

Teaching Models and Practical Skills Acquisition in Nigerian Entrepreneurship Education

Ebute, Ibim Yarwamara¹, Daniel Osephni Amieaye-Izante¹, Sigah, Tarinibo Piou¹ & Ebute, Abinotami Williams²

¹Department of General Studies, School of Foundation Studies, Bayelsa State College of Health Technology, Otuogidi-Ogbia, Nigeria

²Department of Environmental Health and Sanitation, Bayelsa State Ministry of Environment, Nigeria.

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	Entrepreneurship education in Nigeria has expanded institutionally, yet the transition from classroom exposure to graduate entrepreneurial action remains problematic. This study examines how teaching resources, practical orientation, module preparation, institutional policy and delivery constraints differ across seven higher-education institutions (FUO, FPA, NDU, UAT, IJBCOE, BYTEC and HUO). The study is motivated by a central puzzle: why can graduates express favourable views about entrepreneurship while entrepreneurial action and self-employment intentions weaken after graduation? Drawing on the theory of planned behaviour, experiential learning, human-capital theory and an institutional/ecological perspective, the study argues that entrepreneurial intention is not converted into action by attitude alone; it requires capability, credible opportunity structures, practical mastery, supportive institutional rules and exposure to authentic entrepreneurial environments. The supplied data comprise 175 entrepreneurship lecturers. Descriptive comparative analysis shows that NDU has the highest aggregate resource-exposure score (129), whereas HUO has the lowest (115); IJBCOE reports the highest aggregate challenge score (173), while HUO reports the lowest (157). Across institutions, the most pronounced challenges are irregular curriculum updates (M=22.14), poor motivation and encouragement (M=21.57), global relevance/competitiveness (M=21.43), curriculum deficiencies and pedagogy (M=21.29), and lack of modern equipment (M=21.14). These patterns suggest a system-level implementation problem rather than a simple lecturer-deficit explanation. However, the supplied tables do not contain treatment/control allocation, pre-test/post-test observations, student outcomes or an identifiable intervention; consequently, causal quasi-experimental claims would be methodologically indefensible. The manuscript therefore uses the institutional comparison as baseline evidence and specifies a defensible quasi-experimental design for future testing of experiential versus conventional entrepreneurship modules. The central conclusion is that Nigeria's entrepreneurship education problem is best understood as an interaction between lecturer capability and institutional conditions: lecturers matter, but their effectiveness is constrained or enabled by curriculum governance, equipment, class size, professional development, incentives and industry linkages.
Keywords: Entrepreneurship Education; Practical Skills Entrepreneurial Intention Experiential Learning Teaching Models Institutional Constraints Curriculum Graduate Transition	

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship education has increasingly been positioned as a mechanism for developing employability, innovation, opportunity recognition and self-employment. Yet the evidence does not support a simplistic assumption that exposure to an entrepreneurship course automatically produces entrepreneurs. Pittaway and Cope (2007) concluded that entrepreneurship education can influence propensity and intentionality, while also noting uncertainty about its effect on actual graduate entrepreneurship. Bae et al. (2014), in a meta-analysis of 73 studies involving 37,285 participants, found only a small positive association between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention and reported that the post-education relationship became non-significant after controlling for pre-education intention. Martin et al. (2013) similarly found positive relationships between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurship-related human capital, but warned that methodological quality affects estimated effects. Rideout and Gray (2013) identified substantial weaknesses in the empirical evaluation of university entrepreneurship education. Mwasalwiba (2010) further showed that objectives, teaching methods and impact indicators are often poorly aligned. These findings make the Nigerian case less a question of whether entrepreneurship should be taught and more a question of what is taught, how it is taught, under what institutional conditions, and whether students acquire capabilities that survive beyond graduation.

The Nigerian problem is particularly consequential because the policy rhetoric surrounding entrepreneurship education frequently emphasizes self-reliance and employability, while the instructional system may remain dominated by lecture-based knowledge transmission. The practical contradiction is that a graduate can know the vocabulary of entrepreneurship—business plan, innovation, risk, opportunity, financing and marketing—without being able to validate a customer problem, cost a product, negotiate with

suppliers, use production equipment, register and manage a small enterprise, keep financial records or adapt a business model under uncertainty. Experiential learning research has long argued that entrepreneurship is learned effectively when learners confront situated problems, act, reflect, experiment and revise rather than merely memorize concepts (Kolb, 1984; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Neck & Greene, 2011; Rideout & Gray, 2013). The implication is that practical skills acquisition is not an optional supplement to entrepreneurship education; it is a core mechanism through which knowledge becomes entrepreneurial capability.

The present study therefore addresses three connected questions. First, how do the seven institutions compare in the resources and instructional exposures reported by entrepreneurship lecturers? Second, which challenges appear most pervasive across institutions? Third, should weaknesses in entrepreneurship education be attributed principally to lecturers, or should they be understood as consequences of institutional design and policy? The supplied data provide a useful comparative starting point because they contain lecturer characteristics, resource/personnel exposure indicators and institution-level challenge counts. The evidence, however, does not permit the manuscript to claim that one teaching model caused superior student outcomes. A Q1-level treatment of the evidence must distinguish descriptive comparison from causal inference and must identify what additional design would be necessary to test causal claims (Fayolle et al., 2006; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Nabi et al., 2017; Fiet & Patel, (2006).; Mwasalwiba, 2010).

The study's central argument is consequently that the apparent post-graduation 'fading' of entrepreneurial intention is better conceptualized as an intention-to-action conversion failure than as evidence that students were never positively disposed toward entrepreneurship. The theory of planned behaviour suggests that intentions depend on attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived behavioural control is especially relevant when a graduate confronts capital constraints, weak networks, poor infrastructure, regulatory friction and uncertainty. If the university experience builds attitudes but does not build competence or perceived control, intention may remain aspirational and collapse under real-world constraints. Entrepreneurship education therefore requires alignment between curriculum, pedagogy, lecturer competence, infrastructure, institutional incentives and external entrepreneurial ecosystems (Fayolle et al., 2006; Nabi et al., 2017; Lack  s, 2015; Neck & Greene, 2011; Pittaway & Cope, 2007).

This study makes three contributions. Empirically, it organizes the supplied seven-institution dataset into comparable resource and challenge indices. Conceptually, it links practical skills acquisition to the intention-to-action gap rather than treating entrepreneurial intention as an end in itself. Methodologically, it proposes a quasi-experimental comparison that can move the research beyond cross-sectional perceptions toward credible estimates of the effect of experiential teaching modules. The manuscript thus treats lecturer shortcomings and institutional shortcomings as interacting levels of explanation rather than mutually exclusive alternatives (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Martin et al., 2013; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Nabi et al., 2017; Bae et al., 2014).

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Entrepreneurship Education as Capability Formation

Entrepreneurship education can be conceptualized as capability formation rather than the transfer of business knowledge. Human-capital theory predicts that education matters when it creates productive knowledge and skills that can be deployed in action. Martin et al. (2013) found that entrepreneurship education and training were associated with entrepreneurship-related human capital and entrepreneurship outcomes, although effect sizes were heterogeneous and methodological quality mattered. Mwasalwiba (2010) showed that entrepreneurship education serves multiple objectives and uses multiple teaching methods, implying that outcome measures must be matched to programme purpose. Neck and Greene (2011) distinguish conventional business planning from an entrepreneurial method based on practice, experimentation and action. Lack  s (2015) similarly emphasizes value creation and competence development. Pittaway and Cope (2007) argue that entrepreneurship education affects learning processes and intentionality, but the transition to actual entrepreneurship remains less certain.

For Nigeria, this distinction is critical. If the curriculum is assessed predominantly through written examinations, students can maximize grades without demonstrating entrepreneurial competence. Practical capability requires evidence of performance: opportunity identification, customer discovery, prototyping, costing, negotiation, financial literacy, digital marketing, production, sales and reflective learning. Experiential and action-oriented pedagogies are therefore more congruent with the construct being taught than an exclusively didactic model (Kolb, 1984; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Neck & Greene, 2011; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Fayolle et al., 2006).

2.2 Teaching Models: Conventional, Experiential and Hybrid

Three broad instructional logics are relevant to the present comparison. The first is conventional lecture-centred delivery, which is efficient for transmitting conceptual content but weak when the learning objective is behavioural or procedural competence. The second is experiential learning, in which students learn through projects, simulations, fieldwork, enterprise creation, mentorship, internships and reflective practice. The third is a hybrid model that combines conceptual instruction with structured practical application. Entrepreneurship education scholarship increasingly favours the latter two because entrepreneurial learning involves uncertainty, action and reflection (Kolb, 1984; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Neck & Greene, 2011; Mwasalwiba, 2010). The question is not whether lectures have no value. Concepts such as opportunity cost, market structure, business model logic, sources of finance and regulatory obligations can be efficiently introduced through direct instruction. The problem emerges when the lecture becomes the endpoint rather than the beginning of application. Fayolle et al. (2006) propose evaluating entrepreneurship education through mechanisms linked to the theory of planned behaviour; this reinforces the need to examine changes in intention antecedents rather than simply course completion. Nabi et al. (2017) likewise show that entrepreneurship education outcomes vary by pedagogical approach and measurement. Thus, a defensible Nigerian model should combine explicit knowledge with repeated opportunities to apply, receive feedback, fail safely, revise and demonstrate competence.

The present dataset indirectly supports this concern. Across the seven institutions, reported counts for practical skills average only 6.00, compared with 25.00 for degree-level exposure and 13.71 for module preparation. Although these figures should not be interpreted as standardized scale scores without a codebook, the contrast is theoretically suggestive: formal qualifications and

module preparation do not automatically imply extensive practical exposure. Similarly, hands-on experience averages 8.14 and personal engagement 7.43. This pattern is consistent with an implementation gap between what lecturers possess as formal qualifications and what the teaching process enables them to enact (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Martin et al., 2013; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Neck & Greene, 2011; Pittaway & Cope, 2007).

2.3 *Entrepreneurial Intention and the Intention-to-Action Gap*

The theory of planned behaviour provides a useful explanation for why favourable entrepreneurial attitudes may not survive graduation. Ajzen (1991) argues that intention is shaped by attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control. In entrepreneurship, education can strengthen attitudes and knowledge without sufficiently strengthening perceived control. A student may value self-employment while simultaneously perceiving business start-up as financially inaccessible, socially risky or institutionally unsupported. When the graduate leaves the structured university environment, these constraints can become decisive. Fayolle et al. (2006) apply TPB to entrepreneurship education evaluation, while Bae et al. (2014) caution that the relationship between entrepreneurship education and post-education intention is weaker than simplistic programme claims suggest. Nabi et al. (2017) similarly identify heterogeneity in entrepreneurship education outcomes.

This study therefore rejects a deficit interpretation in which graduates who do not become entrepreneurs are labelled unmotivated. A more plausible explanation is a capability and ecosystem discontinuity. During university, the student is protected by a timetable, classmates, lecturers and assessment requirements. After graduation, entrepreneurship demands capital, networks, equipment, market information, confidence, regulatory navigation and persistence. If these capacities were never systematically developed, intention can decay under environmental pressure. This interpretation is compatible with Pittaway and Cope (2007), Rideout and Gray (2013), Martin et al. (2013), Lack  s (2015) and Neck and Greene (2011).

2.4 *Lecturer Shortcoming or Institutional Failure?*

A major contribution of this study is to reject the false binary between lecturer failure and institutional failure. Lecturers are central because they design learning experiences, model entrepreneurial behaviour, select examples, organize projects and provide feedback. Yet lecturers operate within organizational constraints. A lecturer cannot consistently deliver equipment-intensive practical training without equipment, cannot modernize a curriculum that lacks a functioning revision mechanism, and cannot sustain enterprise projects in severely overcrowded classes without institutional support. Mwasalwiba (2010) demonstrates the importance of alignment between teaching methods and programme objectives; Rideout and Gray (2013) show that weak programme evaluation can undermine conclusions about educational effectiveness; and contemporary work on entrepreneurial teachers emphasizes the interaction between teacher capability, curriculum, partnerships and institutional support (Fiet & Patel, (2006).).

The uploaded data reinforce a multi-level explanation. Institutional policy counts average 19.00, the highest resource-related row after degree exposure, but challenge counts for irregular curriculum updates average 22.14 and curriculum/pedagogy deficiencies 21.29. This juxtaposition suggests that the existence of policy is not equivalent to effective implementation. Likewise, specialization averages 9.86 and hands-on experience 8.14, raising questions about whether staff deployment, recruitment and professional development are aligned with practical entrepreneurship teaching. A Q1-level interpretation should therefore distinguish lecturer agency from structural capacity: lecturers may contribute to weak delivery, but institutions determine many of the conditions under which good teaching is possible (Lack  s, 2015; Neck & Greene, 2011; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Martin et al., 2013; Rideout & Gray, 2013).

2.5 *Research Questions and Hypotheses*

RQ1: How do the seven institutions compare in reported entrepreneurship-resource and personnel-exposure indicators?

RQ2: Which challenges to entrepreneurship education delivery are most prominent across the seven institutions?

RQ3: Does the observed institutional pattern support an interpretation centred on lecturer shortcomings, institutional constraints, or their interaction?

RQ4: How should a quasi-experimental comparison be designed to test whether experiential/hybrid teaching produces greater practical-skills acquisition than conventional teaching?

H1: Students exposed to a structured experiential/hybrid entrepreneurship module will demonstrate greater post-intervention practical-skills acquisition than comparable students exposed to conventional delivery, controlling for baseline skill.

H2: The positive effect of experiential/hybrid teaching on practical skills will be larger where institutional resource support is stronger.

H3: Lecturer practical experience and module preparation will positively moderate the effect of teaching model on practical-skills acquisition.

H4: Practical-skills acquisition will be more proximal to post-course entrepreneurial intention than general exposure to entrepreneurship education.

H5: Institutional constraints will explain part of the between-institution variation in teaching effectiveness beyond lecturer-level characteristics.

These hypotheses follow the logic of TPB, experiential learning and human-capital formation (Ajzen, 1991; Kolb, 1984; Fayolle et al., 2006; Martin et al., 2013; Nabi et al., 2017).

2. Method

2.1 *Study Area*

Bayelsa State is the sixth state in Nigeria; located in the core Niger Delta, Southern Nigeria with Yenagoa as the Capital. The state was created in 1996 from Rivers State with only eight local Government; bordered by Delta State in the North; Rivers State to the East and the Atlantic Ocean to the West and South and majorly dominated by a vast network of Rivers, Creeks and Mangrove forest. Demographically, it is dominated by the Ijaw ethnic group with languages as Izon; Ogbia; Nembe and Epie-Atissa. The state is a home to several higher educations with special focused on the Federal University, Otuoke (FUO); Niger Delta University,

Amassoma and Yenagoa(NDU); University of Africa, Toru-Orua (UAT); Federal polytechnic; Ekowe (FP); Isaac Jasper Adaka Boro College of Education, Sagbama (IJEBCOE); College of Health Technology, Otuogidi (BYCOHTEC); Hensard University, Toru-Urua (HUO) as the only private University; each offering entrepreneurship course while spooling out graduates on yearly basics.

2.2 Design and Analysis

The study utilized descriptive cross-sectional survey research design, with a study population of 320 and sample size of 178. However, the instrument uses (questionnaire) returned were 175 given a %5 instrumental validity. The institutions were coded FUAO, FPA, NDU, UAT, IJBCOE, BYCOHTEC and HUO. The manuscript uses a comparative institutional design for the supplied evidence and develops a quasi-experimental comparison as the appropriate next-stage design.

The preferred estimator is a difference-in-differences model of the form $Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 Post_t + \beta_2 Treatment_i + \beta_3(Post_t \times Treatment_i) + \gamma X_{it} + \text{institution fixed effects} + \text{error}_{it}$, where β_3 estimates the differential change attributable to the experiential/hybrid module under the parallel-trends assumption.

3. Results

3.1 Lecturer Demographics

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (Entrepreneurship Lecturers

Variables	Frequency (n = 175)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	83	47.4
Female	92	52.6
Service Years		
Below 2 yrs.	35	20.0
2–5yrs.	64	36.6
6–10 yrs.	57	32.6
>10 yrs.	19	10.9
Total	175	100.0

Source: Researcher (2026).

The dataset contains 175 entrepreneurship lecturers. Women constitute 92 (52.6%) respondents and men 83 (47.4%) respondents. The largest service category is 2–5 years (64; 36.6%), followed by 6–10 years (57; 32.6%), below two years (35; 20.0%) and above 10 years (19; 10.9%). Thus, 69.2% of respondents have between two and ten years of service. This profile suggests that the sample contains a substantial mid-career lecturer population, making professional development and practical exposure especially relevant to implementation quality. Lecturer experience should nevertheless not be equated with entrepreneurship expertise; years in service measure tenure, not necessarily entrepreneurial practice, industry exposure or pedagogical competence (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Neck & Greene, 2011; Lackéus, 2015; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Martin et al., 2013).

3.2 Comparative Resource and Personnel Exposure

Table 2. Entrepreneurship Resources Personnel Exposure

Activities	FUAO	FPA	NDU	UAT	IJBCOE	BYTEC	HUO
Degree	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Specializations	15	12	13	9	7	5	8
Hand on Experience	8	7	10	6	12	9	5
Practical Skills	5	5	7	4	7	6	8
Personal engagement	6	9	11	5	8	6	7
Module preparation	12	17	18	13	15	10	11
Participation	16	18	10	18	14	20	18
Institutional Policies	18	15	19	21	20	21	19
Freelance operations	13	15	16	18	17	19	14

Note. Source: Researcher (2026).

The institution-level sums of the nine Table 2 indicators are: NDU 129, IJBCOE 125, FPA 123, BYCOTECH 121, UAT 119, FUAO 118 and HUO 115. The corresponding mean reported counts per indicator are 14.33, 13.89, 13.67, 13.44, 13.22, 13.11 and 12.78, respectively. NDU therefore has the highest aggregate reported resource/personnel exposure, while HUO has the lowest. These rankings should not be interpreted as institutional quality rankings because the indicators are not shown to be psychometrically equivalent and the dataset does not provide a formal denominator for each item.

Table 3. Entrepreneurship Resources persons exposure.

Institution	Resource-exposure sum	Mean across 9 indicators	Challenge sum	Mean across 8 challenges
FUAO	118	13.11	171	21.38
FPA	123	13.67	172	21.50
NDU	129	14.33	171	21.38
UAT	119	13.22	163	20.38
IJBCOE	125	13.89	173	21.63

RESEARCH ARTICLE

BYCOTECH	121	13.44	169	21.13
HUO	115	12.78	157	19.63

Source: Researcher, 2026.

At indicator level, degree exposure is uniformly reported as 25 at each institution. Specialization averages 9.86; hands-on experience 8.14; practical skills 6.00; personal engagement 7.43; module preparation 13.71; participation 16.29; institutional policies 19.00; and freelance operations 16.00. The low relative value of practical skills and hands-on experience compared with formal degree exposure is the most theoretically consequential pattern. It suggests that formal qualification may coexist with limited practice-based preparation. This is precisely the distinction between education about entrepreneurship and education through entrepreneurial action emphasized in the entrepreneurship-education literature (Neck & Greene, 2011; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Lackéus, 2015; Martin et al., 2013).

3.3 Comparative Challenges

Table 4. Challenges Facing Entrepreneurship Education

Challenge	Across-institution mean reported count	Interpretive priority
Irregular curriculum updates	22.14	Very high
Poor motivation & encouragement	21.57	Very high
Global relevance/competitiveness	21.43	Very high
Curriculum deficiencies & pedagogy	21.29	Very high
Lack of modern equipment	21.14	High
Mindset and commitment gaps	21.00	High
Lack of practical skills	20.86	High
Crowdedness	18.57	Moderate

Source: Researcher, 2026

The highest across-institution challenge mean is irregular curriculum updates (22.14), followed by global relevance/competitiveness (21.43), poor motivation and encouragement (21.57), curriculum deficiencies and pedagogy (21.29), lack of modern equipment (21.14), mindset and commitment gaps (21.00), lack of practical skills (20.86), and crowdedness (18.57). The ordering indicates that the most persistent constraints are not confined to student motivation. Curriculum governance, pedagogical quality, equipment and motivation appear together, pointing toward a system of mutually reinforcing constraints.

The institution-level challenge sums range from 157 at HUO to 173 at IJBCOE. IJBCOE, despite a relatively high resource-exposure sum of 125, also has the highest challenge sum. This is an important finding because it cautions against a simple resource-deficit explanation. More resources do not necessarily produce better delivery if curriculum, incentives, pedagogy, implementation and utilization are weak. Conversely, HUO has the lowest challenge sum but also the lowest resource-exposure sum. The result suggests that institutional performance may depend on configuration and alignment rather than on any single resource variable (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Martin et al., 2013; Nabi et al., 2017; Bae et al., 2014).

4. Discussion

4.1 Why Positive Intentions Can Fade After Graduation

The findings suggest that the post-graduation decline in entrepreneurial action should be understood as a conversion problem. Universities may create awareness and even favourable attitudes, but the graduate must later convert intention into action under conditions of uncertainty. TPB predicts that perceived behavioural control matters alongside attitudes and norms (Ajzen, 1991). If practical training is weak, the graduate's perceived control may remain fragile. If equipment is absent, the student may never learn production or prototyping. If curriculum updates are irregular, the student may graduate with obsolete knowledge. If lecturers lack practical exposure, examples and assignments may remain abstract. If institutional policy rewards examination performance more than enterprise outcomes, practical learning may be crowded out. The current dataset contains evidence consistent with each of these mechanisms.

This interpretation is consistent with the broader evidence. Bae et al. (2014) found that the education intention association is small and becomes non-significant after controlling for pre-education intention. Pittaway and Cope (2007) noted uncertainty about actual graduate entrepreneurship. Rideout and Gray (2013) found methodological weaknesses that make strong claims about entrepreneurship education outcomes difficult to sustain. Martin et al. (2013) found positive but heterogeneous effects. Nabi et al. (2017) concluded that outcomes depend on pedagogical and programme characteristics. Collectively, these findings undermine the assumption that a compulsory entrepreneurship course automatically creates self-employment behaviour.

The Nigerian implication is that graduation can expose a discontinuity between educational simulation and economic reality. A student may have written a business plan for assessment but never sold a product, interviewed a customer, negotiated a price, managed working capital or dealt with equipment failure. Graduation removes the institutional scaffolding without guaranteeing access to finance, mentors, networks or workspace. The result is not necessarily a disappearance of entrepreneurial preference; it may be a rational postponement of action because perceived feasibility has fallen. Experiential learning is important precisely because it can make entrepreneurial uncertainty more familiar before the student encounters it independently (Kolb, 1984; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Neck & Greene, 2011; Fayolle et al., 2006; Lackéus, 2015).

4.2 Teaching Modules and Practical Skills Acquisition

The evidence supports a shift from a content-centred module toward an applied hybrid module. A defensible sequence would be: conceptual foundation; opportunity/problem discovery; customer validation; business model design; prototyping; costing and

financial management; market testing; digital marketing; pitching and negotiation; enterprise simulation; reflective debrief; and an assessed real-world venture task. Each stage should have observable performance criteria. The objective is not to eliminate lectures but to make lectures instrumental to action. This approach reflects experiential learning and entrepreneurial-method scholarship (Kolb, 1984; Neck & Greene, 2011; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Fayolle et al., 2006).

The current Table 2 pattern strengthens this argument because practical skills and hands-on experience are comparatively low relative to degree exposure. Module preparation is higher than practical-skills exposure, implying that preparation activity may not translate fully into practice. This could reflect curriculum design, limited facilities, large classes, assessment systems or lecturer capability. Consequently, improving modules requires more than rewriting syllabi. Curriculum revision must be paired with equipment, staff development, industry partnerships, practical assessment and monitoring of student skill acquisition (Martin et al., 2013; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Lackéus, 2015; Nabi et al., 2017; Mwasalwiba, 2010).

4.3 Lecturer Failure Versus Institutional Failure

The evidence does not justify blaming lecturers alone. A lecturer's responsibility is real: teaching should be current, participatory, applied and aligned with outcomes. However, the challenge profile is too systemic to be reduced to individual performance. Irregular curriculum updates are an institutional governance issue; equipment shortage is an infrastructure and financing issue; overcrowding is a staffing and planning issue; motivation may involve promotion, workload and incentive structures; global relevance depends on curriculum review and external engagement. Even pedagogically competent lecturers can be forced into transmissive teaching when practical classes are too large or facilities unavailable. Conversely, institutions can provide facilities without improving learning if lecturers lack the competence or incentive to use them effectively.

A useful causal model is therefore interactive: institutional conditions influence lecturer behaviour, lecturer behaviour influences teaching quality, teaching quality influences skill acquisition, and skill acquisition affects perceived behavioural control and entrepreneurial intention. This model is closer to an ecological understanding of entrepreneurship education than an individual-deficit model. Recent systematic work on entrepreneurial teachers likewise emphasizes the interaction of teacher characteristics with curriculum, partnerships, institutional support, policy and broader context (Fiet & Patel, (2006).). Earlier reviews reach similar conclusions about the importance of alignment among objectives, methods, learning environments and outcomes (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Martin et al., 2013).

4.4 Theoretical Contributions

First, the study extends TPB-oriented entrepreneurship education analysis by emphasizing perceived behavioural control as a practical capability construct rather than merely a psychological perception. Ajzen (1991) provides the theoretical foundation, while Fayolle et al. (2006), Bae et al. (2014) and Nabi et al. (2017) show why programme design matters to intention outcomes. Second, the study connects human-capital theory to institutional capacity: practical competence is not produced simply by exposure to a course; it requires learning environments capable of repeated practice (Martin et al., 2013; Kolb, 1984; Neck & Greene, 2011). Third, it integrates the individual and institutional levels, explaining why a competent lecturer may still struggle in a dysfunctional delivery environment (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Rideout & Gray, 2013; Lackéus, 2015; Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Fiet & Patel, (2006).).

5. Conclusion

This study set out to explain why entrepreneurship education can generate positive orientations without reliably producing post-graduation entrepreneurial action. The evidence from seven institutions points toward an implementation and conversion problem. The most prominent reported constraints are irregular curriculum updating, poor motivation and encouragement, weak global relevance, curriculum/pedagogy deficiencies and lack of modern equipment. At the resource level, formal degree exposure is much more prominent than hands-on experience and practical-skills exposure. The pattern is therefore consistent with an education system that can transmit entrepreneurial language more effectively than entrepreneurial capability.

The central conclusion is that the failure of entrepreneurship education in Nigeria should not be reduced to lecturers' shortcomings. Lecturer competence matters, but it is embedded within institutional policies, infrastructure, curriculum governance, class size, incentives, professional development and industry relationships. The more defensible explanation is an interaction between lecturer-level and institution-level constraints. The post-graduation fading of entrepreneurial intention can consequently be interpreted as an intention-to-action conversion failure driven by weak practical capability and perceived feasibility rather than simply by a lack of entrepreneurial attitude.

6. Recommendations

- ❖ Nigerian higher-education institutions should redesign entrepreneurship modules around demonstrable competencies rather than content coverage.
- ❖ Secondly, curriculum review should be scheduled and evidence-based, with explicit mechanisms for updating digital, financial, technological and market content.
- ❖ Third, practical entrepreneurship laboratories, maker spaces, simulation environments and enterprise projects should become core instructional infrastructure rather than optional extras.
- ❖ Lecturer development should include industry immersion, venture mentoring, pedagogical training and assessment of practical competence.
- ❖ Policymakers should fund entrepreneurship education as a system rather than as a course: curriculum governance, equipment, lecturer development, industry partnerships, incubation and graduate support should be connected.

References

- [1] Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)

- [2] Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. (2014). The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 217–254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12095>
- [3] Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Houghton Mifflin.
- [4] Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: A new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701–720. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590610715022>
- [5] Fiet, J. O., and P. C. Patel (2006). “Entrepreneurial Discovery as Constrained, Systematic Search,” *Small Business Economics* 30, 215–229.
- [6] Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
- [7] Lackéus, M. (2015). *Entrepreneurship in education: What, why, when, how*. OECD/European Commission background report.
- [8] Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.03.002>
- [9] Mwasalwiba, E. S. (2010). Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. *Education + Training*, 52(1), 20–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911011017663>
- [10] Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0026>
- [11] Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00314.x>
- [12] Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479–510. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607080656>
- [13] Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Simulating entrepreneurial learning: Integrating experiential and collaborative approaches to learning. *Management Learning*, 38(2), 211–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507607075776>
- [14] Rideout, E. C., & Gray, D. O. (2013). Does entrepreneurship education really work? A review and methodological critique of the empirical literature on the effects of university-based entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 329–351. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12021>
- [15] Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin.