Contents lists available at Science-Gate

International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences

Journal homepage: http://www.science-gate.com/IJAAS.html

Effect of the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program on the technological innovation capacity of the students at the Universidad Nacional de Cañete

Segundo Ríos-Ríos *, Filiberto Ochoa-Paredes, Yrene Uribe-Hernández, Hugo Moran-Requena, Daysi Pacheco-Sánchez

Economics Faculty, Universidad Nacional de Cañete, San Vicente de Cañete, Peru

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 26 May 2022
Received in revised form
17 August 2022
Accepted 27 September 2022

Keywords:
Entrepreneurship
Technological innovation
University students
Innovation capacity
Entrepreneurial teachers

ABSTRACT

It is proposed to demonstrate that the millennial 2.0 program significantly influences the technological innovation of the students of the Universidad Nacional de Cañete. It is evidenced that the lack of technical training in the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program prevents students from raising awareness, while the application of a test highly motivates the students of the same program, demonstrating that the training significantly influences the program. MSEs that apply strategic planning improve their financial management and have greater control of their resources and an acceptable development in the market where they operate. Technological innovation and constant training in the millennial 2.0 program produce a greater acceptance of the innovation that is given to students and future professionals in such a way that a greater adaptation in technology and student innovation is achieved in universities, this program is directly proportional to technological innovation because the more training on this program, the greater will be their acceptance and motivation to accept the new changes. The present study has a quantitative approach, for this, the survey technique was used and the virtual multifactorial questionnaire was used as an instrument, carried out on 120 students from the university of Cañete of the school of administration, accounting and administration of tourism and hospitality, which consist of four dimensions for each variable. It was obtained from this research article that in millennial entrepreneurship 2.0 the training helped to raise awareness among the students of the University of Cañete by 70% under the positive effect of the millennial 2.0 program, resulting in an increase of 27.5 % above the average acceptance level, in terms of university technological innovation, the interest of students rises up to 75.0% while the impact on teachers reaches 72.5% after receiving technological innovation training.

© 2022 The Authors. Published by IASE. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Technological innovation is the adoption of new technologies, cultural mergers, and the forefront of the current world situation (Marks and Mirvis, 2011; Rothwell, 1992). This has led consumers around the world to change their tastes and preferences based on a product, always looking for what is innovative and current that is required, and more when this is united with the age groups where the youngest is always looking for recent technological innovations.

That is why organizations introduce technological innovations and plans that modify their existing products and elements in order to improve them and be more attractive to the consumer, in many cases they are minor changes to the product, but in other cases, the change is total due to the fact that the present and globalization demand it (Ünver et al., 2018; Barrios and Ulises, 2020).

The lack of innovation is considered one of the main productivity problems for 8 out of 10 organizations, adding to it a lack of management and investment or inadequate human resources, this means that they do not improve their processes and do not apply technological innovation for the matter economic (Navarro Montalvan, 2021). In addition, personnel must be included in the personnel that should be trained to carry out specific tasks or the old and obsolete production mechanisms, in many cases they are not updated because the work they

* Corresponding Author.
Email Address: srios@undc.edu.pe (S. Ríos-Ríos)
https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2023.01.012
Corresponding author's ORCID profile:
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1202-5523
2313-626X/© 2022 The Authors. Published by IASE.
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

carry is monotonous, thus generating dependency and In many cases stagnation of the organization, this is also because the organization does not carry out strategic planning that guides the objectives of the organization and I think of innovation at the forefront of today; The main problems obtained with this is that productivity is reduced and costs increase and, ultimately, it generates a loss in profit (Cantú Munguía et al., 2019).

Entrepreneurship is the action of starting a process that encompasses the functions, tasks, and activities associated with obtaining opportunities and referring to the strategic creation of an organization. Every organization should have an entrepreneurship program so that workers have that vision and understand the objective of new horizons and new needs that the consumer requires due to globalization and current changes (Carrera and Mariano, 2018). When the enterprise is anchored with a need whether it is technological, it must include among the new technological implements worldwide and also the training of workers due to the new processes that will be carried out and thus increase productivity or improve the service provided (López et al., 2018; Arias, 2021). Cases have been analyzed where many workers think that entrepreneurship is creative destruction because it does not match the old ideals of the company, which is why in many cases organizations are not updated Due to the fear of losing customers or wasting the investment of processes that will not improve the product or service, this is why the importance of a good entrepreneurial plan in technological innovation, weighing all the variables mentioned above (Camino and Aguilar, 2017; Gómez Zuluaga, 2019). The author indicates that the promotion of entrepreneurship is a topic of global importance due to its implications in the increase of employment, in addition to the economic growth of the countries, to which the training and reinforcement of the workers of the organizations are also attributed. Therefore, the author proposes to provide an overview of the dynamics of entrepreneurship in Ecuador with respect to technological innovation. He did it using a descriptive exploratory analysis of the implications of entrepreneurship in the behavior of the economy, to then review the indicators of this for Ecuador and its main characteristics, and finally determine the scope of public policy in the spread of entrepreneurship in the country and their visions of technological innovation that the development of this implies (García, 2015). Obtaining results that the venture capital market that entrepreneurs require to promote their projects is not so mature in Ecuador because there is still no resistance from the private sector, that is why year after year, it is. It has been rewarding and increasing the number of technological innovation projects that revolutionize products and the consumer's perspective. The author concludes that entrepreneurship is the key to economic growth, in addition to referring to its importance in world growth and within Latin America that is why many countries have implemented various reforms to attract investors and motivate strategic sectors of their economies and also young students (Zamora-Boza, 2018).

The main problem is how the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program influences the technological innovation capacity of the students of the National University of Cañete, in the period 2019. Thus having secondary problems in the first place: How the institutional operational capacity influences the information and knowledge management of the students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019? Secondly: To what extent does the inter-institutional relationship influence the management of the human capital of the students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019? Third: How does university educational technology influence the ability to relate to the innovation ecosystem in students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019? Finally, in fourth place: How do entrepreneurial teachers influence the creativity and innovation techniques of the students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019?

The main objective was to demonstrate whether the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program influences the technological innovation capacity of the students of the National University of Cañete, in the 2019 period. The secondary objectives were, first of all, to determine how the institutional operational capacity influences the management of information and knowledge of the students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019. Second, to know to what extent the inter-institutional relationship influences the management of the human capital of the students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019. Third, to identify how university educational technology influences the ability to relate to the innovation ecosystem in students at the National University of Cañete, period 2019. Finally, fourth, it sought to determine how entrepreneurial teachers influence the techniques of creativity and innovation of the students of the National University of Cañete, period 2019.

The millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program with the aim of increasing the level of technological innovation capacity was structured based on the innovation studies of international authors, from these authors the innovation capacities that were incorporated into the program were selected, such as R&D capacity, innovation-oriented strategic planning capacity, marketing capacity, resource management capacity, organizational learning capacity and a transversal capacity that is the information and knowledge management capacity, the which sought from the technological aspect to achieve the accumulation of knowledge in a research group.

2. Methodology

2.1. Study approach and design

The study has been given from a quantitative approach because it allows the collection of

information and data analysis that in turn evaluates the established hypotheses.

2.2. Study population and sample

The population is made up of 1707 students from the Universidad Nacional de Cañete. Of which the corresponding non-probabilistic sampling was made, where part of the population does not depend on the probability but in relation to the particularity of the population, reaching a sample of 120 students, from the administration, accounting, tourism administration schools, and hospitality.

2.3. Data collection technique and instrument

In the study, the data collection technique that was carried out was the survey. Regarding the data collection instrument, the Multifactorial Questionnaire of the millennial Program 2.0 and the Student's Capacity for Technological Innovation was used.

The multifactorial questionnaire of the millennial program 2.0 of which it consists of 4 dimensions (Institutional Operational Capacity, Inter-institutional Relationship, University Educational Technology, and Entrepreneurial Teachers) that include 11 items distributed in the dimensions. Regarding the Questionnaire on the Student's Technological Innovation Capacity, it consists of 4 dimensions (Information and Knowledge Management, Human Capital Management, and Relationship with the Innovation Ecosystem), comprising 13 items distributed in the dimensions.

2.4. Place and application of the instrument

The virtual survey was carried out to determine the effect of the millennial 2.0 multifactorial program on the level of the technological innovation capacity of the students of the Universidad Nacional de Cañete.

To start the data collection process, it was coordinated with the students of said University to be voluntary participants in the research work, although there were certain limitations since not all students were willing to participate in the research work, for reasons of time or they were in the presence of virtual classes and finally that they had little availability in Internet access.

3. Results

The results of the millennial entrepreneurship program 2.0 variable are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program variable in the pretest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
	f	**%**	**Difference%**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	3	5.4%	2.9%	1	2.5%
Basically innovative	26	46.4%	-8.6%	22	55.0%
Highly innovative	27	48.2%	5.7%	17	42.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

Table 1 shows the results of the pretest. In the control group, 48.2% of the students consider that the variable, millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program is highly innovative, 46.4% is basically innovative and 5.4% is innovative. In the experimental group, 55.0% of the students consider that the variable, millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program is basically innovative, 42.5% highly innovative, and 2.5% to innovate.

It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effectiveness of the millennial 2.0 program.

The post-test results are shown in Table 2. In the control group, 44.6% of the students consider that the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program variable is highly innovative, 50.0% is basically innovative and 5.4% is innovative. In the experimental group, 70.0% of the students consider that the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program variable is highly innovative, 30.0% basically innovative and 0.0% innovative.

Table 2: Results of the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program variable in the posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
	f	**%**	**Difference %**		**f**
For innovating	3	5.4%	5.4%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	28	50.0%	20.0%	12	30.0%
Highly innovative	25	44.6%	-25.4%	28	70.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

When comparing the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group, a significant advance from 42.5% to 70% is evidenced at the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped raise awareness of the effect of the millennial 2.0 program.

For variable 1, the millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program, four dimensions have been considered, these are Institutional operational capacity, Inter-institutional relationship, University educational technology, and Entrepreneurial teachers.

In Table 3 we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 25.0% of the students consider that the institutional operational capacity dimension is highly innovative, 55.4% is basically innovative and 19.6% is innovative. In the experimental group,

40.0% of the students consider that the dimension, institutional operational capacity, is basically innovative, 27.5% highly innovative, and 32.5% to be innovative.

Table 3: Institutional operational capacity according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
			Pre-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	11	19.6%	-12.9%	13	32.5%
Basically innovative	31	55.4%	15.4%	16	40.0%
Highly innovative	14	25.0%	-2.5%	11	27.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
			Post-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	11	19.6%	-9.6%	4	10.0%
Basically innovative	38	67.9%	10.4%	23	57.5%
Highly innovative	7	12.5%	-20.0%	13	32.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effectiveness of the institutional operational capacity.

We appreciate in the post-test results, that in the control group 12.5% of the students consider that the institutional operational capacity dimension is highly innovative, 67.9% is basically innovative and 19.6% to innovate. In the experimental group, 32.5% of the students consider that the institutional operational capacity dimension is highly innovative, 57.5% basically innovative and 10.0% innovative.

When comparing the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group, a significant advance from 27.5% to 32.5% is evidenced at the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped raise awareness of the effect of institutional operational capacity.

In Table 4 we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 35.7% of the students consider that the inter-institutional relationship dimension is highly innovative, 37.5% is basically innovative and 26.8% is innovative. In the experimental group, 50.0% of the students consider that the inter-institutional relationship dimension is basically innovative, 30.0% highly innovative and 20.0% innovative. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effectiveness of the inter-institutional relationship.

We appreciate in the post-test results that in the control group 32.1% of the students consider that the inter-institutional relationship dimension is highly innovative, 37.5% is basically innovative and 30.4% is innovative. In the experimental group, 57.5% of the students consider that the interinstitutional relationship dimension is highly innovative, 37.5% basically innovative and 5.0% innovative.

We can observe the results when comparing the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group, a significant advance from 30.0% to 57.5% is evidenced in the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped to raise awareness of the effect of inter-institutional relationship.

Table 4: Inter-institutional relationship according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
			Pre-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	15	26.8%	6.8%	8	20.0%
Basically innovative	21	37.5%	-12.5%	20	50.0%
Highly innovative	20	35.7%	5.7%	12	30.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
			Post-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	17	30.4%	25.4%	2	5.0%
Basically innovative	21	37.5%	0%	15	37.5%
Highly innovative	18	32.1%	-25.4%	23	57.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

In Table 5 we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group it was 64.3% of the students consider that the university educational technology dimension is highly innovative, 33.9% is basically innovative and 1.8% is innovative. In the experimental group, 42.5% of the students consider that the university educational technology dimension is basically innovative, 57.5% highly innovative and 0.0% innovative. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of training to improve the effect of university educational technology. We observe in the post-test results that in the control group 67.9% of the students consider that the inter-institutional relationship dimension is highly innovative, 30.4% is basically innovative and 1.8% is innovative. In the experimental group, 75.0% of the students consider that the university educational technology dimension is highly innovative, 25.0% basically innovative and 0.0% innovative.

Table 5: University educational technology according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
			Pre-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	1	1.8%	1.8%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	19	33.9%	-8.6%	17	42.5%
Highly innovative	36	64.3%	6.8%	23	57.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
			Post-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	1	1.8%	1.8%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	17	30.4%	5.4%	10	25.0%
Highly innovative	38	67.9%	-7.1%	30	75.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

When comparing the pretest and posttest of the experimental group, a significant advance from 57.5% to 75.0% is evidenced in the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped to raise awareness of the effect of university educational technology. In Table 6, we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 58.9% of the students consider that the Entrepreneurial Teachers dimension is highly innovative, 39.3% is basically innovative and 1.8% is innovative. In the experimental group, 30.0% of the students consider the Entrepreneurial Teachers dimension to be basically innovative, 67.5% highly innovative, and 2.5% to innovate.

Table 6: Entrepreneurial teachers according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
			Pre-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	1	1.8%	-0.7%	1	2.5%
Basically innovative	22	39.3%	9.3%	12	30.0%
Highly innovative	33	58.9%	-8.6%	27	67.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
			Post-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	1	1.8%	1.8%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	24	42.9%	15.4%	11	27.5%
Highly innovative	31	55.4%	-17.1%	29	72.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effect of entrepreneurial teachers

We appreciate that, in the post-test within the control group, 55.4% of the students consider the Entrepreneurial Teachers dimension to be highly innovative, 42.9% to be basically innovative and 1.8% to be innovative. In the experimental group, 72.5% of the students consider that the Entrepreneurial Teachers dimension is highly innovative, 27.5% basically innovative and 0.0% innovative.

When comparing the group's pre-test and post-test, a significant advance from 67.5% to 72.5% is evidenced in the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped raise awareness of the effect of entrepreneurial teachers.

Results of the variable Capacity for technological innovation of the student are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Technological innovation capacity of the student according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
			Pre-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	0	0.0%	-2.5%	1	2.5%
Basically innovative	13	23.2%	3.2%	8	20.0%
Highly innovative	43	76.8%	-0.7%	31	77.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
			Post-test		
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	1	1.8%	1.8%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	10	17.9%	-4.6%	9	22.5%
Highly innovative	45	80.4%	2.9%	31	77.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

In Table 7, we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 76.8% of the students consider that the variable, the student's technological innovation capacity is highly innovative, 23.2% is basically innovative and 0.0% for innovating. In the experimental group, 20.0% of the students consider that the variable, the student's technological innovation capacity, is basically innovative, 77.5% highly innovative, and 2.5% for innovation. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effectiveness of the student's technological innovation capacity.

We appreciate that, in the post-test within the control group, 80.4% of the students consider that the variable capacity for technological innovation of the student is highly innovative, 17.9% is basically innovative and 1.8% is innovative. In the experimental group, 77.5% of the students consider that the variable, the student's technological innovation capacity, is highly innovative, 22.5% basically innovative, and 0.0% for innovation.

When comparing the group's pretest and posttest, equality of 77.5% in the highly innovative level is evidenced in the experimental group in the effect of the student's technological innovation capacity program.

In Table 8, we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 41.1% of the students consider that the information and knowledge management dimension is highly innovative, 44.6% is basically innovative and 14.3% is innovative. In the experimental group, 40.0% of the students consider the information and knowledge management dimension to be basically innovative, 50.0% highly innovative, and 10.0% to innovate. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effect of information and knowledge management.

Table 8: Information management according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
		Pre-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	8	14.3%	4.3%	4	10.0%
Basically innovative	25	44.6%	4.6%	16	40.0%
Highly innovative	23	41.1%	-8.9%	20	50.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
		Post-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	5	8.9%	1.4%	3	7.5%
Basically innovative	22	39.3%	11.8%	11	27.5%
Highly innovative	29	51.8%	-13.2%	26	65.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

We appreciate that, in the post-test within the control group, 51.8% of the students consider that the information and knowledge management dimension is highly innovative, 39.3% is basically innovative and 8.9% is innovative. In the experimental group, 65.0% of the students consider that the information and knowledge management dimension is highly innovative, 27.5% basically innovative and 7.5% innovative.

When comparing the pretest and posttest of the experimental group, a significant advance from 50.0% to 65.0% is evidenced at the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped to raise awareness of the effect of information and knowledge management. In Table 9, we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 69.6% of the students consider that the human capital management dimension is highly innovative, 30.4% is basically innovative and 0.0% is innovative. In the experimental group, 25.0% of the students consider that the human capital management dimension is basically innovative, 75.0% highly innovative and 0.0% innovative. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of the training to improve the effectiveness of human capital management.

Table 9: Human capital management according to pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
		Pre-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	17	30.4%	5.4%	10	25.0%
Highly innovative	39	69.6%	-5.4%	30	75.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
		Post-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	18	32.1%	14.6%	7	17.5%
Highly innovative	38	67.9%	-14.6%	33	82.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

We appreciate that, in the post-test within the control group, 67.9% of the students consider that the human capital management dimension is highly innovative, 32.1% is basically innovative and 0.0% is innovative. In the experimental group, 82.5% of the students consider that the human capital management dimension is highly innovative, 17.5% basically innovative and 0.0% innovative. When comparing the group's pretest and posttest, a significant advance from 75.0% to 82.5% in the highly innovative level is evidenced in the experimental group, which means that the training helped to raise awareness of the effect of human capital management.

In Table 10, we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 76.8% of the students consider that the dimension of relationship with the human innovation ecosystem is highly innovative, 21.4% is

basically innovative and 1.8% for innovating. In the experimental group, 20.0% of the students consider that the dimension of relationship with the human innovation ecosystem is basically innovative, 77.5% highly innovative and 2.5% to innovate. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of training to improve the relationship effect with the human innovation ecosystem.

Table 10: Relationship with the innovation ecosystem according to the pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
		Pre-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	1	1.8%	-0.7%	1	2.5%
Basically innovative	12	21.4%	1.4%	8	20.0%
Highly innovative	43	76.8%	-0.7%	31	77.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
		Post-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	18	32.1%	19.6%	5	12.5%
Highly innovative	38	67.9%	-19.6%	35	87.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

We appreciate that, in the post-test within the control group, 67.9% of the students consider that the dimension of relationship with the human innovation ecosystem is highly innovative, 32.1% is basically innovative and 0.0% is innovative. In the experimental group 87.5% of the students consider that the relationship with the human innovation ecosystem is highly innovative, 12.5% basically innovative and 0.0% innovative. When comparing the group's pretest and posttest, a significant advance from 77.5% to 87.5% in the highly innovative level is evidenced in the experimental group, which means that the training helped to raise awareness of the relationship effect with the innovation ecosystem human.In Table 11, we observe the results of the pretest, in the control group 75.0% of the students consider that the dimension Creativity and innovation techniques are highly innovative, 25.0% are basically innovative and 0.0% are innovative. In the experimental group, 10.0% of the students consider that the Creativity and Innovation Techniques dimension is basically innovative, 87.5% highly innovative, and 2.5% to innovate. It can be considered that in both groups there are slight differences before the application of training to improve the effect of creativity and innovation techniques.

We appreciate that, in the post-test within the control group, 67.9% of the students consider that the Techniques of Creativity and Innovation dimension is highly innovative, 32.1% is basically innovative and 0.0% is innovative. In the experimental group, 90.0% of the students consider that creativity and innovation techniques are highly innovative, 10.0% basically innovative and 0.0% innovative.

When comparing the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group, a significant advance from 87.5% to 90.0% is evidenced in the highly innovative level, which means that the training helped to raise awareness of the effect of creativity and innovation techniques.

Table 11: Creativity and innovation techniques according to the pretest and posttest

Level	Control group			Experimental group	
		Pre-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	0	0.0%	-2.5%	1	2.5%
Basically innovative	14	25.0%	15.0%	4	10.0%
Highly innovative	42	75.0%	-12.5%	35	87.5%
Total	56	100%		40	100%
		Post-test			
	f	**%**	**Difference %**	**f**	**%**
For innovating	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Basically innovative	18	32.1%	22.1%	4	10.0%
Highly innovative	38	67.9%	-22.1%	36	90.0%
Total	56	100%		40	100%

4. Discussion

After having carried out the analysis to obtain the results of the research study, it was observed that from the perspective of millennials, they seek to develop and increase in their work environment the experience that allows them to develop personally and professionally. And that this is due to the fact that millennials seek short-term goals and dreams in order to be positioned in a comfortable work environment that allows them to work with ease and to increase the success of the company; and that the training that is presented to them is increased, since they can learn quickly if they are trained, therefore millennials obtain a high knowledge according to what they have been taught since it is essential where it allows them to enrich themselves of educational materials that empower you to grow professionally. In the same way, Ferri-Reed (2014) argued that millennials change positions in the

workplace because they tend to seek new challenges that must be imposed on them, and that at the work level their experience gives you new ideas, knowledge and develop as a person, which motivates you to stay in your workplace since your superiors want you to stay and stay so that more challenges are imposed on them daily so that millennials can grow daily and thus increase the talent of the company.

It should be noted that previous studies, such as Perales-de-Freitas (2019) maintained that millennials tend to generate good job expectations at a higher level than that of older generations, in addition to that millennials look for options that allow them to satisfy themselves in the Most workplace does not exceed your expectations. Likewise, Özçelik (2015) argued that the internal or external motivation of millennials will play a very important role within the workplace since it improves the behavior required to achieve the goals of the organization and that this allows millennials have a good attitude by doing their job in a dedicated and efficient manner.

5. Conclusions

- The millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program influences the capacity for technological innovation of the students of the Universidad Nacional de Cañete.
- The millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program influences the ability to influence the information and knowledge management capacity of the students of the Universidad Nacional de Cañete, period 2019
- The millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program influences the relationship with the innovation ecosystem of the students at the Universidad Nacional de Cañete.
- The millennial 2.0 entrepreneurship program influences the relationship with the innovation ecosystem of the students at the Universidad Nacional de Cañete.
- This research article mentions that the millennial Entrepreneurship 2.0 pieces of training help to raise awareness among the students of the University of Cañete by 70% under the positive effect of the millennial 2.0 program, resulting in an increase of 27.5 % above the average acceptance level, in terms of university technological innovation, the interest of students rises up to 75.0% while the impact on teachers reaches 72.5% after receiving technological innovation training.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Arias VFJ (2021). Actividad emprendedora de los millennials en antioquia (Colombia). Ph.D. Dissertation, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, Spain.

Barrios E and Ulises D (2020). Diseño y validación del cuestionario "Actitud hacia la investigación en estudiantes universitarios." Revista Innova Educación, 2(2): 280-302. https://doi.org/10.35622/j.rie.2020.02.004

Camino RC and Aguilar AE (2017). Emprendimiento e innovación en Ecuador, análisis de ecosistemas empresariales para la consolidación de pequeñas y medianas empresas. INNOVA Research Journal, 2(9.1): 73-87. https://doi.org/10.33890/innova.v2.n9.1.2017.504

Cantú Munguía IA, Medina Lozano A, and Martínez Marín FA (2019). Research seedbed: Educational strategy to promote technological innovation [Research seedbed: Educational strategy to promote technological innovation]. Revista Iberoamericana para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Educativo, 10(19): e011. https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v10i19.505

Carrera F and Mariano A (2018). Análisis del efecto del emprendimiento juvenil en el empleo de los jóvenes estudiantes universitarios de Guayaquil. Universidad Católica de Santiago de Guayaquil, Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Ferri-Reed J (2014). Are millennial employees changing how managers manage? The Journal for Quality and Participation, 37(2): 15-18.

García GVD (2015). Emprendimiento empresarial juvenil: Una evaluación con jóvenes estudiantes de universidad. Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud, 13(2): 1221-1236. https://doi.org/10.11600/1692715x.13246200315

Gómez Zuluaga ME (2019). Technology-based entrepreneurship: A challenge to meet. Tec Empresarial, 13(2): 33-44. https://doi.org/10.18845/te.v13i2.4493

López FJM, Ortiz PA, and Torres LGG (2018). Emprendimiento como estrategia para la formación de líderes en institutos tecnológicos, un caso de éxito. Revista Electrónica Anfei Digital, 4: 8.

Marks ML and Mirvis PH (2011). A framework for the human resources role in managing culture in mergers and acquisitions. Human Resource Management, 50(6): 859-877. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20445

Navarro Montalvan JA (2021). Innovación tecnológica y su influencia en la ejecución del programa social Haku Wiñay-FONCODES, Unidad Territorial Chiclayo, 2016-2020. M.Sc. Thesis, Universidad César Vallejo, Lima, Peru.

Özçelik G (2015). Engagement and retention of the millennial generation in the workplace through internal branding. International Journal of Business and Management, 10(3): 99-107. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v10n3p99

Perales-de-Freitas CA (2019). Proyecto de empresa de consultoría en innovación en empresas de Lima Metropolitana. M.Sc. Thesis, Universidad de Lima, Lima, Peru.

Rothwell R (1992). Successful industrial innovation: critical factors for the 1990s. R&D Management, 22(3): 221-240. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.1992.tb00812.x

Ünver S, Semerci R, Özkan ZK, and Avcibasi I (2018). Attitude of nursing students toward scientific research: A cross-sectional study in Turkey. Journal of Nursing Research, 26(5): 356-361. https://doi.org/10.1097/JNR.0000000000000244 **PMid:29232317**

Zamora-Boza CS (2018). La importancia del emprendimiento en la economía: El caso de Ecuador. Revista Espacios, 39(7): 15-26.