

Entrepreneurship Career Choice and its Influencing Factors Among the Graduates of Diploma in Fashion and Design from University of Padang, Indonesia

Ernawati, Nor Aishah Buang, AsmarYulastri, Ganefri

Abstract: *This paper discusses the reasons why graduates from the Fashion and Design Department, Faculty of Engineering, university of Padang Indonesia chose to become entrepreneurs. In addition, what are the influencing factors for that. A survey design was used. The total population of graduates from the department who graduated from the program in ten years duration were involved. They were only 218 of them. Findings show that the majority of those graduates were entrepreneurs followed by working at industries. From the percentage who were entrepreneurs, the main reason for choosing the career was to apply knowledge they had learned compared to those who work at industries was they thought that the skills they had learned is more suitable to be workers. On the other hand, parents was the most influencing factor for those who chose to become entrepreneurs as compared to those who work at industries was influenced by their own choice. These findings implied that lecturers and the curriculum of the program did not play much role in influencing those graduates to become entrepreneurs. Thus, much has to be done to redesign the curriculum and retraining the lecturers for this purpose.*

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship, career choice, graduates, influencing factors.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship career choice among the university students has always been the concern of many universities in the world. Studies had shown that less than 4% graduates from most of the universities in the world will become entrepreneurs after leaving the universities (Douglas and Sheperd, 2002). This percentage is true in most western countries rather than in Asia which is much less. For example, in Indonesia, less than 1% graduates will become entrepreneurs (Department of National Statistics, 2013). Some of the factors discussed by the researchers were internal factors such as personality, attitude and intention and external factors such as universities' education, parents and work experiences (Collins *et al* 2006; Nor Aishah 2006).

Among the university graduates who choose to become entrepreneurs, those from the diploma level program are still low in number of becoming entrepreneurs (Cheng & Chan 2004; Kamariah *et al.* 2004; Norshidah 2009) in most universities. Thus, attention need to be given to all levels of formal education from the primary schools to the university level (Brown 2000; Kent 1990; Rondstadt 1990). One of the reasons that contribute to this situation is the understanding of universities' planners and educators, that the main purpose of academic programs is to prepare students to be professionals in their areas who can work at industries when they leave (Asarudin&khairi 1995). In most ASEAN countries, for example in Indonesia, diploma programs are more for mediocre which influence the purpose of producing them more to become technicians and operators for industries (Alfian 2002). However, changed in awareness about encouraging all level of university graduates to become entrepreneurs had taken place since 2010 by the Ministry of Education, Indonesia (Muhaimin 2013). Since then, most higher education institutions in Indonesia have integrated entrepreneurship course in most of their diploma and degree programs.

As a background, Indonesia is still facing many problems with regard to her workforce development. According to Firdaus (2012), there were four main problems such as 1) limited number of jobs offered by industries, 2) low quality of higher education institutions' graduates which contributes to only 9.72% get employed, 3) rate of unemployment which is high such as 19.99% due to lack of skills which match with the industries' need and lastly 4) slow development of global industries in Indonesia. According to McClelland (1961), for a country to develop fast she must have at least 2% entrepreneurs from the total population. Indonesia has only 1.65% entrepreneurs from her total 253.61 million people which 0.8% aged below 40 years old. United of America has 12%, Singapore has 7.2%, South Korea has 4% and Malaysia has almost 3% (Ministry of Cooperatives and SME Indonesia, 2014). The government of Indonesia has taken a lot of measures to increase the number of youth entrepreneurs. One of them is through entrepreneurship education at all higher education institutions.

Revised Manuscript Received on May 28, 2019.

Ernawati, Universitas Negeri Padang

Nor Aishah Buang, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

AsmarYulastri, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

Ganefri, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia



In 2009, a national conference was organized involving almost all 83 state universities and 103 private universities to discuss the approach for accelerating the numbers of graduate entrepreneurs (Department of Higher Education Indonesia, 2009).

In 2013, about 7.4 million youth were unemployed. From this figure, 7.54% was among the diploma level graduates, 6.4% undergraduates and the rest from the high schools' leavers (Department of National Statistics, 2013). According to Siswoyo (2009), most universities' graduates tend to be job seekers rather than job creators. He claimed that this was due to universities' role which tend to prepare those graduates for applying jobs rather than for creating their own job. Ciputra (2008) added that universities tend to teach students to be knowledge sponge rather than how to use their professional knowledge to create or develop something. One of the ways to do this is by working together with industries for students to observe real world work life and gain industrial experiences (Chrisman & McMullan 2004; Greenback 2000). Employers look for individuals who are proactive, tend to solve problems creatively and responsible. Thus, Nor Aishah (2013) pointed entrepreneurship education can equip graduates with qualities that employers are looking for besides developing entrepreneurship attitudes and skills.

In 2009, a tracer study was conducted by the Department of Family Well-being (Fashion Design Unit) at the Faculty of Engineering Education, University of Padang throughout the four states (West Sumatera, North Sumatera, Riau and Jambi) on 30 industries which employed her diploma graduates. It was found that employers were below moderately satisfied with the department's diploma graduates at their workplace. For example, 80% of the employers stated that the skills of the diploma graduates were not up to their standards or expectations. Based on this finding, efforts had been taken by the department to look into the curriculum and its teaching and learning activities. A follow-up study done by Efendi (2010) found that only a few graduates from the same program were employed or become entrepreneurs which is much less than 1%. Other studies conducted in Malaysia also found that less than 3% percent university graduates become entrepreneurs (Nor Aishah 2013; Zolkafli et al. 2004; Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia 2010; Mohd Salleh 2002). Studies conducted by Abdul Aziz (2002), Ramli (2010), and Muhammad Iskandar Zulkarnain (2014) and Sarimah et al. (2011) found that many universities did not have a clear strategic plan and direction on how to encourage graduates to become entrepreneurs. This was due to lack of teaching experts in entrepreneurship education, infrastructure and capital. According to Nor Aishah (2013), one of the weaknesses of the universities' curriculum in Malaysia is lack of emphasis on the development of attitude, thinking and moral values. Norasmah (2009) added that university students were not equipped with enough fieldwork experiences to help develop their confidence in starting a small business.

II. LITERATURE REVIEWS

Studies have shown that there are two main factors that could influence students to become an entrepreneur. They are personal and environmental factors. In this article, environmental factors include entrepreneurship knowledge, parents and lecturers. According to Gosh et al. (1996), knowledge background can influence someone's decision to be entrepreneur. Many studies had been conducted to determine the relationship between knowledge and entrepreneurship. For example, Stokes and Wilson (2006) concluded that is no clear relationship between the two variables. However, Ashmore (1991), Wickham (1990), Mohd Salleh *et al.* (2005) and Nor Aishah (2006), knowledge contributes to the development of individual entrepreneurial behavior and development. Shane (2003) and Kartz (2007) pointed out that formal entrepreneurship education helps individual's ability to identify and grab business opportunity. They added that it also contributes to individual's ability to sustain their business start-ups. Henry *et al.* (2003) stressed that entrepreneurship education whether in the form of short course trainings or long-term courses learned at an institution contributes to the development of graduates' entrepreneurship career choice. Studies conducted by Owusu-Ansah (2004), Ede *et al.* (1986), Zaidatul Akmaliah et al. (2002), Raichauduri (2005), Collins et al. (2005) and Asmar Yulastri (2016) found that there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurship knowledge and entrepreneurship attitude and readiness.

Another significant contributor to entrepreneurship inclination is parents. Many studies had looked into this relationship such as Md Nor *et al.* (2004) found that there is a significant difference between those who become entrepreneurs and work with companies based on those whose fathers were self-employed. Parris (2002) and Hisrich *et al.* (2005) also found that parents' entrepreneurship background play an important role on graduates' inclination to choose entrepreneurship career. Mohd Salleh (1992) found that graduates whose both parents were entrepreneurs had more significant relationships to become entrepreneurs. This phenomenon is further supported by Koh (1996). Isteti (2010) and Asmar Yulastri (2016) however found that mothers had more influence on students at Padang Indonesia to become entrepreneurs compared to the fathers.

Other than knowledge and parents, lecturers also play some role in influencing graduates to become entrepreneurs. Since lecturers at universities are the main persons graduates meet at the universities, they can be their motivators during the teaching and learning processes in class. Colvin dan Schlosser (1998) pointed out that a graduate's success at universities to a certain extent depend on his or her relationship with the lecturers. Kauffman dan Burbach (1997); Noriah dan Nor Shakinah (2001) in their studies also found that lecturers contribute to students' success at universities by giving encouragement and motivations.



Kao (1995) in Mohammad Rezalet al. (2009) stressed on the importance of effective teaching and guidance by lecturers who teach the subject to influence graduates to like the subject and subsequently choose to entrepreneurship career. Kao (1995) in Mohammad Rezalet al. (2009). According to Lewis (2002), change in the entrepreneurship behavior can happen due to a lot of social interaction of a student both with his or her inside and outside classrooms. Thus, with lecturers' encouragement in the class or outside will contribute to the development of graduates' interest and motivation to choose entrepreneurship career. Even though its not easy to shape entrepreneurship thinking and attitude among the graduates, studies conducted by Kao (1995) in MohammadRezal et al. (2009) found that entrepreneurship education at universities to a certain extent can influence the graduates to like entrepreneurship career. Collins et al. (2004); Lewis (2002) and Nor Aishah (2006) agreed with Kao's findings in terms of the effectiveness of proper entrepreneurship curriculum will help to alleviate graduates' interests in entrepreneurship. Yap (2002) stated that entrepreneurship education can help to develop a student's potential to be creative and innovative, to be more alert of opportunities in their surroundings and able to translate them into business ideas and plan to realize them.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are:

1. To determine the types of jobs taken by the Diploma in Fashion and Design graduates after finished their study.
2. To determine the reasons for choosing entrepreneurship job among the Diploma in Fashion and Design graduates.
3. To determine the reasons for choosing to work in industries among the Diploma in Fashion and Design graduates.
4. To determine factors influencing the Diploma in Fashion and Design graduates who choose to be entrepreneurs and who choose to work in industries.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The main design of this study was evaluation design. The original work of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Diploma in Fashion and Design program from the Faculty of Engineering, University of Padang, Indonesia on entrepreneurship career choice among the graduates. For the purpose of this article, the writers selected some tables in order to focus on how many graduates become entrepreneurs, work in industries, why did they choose those careers and finally what are the influencing factors for their career choice. Data was collected using a questionnaire which was developed by the researchers based on literature reviews. A few pilot studies were conducted to ensure the reliability and validity of the items and its constructs. The final overall Alpha Cronbach value for all items was more than 0.8. The population of this study was those who graduated between the years 2001 to 2010. The total number of graduates between these years is only 241 because each year the number of graduates was not more than 30 students.

All of them were contacted manually through telephone calls and personal visits since the faculty still keep their addresses and contact numbers.

V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the percentage of respondents according to jobs they were holding when surveyed. From the total of 218, majority of them were entrepreneurs (38.0%), followed by 22.5% of them worked at industries or companies, 11.5% were teachers, 4.6% doing a variety of jobs and finally 23.4% were still unemployed. Based on this result, a good indicator is many of them were entrepreneurs.

Table. 1 Distribution of respondents based on jobs

Types of Jobs	Frequency	Percentage
Entrepreneur	83	38.0
Industry workers	49	22.5
Teacher	25	11.5
Miscellaneous	10	4.6
Not employed	51	23.4
Total	218	100.0

With reference to Table 2, based on the number of graduates who were entrepreneurs in Table 1, 15 of them (20.3%) choose to be entrepreneurs because they wanted to apply the knowledge they had learned during their study. Twelve of them (16.2%) said because they need to earn income. Subsequently, another 12 of them (16.2%) said the skills they learned is suitable to for doing entrepreneurship job. Eleven of them (14.9%) said they wanted to create their own jobs followed by 8 of them said they want a sense of freedom to manage their own life. The rest which is less than 4 persons each said they wanted to continue their parents' businesses, willing to take risk, interest in the career, not sure why and lastly to gain experience in the job. Since the majority gave the reasons of wanting to apply knowledge, it implies that the entrepreneurship education in their study program is quite effective.

Table. 2 Percentage of reasons for choosing to be entrepreneur

No	Reasons	Frequency	%
1	Apply knowledge	15	20.3
2	To earn money	12	16.2
3	Suitable with the skills learned	12	16.2
4	To create own job	11	14.9
5	Can manage own life	8	10.8
6	Willing to take risk	4	5.4
7	Continue parents' business	4	5.4
8	Not sure why	3	4.1
9	Interest	2	2.7
11	To seek experience	1	1.4
Total		74	100.0



With reference to Table 3, based on the number of graduates who choose to work in industries, majority of them which is 28.6% (14) believed that the skills they learned from the Diploma program was more suitable to work with industries. Ten of them (20.4%) gave the reasons “to seek experience” at industries. Nine of them (18.4%) gave the reason “to earn money”, followed by 4 of them to “apply knowledge” and the rest which was less than 3 persons each gave the reasons such as “to try work life”, “no risk”, “interest”, “live nearby the industries”, “grab the opportunity” and lastly “follow parents’ footsteps”. Majority of them have the perception that the Fashion and Design skills they learned are more suitable to work at industries.

Table. 3 Percentage of reasons for choosing to work in industries

No	Reasons	Frequency	%
1	Suitable with the skills learned	14	28.6
2	To seek experience	10	20.4
3	To earn money	9	18.4
4	To apply knowledge	4	8.2
5	To try worklife	3	6.1
6	No risk	3	6.1
7	Interest	2	4.1
8	Live nearby industries	2	4.1
9	Grab opportunity	1	2.0
10	Follow parents’ footsteps	1	2.0
Total		49	100.0

With reference to Table 4, the main factor that encouraged them to work in industries is “own choice”. For example, there was 69.4% (34) of them from the total number surveyed. The second most influencing factor is their parents (24.5%). The rest which is less than 2 persons said their lecturers and friends influenced them.

Table. 4 Percentage of graduates based on influencing factors to work in industries

No	Influencing Factors	Frequency	%
1	Own choice	34	69.4
2	Parents	12	24.5
3	Lecturers	2	4.1
4	Friends	1	2.0
Total		49	100.0

With reference to Table 5, the main influencing factor is parents. For example, 44.6% (33) of the graduates who were entrepreneurs agreed that their parents influenced them to become entrepreneurs. This is followed by “own choice” which is 40.5% (30) of them. The third most influencing factor is from their lecturers which is not much such only 9.5% (7) of them. The rest is followed by less than 2% for each factor such as friends, both parents and friends, both friends and lecturers and lastly lecturers, friends and parents. It is interesting to find out that parents play most important role in influencing the graduates to become entrepreneurs.

Table. 5 Percentage of graduates based on influencing factors to be entrepreneurs

No	Influencing factors	Frequency	%
1	Parents	33	44.6
2	Own choice	30	40.5
3	Lecturers	7	9.5
4	Friends	1	1.4
5	Both parents and lecturers	1	1.4
6	Both friends and lecturers	1	1.4
7	All three-lecturers, parents and friends	1	1.4
Total		74	100.0

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, surprisingly most of the graduates of the Fashion and Design Department from the Faculty of Engineering were working as entrepreneurs compared to working at industries. However, the main influencing factor they chose to become entrepreneurs was their parents rather than knowledge or experience they gained from learning at the department. For example, less than ten percent was due to the lecturers’ encouragements. In comparing with Norashidah’s(2009) study, she found that lecturers do play some significant role in influencing graduates to become entrepreneurs such as more than 14%. This implies that, the Fashion and Design Department’s program for entrepreneurship education need to be improved in terms of lecturers’ role. In terms of the curriculum, to a certain extent it was quite effective because the top reason for choosing to be entrepreneurs among those graduates was to apply knowledge they had learned even though it was not more than twenty percent. Another interesting factor for influencing those graduates to become entrepreneurs were “their own choice”. This implies the graduates’ own internal factor that could interest, motivation and personality. A lot of studies have agreed that these three factors are the main internal factors that encourage a person to become entrepreneurs. When comparing the influencing factor for both who work at industries and who chose to become entrepreneurs, it is interesting to see when it comes to chose to become entrepreneurs, it took their parents to do so as compared to “own choice” when comes to those who work at industries. This implies that to become entrepreneurs, since human surrounding factor is very important, lecturers can play the same role as the parents. In the past, most parents prefer their children to have a stable job and not taking entrepreneurship which is riskier. In conclusion, the tendency for graduates from the Fashion and Design Department to choose entrepreneurship career is high and improving the program from all aspects such as the curriculum and the lecturers is crucial.



REFERENCES

1. Ab Aziz Yusuf & Zakaria Yusof. 2004. *Prinsip Keusahawanan*. Kuala Lumpur: Prentice-Hall
2. Alfian Lains. 2002. *Peranan Perguruan Tinggi Dalam Pembangunan Pendidikan Di Daerah Dalam Kerangka Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Kertas Kerja dalam rangka seminar International, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Universitas Negeri Padang.
3. Asarudin Hj. Ashari & Khairi Izwan Abdullah. 1995. Higher education for all: Meeting the challenges of vision 2020. *Proceedings of The Annual ASAIHL Seminar on Higher Education for all*, hlm.66-78.
4. Asmar Yulastri. 2015. Pengaruh kecenderungan personaliti kerjaya, tahap pengetahuan dan aspirasi kerjaya terhadap minat kerjaya keusahawanan pelajar sekolah Menengah vokasional (SMV) Sumatera Barat; tesis Dr. Falsafah Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Bangi
5. Badan Pusat Statistik. 2013. Data strategi BPS. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik
6. Brown, C. 2000. Entrepreneurial education teaching guide. *CELCEE Digest*(00-7): 8.
7. Cheng, Ming Yu & Chan, Cheryl 2004. Entrepreneurship education in Malaysia. Kertas Kerja 49th ICSB World Conference, Johannesburg, South Africa.
8. Chrisman, J.J. & McMullan, W.E. 2004. Outsider assistance as a knowledge resource for new ventures survival. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 42(3):229-245.
9. Ciputra. 2008. *Bagaimana Entrepreneurship Dapat Mengubah Masa Depan Anda dan Masa Depan Bangsa*. Jakarta; PT Alex Media Kumpotindo.
10. Ciputra. 2008. *Quqntum Leap, Bagaimana Entrepreneurship Dapat Mengubah Masa Depan Anda dan Masa Depan Bangsa*. Jakarta; PT Gramedia.
11. Collins, L., Hannon, P.D., & Smith, A. 2004. Enacting entrepreneurial intent: The gap between students needs and higher education capabilities. *Education+Training* 46 (8/9): 454-463
12. Colvin, C. & Schlosser, L.K. 1998. Developing academic confidence to build literacy: what teachers can do. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 41(4): 272-281.
13. Douglas, E. J. dan Shepherd, D. A. 2002. Self-Employment as a Career Choice: Attitudes, Entrepreneurial Intentions, and Utility Maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25. Hlm. 81 – 90.
14. Isteti Murni. 2012. Pemikiran dan tingkah laku keusahawanan dalam mengenal peluang perniagaan dalam 413 alingan pelajar IPT di Padang Sumatera Barat Indonesia. Tesis Dr. Fal, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
15. Ghosh, B. C., Teo Sock Kim, & Low Aik Meng. 1996. Factors contributing to the success of small and medium enterprises in Singapore. Dlm. Low Aik Meng & Tan Wee Liang (pnyt.). *Entrepreneurs, entrepreneurship and enterprising culture* (hlm. 30-46). Singapore: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
16. Greenback, P. 2000. Undergraduate work experience: An alternative approach using micro business. *Education & Training*. 44(6): 261-271.
17. Henry, C., Hill, F. & Leitch, C. 2003. *Entrepreneurship Education and Training*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
18. Hisrich, R. D., Peters, M.P. & Shepherd, D.A.S. 2005. *Entrepreneurship*. Ed. Ke-6. New York: McGraw-Hill Education Asia.
19. Hisrich, R.D., Peters, M. P. & Shepherd, D.A. 2008. *Entrepreneurship: A Process Perspective*. Edisi Ke-6. New York: McGraw-Hill.
20. Kamariah Othman, Yacobanas & Wan Jamaliah Wan Jusoh. 2004. A study of entrepreneurial intention among young Malaysia: A case of Universiti Tenaga Nasional (UNITEN) student. *Proceedings of the Third International Convrence on SMEs in a Global Economy*, hlm.531-542.
21. Kao, J.J. 1995. *The entrepreneur*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
22. Katz, J. A. 2007. Education and training in entrepreneurship. Dlm. J. R. Baum, M. Frese & R. A. Baron (pnyt.). *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship* (hlm. 189-208). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. Publishers.
23. Kauffman, J.M. & Burbach, H.J. 1997. On Creating a Climate of classroom activity. *Phi Delta Kappan*. December: 320-325.
24. Kementerian Kewangan. 2009. *Pekeliling Perbendaharaan Bil. 2 Tahun 2009*. Garis Panduan Bagi Penyediaan Cadangan Perbelanjaan Tahun 2010 dan 2011.
25. Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi Malaysia. 2005. *Kod Amalan Kualiti Institusi Pengajian Awam Malaysia*.
26. Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi. 2010. *Dasar Pembangunan Keusahawanan Institusi Pengajian Tinggi*. Putrajaya.
27. Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional. 2002. *Pedoman pelaksanaan program keterampilan hidup (life skills) oleh perguruan tinggi*. Jakarta: Direktorat Pendidikan Masyarakat. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah.
28. Kent, C.A. 1990. Entrepreneurship education at the collegiate level: a synopsis and evaluation. Dlm. Kent, C.A. (pnyt.). *Entrepreneurship Education: Current Development, Future Direction*, hlm. 111-122. Westport, CT: Quorum.
29. Koh, H. C. 1996. Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristic: A study of Hong Kong MBA. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 11(2): 12-21.
30. Lewis, K. 2002. An Enterprising Future: Evaluating the Young Enterprise Scheme. *Laporan disediakan untuk the Enterprise New Zealand Trust*. http://www.smecentre.massey.ac.nz/research/YES_evaluation_final_Report.pdf. [2.6.2005]
31. Malik, Fadjar. 2003. *Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*, Jakarta Indonesia.
32. Mawardi Efendi. 2010. *Buku pedoman akademik Universitas Negeri Padang*.
33. McClelland, David C. 1961. *The Achieving Society*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co Inc.
34. Md Nor Othman, Ezlika Ghazali, & Ong Chee Cheng. 2004. Demographics and personal characteristics of urban Malaysian entrepreneurs: An ethnic comparison. *Third International Conference on SMEs in a Global Economy*, hlm. 509-529.
35. Mohd Salleh Din. 2002. *Laporan Akhir Kajian Pengesanan Siswazah Universiti Utara Malaysia*, Sintok Sintok: Universiti Utara Malaysia.
36. Mohd. Salleh Din. 2002b. *Pembangunan Keusahawanan: Cabaran kepada pendidikan tinggi*. Siri Syarahan Pengukuhan Profesor. Sintok: Penerbit Universiti Utara Malaysia.
37. Mohd. Salleh Din. 2005. *Pembangunan usahawan: Cabaran kepada pendidikan tinggi: siri syarahan pengukuhan professor*. Sintok: penerbit UUM.
38. Mohammad Rezal Hamzah, Ku Amir Ku Daud, Narimah Ismail, Norizah Ahmad & Norshahrizan Nordin. 2009. Tahap pengetahuan dan minat pelajar Universiti Malaysia Perlis terhadap Bidang Keusahawanan: satu tinjauan ke arah Pembentukan Teknousahawan University Malaysia Perlis. *Prosiding seminar Kebangsaan Pembangunan Keusahawanan 2009*, 8-9 Disember 2009
39. Muhaimin & Ilham Tirta. 2013. Ribuan pencari kerja padati Universiti Indonesia Career 2013. <http://www.tempo.co/read/news/20November2013>
40. Muhammad Iskandar Zulkarnain Muhammad Suhaimi. 2014. *Sejarah Perkembangan Program Siswaniaga Universiti Utara Malaysia*.
41. Naimah Binti Mohd. Khalil. 2008. *Penilaian Keberkesanan Program Latihan sangkutan Ke Industri Pensyarah Politeknik*. Tesis. Doktor falsafah. Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.
42. Nor Aishah. 2006. *Prinsip-prinsip keusahawanan, konsep, teori dan model-model pembentukan usahawan*. Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
43. Nor Aishah. 2010. *Pendidikan Keusahawanan, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia 43600 Bangi Selangor Darul Ehsan*.
44. Nor Aishah. 2010. *Pengembangan Kurikulum Mata Kursus Keusahawanan, Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*.
45. Nor Aishah Buang. 2002. *Asas Keusahawanan*. Shah Alam: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn Bhd.
46. Nor Aishah Buang. 2013. *Pendidikan Keusahawanan*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
47. Norashidah Hashim. 2009. *Kesediaan pelajar dan persekitaran dalam institusi pengajian tinggi awam terhadap pendidikan keusahawanan*. Draf Tesis PhD. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.

Entrepreneurship Career Choice and its Influencing Factors Among the Graduates of Diploma in Fashion and Design from University of Padang, Indonesia

48. Norasmah Othman, Halimah Harun, Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie & Nor Aishah Buang. 2006. Pembentukan indeks tingkah laku keusahawanan golongan remaja Malaysia. Laporan akhir Projek IRPA No. 07-02-02-0036 EA279.
49. Norasmah Othman. 2002. Keberkesanan Program Keusahawanan Remaja di Sekolah Menengah Tesis Dr. Fal. Universiti Putra Malaysia.
50. Norasmah Othman, Azziyyati Anuar & Muhammad Husin. 2009. Kekangan dalam menjalankan perniagaan dalam kalangan pelajar di Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. *Jurnal Personal Pelajar* 12(6): 87-107.
51. Noriah Mohd Ishak & Nor shakinah Mohamed. 2001. Gya pertautan, gaya pengajaran dan komitmen teerhadap profesion perguruan di kalangan guru-guru pelatih. Kertaskerja International Conference on Challenges and Prospects in Teacher education. Concorde Hotel, Shah Alam, 16-17 Julai.
52. Owusu-Ansah, W. A. 2004. The Impact of entrepreneurship education on career intencion and aspiration of tertiary students in Ghana. *Proceedings of 49th World Conference of Internasional Council for Small Business*.
53. Ramli Hasan. 2010. Entrepreneurship Education in Malaysian Higher Institutions. Kertas kerja Seminar Entrepreneurship and Societal Development in ASEAN (ISE-SODA2010): Achieving Regional Growth through Entrepreneurship Education. Anjuran Institut Pembangunan Keusahawanan dan Koperasi dan Kementrian Pengajian Tinggi. Langkawi, 27 Februari-1 Mac 2010.
54. Dlm. C. A. Kent (pnyt). *Entrepreneurship Education: Current development,Future Direction*,hlm. 69-88. New York: Quorums Books.
55. Sarimah Che Hassan, Armanurah Mohamad & Hariyaty Ab Wahid. 2011. Pendidikan Keusahawanan Pemangkin Berpaduan Dalam Kalangan Mahasiswa. Prosiding Persidangan Kebangsaan Berpaduan Nasional. 14-15 Disember.
56. Shane, S.A. 2003. *A generaltheory of entrepreneurship:The individual-opportunitynexus*. Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
57. Stokes, D. & Wilson, N. 2006. *Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship*. Ed. ke-5. London: Thomson Learning.
58. Siswoyo, B.B. 2009. Keusahawanan dalam Kajian Dunia Akademik. Fakulti Ekonomi Universiti Malang.
59. Siswoyo, B.B. et. al. 2009. PenyusunanStrategiKebijakanEfektivitasPemanfaatan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). KerjasamaBappedaProvinsiJawa Timur dan Lembaga PenelitianUniversitas Negeri Malang.
60. Wickham, P.A. 2004. *Strategic Entrepreneurship*. Edisi Ke-3. Essexs: Pearson Education Limited.
61. Yap Poh Moi. 2002. Kesedian guru-guru perdaganganterhadapnpengajaransubjekpengajiankeusahawanan. Tesis Sarjana. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
62. Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie, Mohd. Majid Konting,Ab. Rahim Bakar & Genevieve KlangAngking. 2007. Entrepreneurial aspirations of secondary school students enrolled in vocation and technical subjects. Laporanprojekpenyelidikan IRPA. 07-02-04-0030.
63. Zolkaffli Hussin, Mohd Salleh Din, Abdul Malek Karim, Hajah Mustafa Mohd Hanafeah, Abdul Razak Saleh, Mahmood Nazar Muhamed & Abdul Razak Chik. 2004. 28-29 Jun. Graduate employment as a challenge to higher education: The case of University Utara Malaysia. *Proceedings International Conference on Management Education*, hal 712-71