 14.41 |
| no answer | 73 | 21.93 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

Table 4: Acceptability indicators (questions 5-9) on the proposed student enterprise center

| 5. If the stall is for lease, how much are you willing to rent, on a monthly basis? | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
| 15000-20000 | 283 | 84.98 |
| 21000-25000 | 20 | 6.01 |
| 26000-30000 | 6 | 1.80 |
| no answer | 24 | 7.21 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |
| 6. How long would you want to lease out? | | |
| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
| semestral | 216 | 64.86 |
| annual | 94 | 28.23 |
| no answer | 23 | 6.91 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |
| 7. Are you capable to devote time and financial resources in the entire duration of the business? | | |
| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
| Yes | 202 | 60.66 |
| No | 121 | 36.34 |
| no answer | 10 | 3.00 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |
| 8. Are you willing to submit a proposal or study on the viability of the business for approval of SBCA management? | | |
| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
| Yes | 182 | 54.65 |
| No | 141 | 42.34 |
| no answer | 10 | 3.00 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |
| 9. Are you willing to comply with the business requirements such as permits (sanitary, mayor's, BIR, DTL, etc.) | | |
| Description | Frequency | Percentage |
| Yes | 224 | 67.27 |
| No | 99 | 29.73 |
| no answer | 10 | 3.00 |
| Total | 333 | 100.00 |

Tables 3 and 4 show the acceptability indicators through questions 1 to 9. Majority of the students are business-minded (79.88%) and are willing to test their business skills in a hands-on environment (75.98%). About 70.27% are willing to convert the gazebos into stalls or kiosks and engage in a business of their choice.

About 63.66% of the respondents would like to put up food stalls and rent each kiosk between 15,000-20,000 per month (84.98%). The term or period of lease is on a semestral basis or 64.86%. About 60.66% of the respondents are willing to devote their time and financial resources on the entire duration of the business. Meanwhile, half of the respondents or 54.65% are willing to submit business proposals subject to approval of SBCA management and 67.27% of them are willing to comply with the submission of business requirements.

Overall, the students express optimism and enthusiasm on the proposed student enterprise center.

Based on the results of the survey questionnaire, the researchers have projected demand and supply on a five-year period on the proposed student enterprise center.

To project demand and supply, the researchers totally relied on the results of the survey questionnaire. The following assumptions were made to project demand and supply on a five-year period.

1. The demand is taken from the survey question 3, that 70% of the 333 respondents is willing to convert the gazebos into a student enterprise center.

The total population for 2ndsem SY 2012-2013 is 1962. (70% of 1962 is 1373.)

2. The supply is assumed at 78%, based on question 4, on the kind of business that respondents are willing to put up. (64% for food and 14% for non-food). (78% of 1373 is 1071)
3. The increase in student population every year is assumed at 10%. Thus, it is also assumed that the demand and supply will increase by 10%.

Table 5
Projected Demand and Supply

| YEAR | DEMAND | SUPPLY | GAP |
|------|--------|--------|-----|
| 1 | 1373 | 1071 | 302 |
| 2 | 1510 | 1178 | 332 |
| 3 | 1661 | 1296 | 365 |
| 4 | 1827 | 1426 | 401 |
| 5 | 2010 | 1568 | 442 |

To test the hypothesis, pearson chi square test and phi coefficient are used. This is to determine the relationship between the year level of the respondents and the acceptability indicators for the student enterprise center.?

1. Year level and question 1: *Are you business minded?*
2. Year level and question 2: *If yes, do you want to test your business skills in a hands-on learning environment?*
3. Year level and question 3: *If the gazebos will be converted to commercial stalls or kiosks, are you willing to engage in a business of your choice?*

Year level and question 1

Year level and question 2

Year level and question 3

Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 18.082 ^a | 3 | .000 | Pearson Chi-Square | 22.356 ^a | 6 | .001 | Pearson Chi-Square | 8.457 ^a | 3 | .037 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 18.461 | 3 | .000 | Likelihood Ratio | 27.434 | 6 | .000 | Likelihood Ratio | 8.744 | 3 | .033 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 12.755 | 1 | .000 | Linear-by-Linear Association | 10.808 | 1 | .001 | Linear-by-Linear Association | 6.618 | 1 | .010 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | | N of Valid Cases | 333 | | | N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .20.

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .07.

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. | | Value | Approx. Sig. | | Value | Approx. Sig. | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|------|--------------------|--------------|------|-------|--------------------|------------|------|------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .233 | .000 | Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .259 | .001 | Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .159 | .037 |
| | Cramer's V | .233 | .000 | | Cramer's V | .183 | .001 | | Cramer's V | .159 | .037 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | | N of Valid Cases | 333 | | | N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

With a pearson chi square of 18.082, and phi of 0.233, question 1, *Are you business minded?*, is moderately correlated with year level of students. On the other hand, pearson chi square of 22.356, with phi of 0.259 means that the year level of students has a significant relationship with question 2: *Do you want to test your business skills in a hands on environment?* Whereas, the pearson chi square of 8.437 and phi of 0.159 means that year level of students and question 3, *If the gazebos will be converted to commercial stalls or kiosks, are you willing to engage in a business of your choice?*, are significantly related but with a low relationship.

4. Year level and question 4: *What kind of business are you going to put up?*
5. Year level and question 5: *How much are you willing to rent the kiosks on a monthly basis?*
6. Year level and question 6: *How long do you want to lease out?*

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 35.624 ^a | 9 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 28.478 | 9 | .001 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.902 | 1 | .015 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 8 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 17.115 ^a | 9 | .047 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 17.714 | 9 | .039 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.097 | 1 | .024 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 9 cells (56.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 16.063 ^a | 6 | .013 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 16.530 | 6 | .011 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.350 | 1 | .245 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .07.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Phi | .327 | .000 |
| Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V | .189 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Phi | .227 | .047 |
| Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V | .131 | .047 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Phi | .220 | .013 |
| Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V | .155 | .013 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

□

With a pearson chi square of 35.624 and phi coefficient of 0.327, year level and question 4: *What kind of business are you going to put up?* are significantly related, and with a moderate relationship as well. The year level of students and question 5: *How much are you willing to rent the kiosks on a monthly basis?* are also significantly related with a pearson chi square value of 17.115 and phi coefficient of 0.227, with a low relationship. On the other hand, year level of students and question 6: *How long do you want to lease out?* are significantly related with a pearson chi square value of 16.063 and phi coefficient of 0.220, also with a low relationship.

7. Year level and question 7: *Are you capable to devote time and resources in the entire duration of the business?*
8. Year level and question 8: *Are you willing to submit a proposal or study on the viability of the business for approval of SBCA management?*
9. Year level and question 9: *Are you willing to comply with the business requirements such as business permits, etc.?*



Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | Df | Asym p. Sig. (2- sided) |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------|----|----------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi- Square | 11.836 ^a | 6 | .066 |
| Likeliho od Ratio | 12.722 | 6 | .048 |
| Linear- by- Linear Associat ion | 8.634 | 1 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asym p. Sig. (2- sided) |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|----|----------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi- Square | 4.545 ^a | 6 | .603 |
| Likeliho od Ratio | 4.938 | 6 | .552 |
| Linear- by- Linear Associat ion | .048 | 1 | .827 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asym p. Sig. (2- sided) |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------|----|--------------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi- Square | 11.674 ^a | 6 | .070 |
| Likeliho od Ratio | 12.025 | 6 | .061 |
| Linear- by- Linear Associat ion | 7.485 | 1 | .006 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | | |

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Appro x. Sig. |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------------|
| Nominal Phi | .189 | .066 |
| by Nominal Cramer's V | .133 | .066 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Appro x. Sig. |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------------|
| Nominal Phi | .117 | .603 |
| by Nominal Cramer's V | .083 | .603 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Appro x. Sig. |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------------|
| Nominal Phi | .187 | .070 |
| by Nominal Cramer's V | .132 | .070 |
| N of Valid Cases | 333 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.



The year level of students and question 7: *Are you capable to devote your time and financial resources for the entire duration of the business?* is not significantly related with a pearson chi square of 11.836 and phi coefficient of 0.189. Meanwhile, the pearson chi square of 4.545 and phi coefficient of 0.117 means that year level of students and question 8, *Are you willing to submit a proposal for approval of SBCA management?* are not significantly related. This is also true for year level of students and question 9, *Are you willing to comply with business permits, etc.?* with a pearson chi square of 11.674 and phi coefficient of 0.187.

With 6 out of 9 acceptability indicators, with significant relationship to year level, the null hypothesis is rejected.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After presenting and analyzing the results, the following conclusion on the 9-item acceptability can be given:

1. The 9-item acceptability indicators for the proposed student enterprise center reveal positive results. The students approved the proposed student enterprise center based on their willingness to test their business skills into a hands-on learning environment. Majority of the students also agreed to convert the gazebos into stalls or kiosks to be managed by the students themselves.
2. Majority of the students would like to engage in the food business and are willing to rent between 15,000-20,000 per month, on a semestral basis.

3. Majority of the students are willing to devote their time and financial resources for the business, submit their business proposals and comply with business requirements.
4. The projected demand and supply of the proposed student enterprise center on a five year period shows high potential to succeed if it will push through.
5. There is a significant relationship between the year level of students and the following acceptability indicators: being business-minded, willing to engage in a hands-on learning environment, conversion of the gazebos to kiosks, the kind of business they are going to put up, the willingness to rent the kiosk and the amount of lease.
6. There must be a conscious and planned effort to shift towards an “entrepreneurial college” through a focused approach in facilitating and supporting entrepreneurial education through business spin-offs or start-up activities to further attract student enrollment and at the same time inculcating entrepreneurial mindsets to the students. There must be a transition to a focused approach that places importance to quality and long term impact towards innovative entrepreneurial education rather than over-reliance on quantitative or theoretical classroom performance.
7. Entrepreneurial development initiatives led by the BAE Department last 2012 through the Investor’s Fair wherein delegates and directors of PCCI (Philippine Chamber of Commerce) were invited not only for student mentoring but to also reinforce the interest of the industry to

the College. However, a more proactive approach is needed to encourage entrepreneurial incubation, start-up activities and possible seed funding through policy reforms towards a more business-oriented approach of entrepreneurial education combined with active and stronger industry partnerships.

REFERENCES

- Alberti, Sciascia F. S. et al. (2004). Entrepreneurship education: note on an ongoing debate. 14th annual IntEnt Conference, University of Napoli, Federico Italy.
- Bines, M. (2005). Entrepreneurship education and integrative learning at www.nege.org.uk/download/policy/entrepreneurship_education_and_integrative_learning.doc.
- Deakins, D., Glancey, K. et al. (2005). Enterprise education: The role of head teachers. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*.
- Fayole, A. and Degeorge, J.M. (2006). Attitudes, intentions and behavior: new approaches to evaluating entrepreneurship education. *International Entrepreneurship Education: issues and mission*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Franke, N. and Luthje, C. (2004). Entrepreneurship intentions of business: a benchmarking study at www2.wu_wien.ac.at/entrep/modules/updownload/store_folder
- Gatchalian, Maria Luisa B. (September, 2010). An in-depth analysis of the entrepreneurship education in the Philippines: an initiative toward the

development of a framework for a professional teaching competency program for entrepreneurship educators. Philippines: The International Journal of Research and Review, Vol. 5.

Hannon, P.D. (2005). The journey from student to entrepreneur: a review of the existing reward into graduate entrepreneurship. UK: National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship.

Keat, Cloi Yeng, Selvarajah, Christopher and Meyer, Deany (2009). Inclination towards entrepreneurship among university students: an empirical study of Malaysian University students. Malaysia: International Journal of Business and Social Science.

Lim, Yet Mee, Lee Lock Huan and Cheng, Boon-Liat (October, 2012). Entrepreneurial inclination among business students: a Malaysian study. Management Research Center, Indonesia: South East Asian Journal of Management, Vol. 6 No.2.

PohKam Wang (2011), Academic entrepreneurship in asia: The role and impact of universities in national innovation system. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Robinson, P. and Haynes, M. (1991). Entrepreneurship education in America's major universities. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Spring.

Venkatachalam, V.B. and Wagif, A.A. (2005). Outlook on integrating entrepreneurship in management education in India. Decision 32.

www.admu.edu.ph.

www.columbia.edu

www.manchester.ac.uk.