Full text open access online (Since 2009)

PRINT: ISSN 0975-1122 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6322
Int J Edu Sci, 38(1-3): 70-79 (2022)
DOI: 10.31901/24566322.2022/38.1-3.1247

# Teaching Methods and its Effect on Entrepreneurship Development of Millennials in Nigeria Universities

**Cosmas Anayochukwu Nwankwo, MacDonald Isaac Kanyangale, Solomon Uchechukwu Eze and Adaobi Patricia Ifejiofor**

*Graduate School of Business and Leadership Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, KwaZulu Natal, South Africa*
*Telephone: +27649998631; +2348038501255, E-mail: j.cosmaris@gmail.com,*
*ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3135-7788*
*Graduate School of Business and Leadership Studies,University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, KwaZulu Natal, South Africa*
*Telephone: +27312607934, E-mail: kanyangalem@ukzn.ac.za,*
*ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2259-1449*
*Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria*
*Telephone: +2347034687663, E-mail: su.eze@unizik.edu.ng*
*Department of Educational Foundations, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Anambra State, Nigeria*
*Telephone: +2348066769662, E-mail: ap.ifejiofor@coou.edu.ng*

**KEYWORDS** Entrepreneurship Education. Entrepreneurship Development. Millennials. Nigeria. Teaching Methods

**ABSTRACT** The teaching methods used in entrepreneurship education are a lynchpin for university students to become graduate venture creators in the economy. However, many university graduates in Nigeria remain unemployed even after receiving an entrepreneurship education. This positivistic study examines the entrepreneurship teaching methods used in three public universities and the effects on the entrepreneurship development of millennials. The research used a census of 357 millennials who are in their final year of studies at three Nigerian public universities. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire and analysed using multiple regression. The findings reveal that teaching "through" entrepreneurship has a major contribution to the entrepreneurship development of millennials, while teaching "about" entrepreneurship, which many Nigerian universities adopt, depicts a negative effect. The study concludes that teaching methods significantly affect the entrepreneurship development of millennial students in public universities in Nigeria. There is an urgent need for lecturers in the universities to revisit how they teach entrepreneurship and adopt teaching methods that are effective in enabling students to practice rather than just become theoretically aware of entrepreneurship during the university education.

## INTRODUCTION

Without effective methods of teaching entrepreneurship education (EE) in the university, graduate venture creation will not be achievable in many African countries. Andah et al. (2019: 184) assert that "graduate venture creation is viewed as the ability to start-up ventures without a paid form of employment". The question of how to teach entrepreneurship is fundamental for academics and makers of government policy concerned about graduate unemployment and its potential adverse effects, for example, fueling looting, insurgencies, terrorist activity, and youth migration en masse to developed countries (Donkor 2021).

Effective teachers in EE know their students and how to teach them. Most of the students in the university today are the millennial generation born between 1982-2000 (Strauss and Howe 2010). Millennials are digital-savvy. They have stronger team instincts and close peer ties and are more accepting of diversity than their forefathers (McNeill 2011). Justice and societal issues are fundamental to Millennials. They do, however, have a limited attention span. EE educators must modify their teaching methods to meet the particular features of the millennial generation, which now dominates university classrooms. Millennials are connected to peer groups

*Note:* This paper has no conflict of interest whatsoever.

all across the world. Millennials are thus the first generation to grow up in a fully global society.

Educators of entrepreneurship in Africa need to be familiar with two key issues: the distinction between enterprising education and EE and narrow and comprehensive rationales of entrepreneurship. First, it is salient for African educators to understand the nuances in the meaning and focus of EE among North American and European scholars (Hägg and Gabrielsson 2020). Scholars of EE in Europe focus on "enterprising education". This embraces small business management and entrepreneurial behaviour. This view of EE by European scholars is different from North American scholars who focus on EE, which is about the entrepreneur starting an enterprise and the issues that come with starting a new venture. With this nuance, the interesting question is about how educators of EE in Africa situate themselves in this discourse. There are times when the notion of EE from North America, which focuses on the narrow context of enterprise formation, is merged with an enterprising approach in terms of human growth, mentality, skills, and talents more broadly. There is a continuous debate regarding whether the primary focus of EE should be the formation of new businesses or developing the individual`s entrepreneurial competences for life (Neck and Corbett 2018). Curricula design, teaching methods, roles of learners, and desired learning outcomes are all influenced differently by EE viewpoints. The main flaw is that scholarly knowledge of education in EE is lacking (Hägg and Gabrielsson 2020). It is compelling to implore researchers to explore the effectiveness of different teaching methods in achieving the desired outcome of enterprising education (for example, enterprising behaviour and small business management), which is different from EE (for example, venture creation, entrepreneurial individual) or both.

Second, the teaching methods a lecturer may adopt in EE are shaped by narrow and comprehensive rationales of entrepreneurship. The narrow explanation of EE is praxis-oriented and focuses on start-a-firm activity (Hägg and Gabrielsson 2020). EE is useful for a small percentage of students who want to start their own business. In most universities and colleges, the restricted viewpoint of EE emphasises entrepreneurship awareness activities, new enterprises, and new enterprise survival and growth. The holistic rationale of EE, on the other hand, covers entrepreneurial thinking, dissemination of new pedagogies, learning activities which cross-discipline boundaries, and business-related information found in the business arena (Hägg and Gabrielsson 2020). The comprehensive rationale of entrepreneurship goes beyond venture creation. The comprehensive rationale upholds that teaching entrepreneurship needs to focus on various levels. As a result, teaching entrepreneurship must address individual mental states and behaviours, specific conditions (new enterprise formation, corporate venturing, and acquisition of existing enterprises) and culture (Fayolle and Klandt 2006: 2). Entrepreneurial behaviours, abilities, and qualities, cultivated via suitable pedagogies and experience, are critical elements of 'feeling' what it is like to be an entrepreneur (Gibb 2006: 3). Table 1 reflects the variety of

**Table 1: Narrow and comprehensive perspectives of entrepreneurship in the university**

| *Rationales* | *Narrow perspective* | *Comprehensive perspective* |
|---|---|---|
| Overall rationale | Turning students into entrepreneurs Praxis and get close to real-life entrepreneurs and firms | Fostering entrepreneurial students and graduatesEnhance creativity, develop personal attributes and make students "feel" what it is like to be entrepreneurial as a vital outcome |
| Learning outcome rationale | Instrumental 'doer' skills | Opportunity recognition and evaluation skills |
| Teaching rationale | Knowledge transfer | Knowledge facilitation |
| Macro-economic rationale | More knowledge-intensive start-ups in the economy | Improved knowledge spillover from universities |

*Source:* Authors

logic underpinning the narrow and comprehensive perspectives of entrepreneurship.

Nigerian University Commission has made it mandatory that before any student graduates from the university, they must have entrepreneurship skills to address graduate unemployment in Nigeria (Igbokwe-Ibeto et al. 2018). The rate of youth unemployment has increased from 40 percent to 53 percent in the fourth quarter of 2020 (National Bureau of Statistics 2020). For this policy to succeed, there are two scholarly issues. First, adding an entrepreneurship course here and there is inadequate to address graduate unemployment if the methods of teaching EE are ineffective or not aligned to the needs of learners, especially in a digital era. Andah et al. (2019) add that there is a need to regularly review the curriculum content on entrepreneurship education in Nigeria to increase venture creation among graduates. Second, there is a general lack of consensus and enthusiastic attention by researchers on the aspect of "what" is taught in EE and "how" it should be taught (Hägg and Gabrielsson 2020). In the light of this scholarly gap, the current quantitative study investigates "how" the teaching methods used in EE in Nigeria's universities could develop an entrepreneurial mindset and practice among millennials. This study is valuable as it responds to the call for focused research on how the methods used to teach EE effectively develop entrepreneurship among students.

## Objectives of the Study

Specifically, the study is poised to examine the following:

1. Examine the effect of teaching methods on the entrepreneurship development of millennials in Nigerian universities.
2. Examine whether teaching methods used in Nigerian universities are effective to turn millennials into start-up entrepreneurs.

## Literature Review

### *Understanding the Evolution of Teaching Methods of EE*

The teaching of EE is a contemporary challenge that has evolved since the 1980s. Notably, the 1980s reflect a predominantly teacher-oriented era within the pedagogy of teacher-centred teaching (PTCT). Pedagogy is traceable to paidagogos in Greece, an enslaved person who accompanied boys to and from school, taught them basic etiquette and educated them after school (Shah and Campus 2021). Over the years, the meaning of pedagogy has become complex. Scholars are talking about narrow and broad or sociocultural conceptions of pedagogy (Shah and Campus 2021). One example of the narrow definition of pedagogy is "the science of teaching", or teaching techniques and strategies in schools (Zhou and Brown 2015). This is narrow because it only focuses on what happens in the classroom. Another narrow definition depicts a technicist view of pedagogy. In this vein, pedagogy is a technical matter. It upholds that good teaching practices are neutral and universally applicable (for example, best practices) and transferable across different countries (Vavrus 2016). The technicalist perspective of pedagogy is criticised for simplifying the teaching and learning process. It isolates and separates teaching methods and practices in the classroom from connections, motives, and knowledge creations in a historical and social context of teaching (Shah and Campus 2021). Pedagogy in a broad or social-cultural sense applies to any purposeful activity by one person to improve the learning of another. The sociocultural approach to teaching considers technical and non-technical factors that impact classroom interactions and practices (Murphy 2008). Pedagogy is not only about what occurs in the classroom. It necessitates understanding the interactions among instructors, students, the learning environment, and the rest of the world (Shah and Campus 2021).

The approach to teaching EE in the 1980s required teachers to construct and manage the learning environment. In a well-structured class, teachers explain to their pupils the learning topic and how they learn (Zhou and Brown 2015). The approach strengthens the teacher's authority in the classroom and presupposes that pupils are obedient (Hattie and Zierer 2018). Freire (1972) discussed banking education in his book Pedagogy of the Oppressed, which refers to professors filling students' brains with the contents of their narration rather than training them to be critical thinkers. In this way, education becomes

merely "an act of depositing "knowledge informed by the assumption that teachers are knowledgeable while students are ignorant (Hattie and Zierer 2018). Traditional teaching approaches proved ineffective for EE. Experiential activities and working with or alongside actual entrepreneurs emphasised the need to "take action". Business plans arose as a unique teaching approach, and they were an essential aspect of the "narrow" perspective of EE's. In the 1990s, interest in action-oriented teaching grew alongside traditional instructor-centred techniques of seminars, guest lectures, case studies, and assigned readings (Gartner and Vesper 1994). During this time, researchers came to a more common understanding of the requirement for a practice-oriented approach to represent "real-world contexts."

The 1990s are notable for experimentation, with entrepreneurship researchers adopting experiential and problem-based teaching methodologies and practices to promote classroom learning. Scholars were interested in better understanding the process of learning by the entrepreneur. In the 2000s, EE classes began to emphasise "lived experience," or real-world learning situations. Practical knowledge was generated and shown via cooperation and creativity in a real-life context. Teachers created real learning environments to provide entrepreneurial students with dynamic and engaging entrepreneurial experiences. Simultaneously, the focus was on distinct and diverse circumstances in which entrepreneurship might be conducted and recognised. The diversity of these circumstances includes start-up, growth entrepreneurship, technology entrepreneurship, public sector entrepreneurship, immigrant entrepreneurship, and social entrepreneurship, to mention a few. During the 2010s, the discipline shifted to a more student-centred approach, with a continuous emphasis on action in the teaching methods, generally based on constructivist learning techniques. The pedagogy of learner-centred teaching (PLCT) upholds learning as an active and interactive process that focuses on students. Instruction is tailored to the developmental level of students, and teachers' aid learning by giving a variety of experiences (Zhou and Brown 2015). Learning in the PLCT emphasises student discovery of information rather than instructor telling. As a result, instructors are willing to take on a more democratic and less authoritarian role. The difficulty with PLCT is that it necessitates a variety of adaptable classroom setups, ample time, a variety of materials, and small class numbers. Over time, a systemic approach has arisen, emphasising the interaction between the person and society. In 2015, constructivist and experiential learning theories dominated modern EE, with students being encouraged to learn through design thinking as a potent approach to teaching EE.

The evolution of pedagogy in EE, providing answers to key questions related to instructor, content, target, and teaching methods. However, the evolution of teaching methods according to Hägg and Gabrielsson (2020: 835) have been categorised into four periods namely; The first category is the period of *teacher-orientated teaching* (1980-1989). This period is described as the didactic teaching methods which cover lectures, guest lectures and case studies. Here, business plans were the core feature in teaching. The second category is the period of process-orientated teaching (1990-1999). In this era, teaching methods are didactic and action-oriented and is centred on business plans, lectures, guest lectures and case studies. This category of teaching is based on increasing the use of simulation. The third category is the period of context-oriented teaching which focused on experiential learning (action and reflection) (2000-2009). The teaching method in this period focused on increasing the use of real-life ventures as vehicles for learning. Finally, is the period of *learner-oriented teaching* (2010-date). This period, teaching is based on experiential and constructivist on learning entrepreneurship as a method. In this period, teaching methods focuses on leaning start-up and business model canvas.

There is a variety of teaching methods available for use by educators of EE. It is not easy to organise them in a relevant, mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive manner. However, Esmi et al. (2015: 174) identified and classified various teaching methods of EE into three, namely interactive, direct and practical-operational. The framework which categorises teaching methods and their respective elements used in a study in Iran by Esmi et al. (2015: 174) are as follows.

1. Direct teaching-learning methods: Inviting guest entrepreneurs, mentoring, official speech-seminars, video watching and

recording, training in extracurricular activities, training in specialised lessons, small business mentoring, entrepreneurship tutoring.

2. Interactive teaching-learning methods: Process-oriented learning, learning from mistakes - interviewing entrepreneurs, bilateral learning, group discussion, networking, discussion, problem-oriented learning, action learning.
3. Practical-operational teaching-learning methods: Role-playing - training workshops - site visiting - class practice -research projects – business planning - starting a business - studying nature - investment projects - practical experience.

The relevance of the teaching methods identified in Iran for a study in Nigeria is critical due to cultural differences. Notably, extant research on EE in Nigeria has confirmed the use of teaching methods for EE identified by Esmi et al. (2015). For example, Andah et al. (2019) identify teaching methods for EE in Nigeria, such as writing business plans, professional classes, case studies, and mentoring. Audu et al. (2014) identified the use of practical activities and demonstration, while Okoye (2017) is aware of simulation and computer-assisted instruction in teaching EE in tertiary education institutions.

### *Three Themes for EE Provision*

There is a variety of objectives underlying methods of teaching EE. For example, Hytti and O'Gorman (2004) propose three categories of objectives for the teaching methods of EE. They are transferring or facilitating knowledge of entrepreneurship, teaching students to become entrepreneurial, and stimulating the entrepreneur or the venture creator in an individual. It is sound to illuminate that Sirelkhatim and Gangi (2015) have identified three generic themes of EE provision and their teaching methods which are interesting for this study.

#### *Teaching About Entrepreneurship*

The first theme illuminates how the teaching of EE is theoretically-oriented. It dwells on courses that educate students "about" entrepreneurship. The goal is to raise entrepreneurship awareness among students, inspire them to explore entrepreneurship as a career, and urge them to seek self-employment (Sirelkhatim and Gangi 2015). In this regard, teachers introduce the key scholars and theories of entrepreneurship to students. Teaching about entrepreneurship is insufficient without experience of what it is like to be an entrepreneur. The key content when teaching about entrepreneurship includes the business plan, entrepreneurial attributes, awareness of business life cycle, personality traits, business success, how individuals think and act entrepreneurially, and entrepreneurial awareness (Sirelkhatim and Gangi 2015). Traditional management disciplines, including marketing, finance management and small business management, are also taught in this approach of providing EE. The student is mostly a passive observer in most classrooms. The most prevalent teaching approaches are lectures, guest speakers, and case studies from academic books (Esmi et al. 2015).

#### *Teaching for Entrepreneurship*

Another option to provide EE is through practical, hands-on classes that teach "for" entrepreneurship. The goal is to inspire pupils and increase their desire to become entrepreneurs in the future. Teaching "for" entrepreneurship is concerned with the substance of curriculum for skills-based methods. The objective of teaching for entrepreneurship is to help students understand the actual workings of the enterprise or business. As such, the classes cover content such as business idea generation, building teams, business planning, creativity, invention, inspiration, identification and evaluation of opportunity, selling, networking, and the risks inherent in entrepreneurship, adaptation to customer, market and internal change, and expectation and acceptance of failure in a business (Sirelkhatim and Gangi 2015). What is critical in teaching "for" entrepreneurship is the principle of "learning by doing" and practical approaches to teaching. Simulations, self-directed activities, teaching which by a team of academics and entrepreneurs as practitioners, mentorship, and networking with different key stakeholders (for example, entrepreneurs, suppliers, members of distribution channels) are pivotal to helping students understand how different enterprises work (for example, commercial, social enterprises)

(Sirelkhatim and Gangi 2015). Practical experience, starting enterprises, business strategies, class practice, workshops, role play and research projects are examples of practical-operational teaching approaches.

*Teaching Through Entrepreneurship*

Finally, teaching "through" entrepreneurship seeks to graduate entrepreneurs, assist in forming new businesses, and build entrepreneurial skills (Bridge et al. 2010). Teaching via entrepreneurship involves students learning "with" and "through" actual business, allowing them to experience "becoming" entrepreneurs rather than "pretending" to be entrepreneurs. The emphasis is also on getting a sense of how market forces work in real life. Teaching via entrepreneurship includes pitching business ideas to potential investors and working with established or emerging entrepreneurs. Business simulations, incubators, internships to build and deploy breakthrough products for actual clients, and live projects by students to interact with real business people are examples of teaching through entrepreneurship. Experiential learning and learning by doing are essential components of EE, and they are linked to entrepreneurial learning-teaching "through entrepreneurship", Teaching "through" entrepreneurship requires students to act and role-play. Apprenticeships are distinguished by less classroom instruction to prepare students to become entrepreneurs. In a nutshell, teaching through entrepreneurship is more learner-centred and focuses on developing entrepreneurial skills rather than just delivering information. This study used two comprehensive lists of teaching methods relevant to EE compiled by Sirelkhatim and Gangi (2015) and Esmi et al. (2015) for comparison. The comparison assured that the techniques studied included all three of EE's requirements and teaching approaches categorised as direct, interactive and practical learning methods.

## METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a positivistic research paradigm and descriptive research design. The study focuses on final year students of the 2020/2021 academic year at three Departments (Entrepreneurship, Marketing and Business Administration) of the selected universities, namely: Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University (COOU), Delta State University (DELSU) and Benue State University (BSU) respectively. The three universities under study were conveniently selected from three geo-political zones of Southeast, South-south, and North-central Nigeria. The study population is 357, which comprises 78 students in the Department of Entrepreneurship studies (COOU), 132 students in the Department of Marketing (DELSU) and 147 students in the Department of Business Administration (BSU). The students were millennials and studied entrepreneurship in their final year of study at their respective universities. The study adopted a census which entails using the entire population as it is manageable. Data collection was done using a structured questionnaire on a four-point Likert scale to elicit relevant information from the university students. Cronbach Alpha was utilised to measure the instrument's internal consistency, and the result obtained shows that the instrument is reliable (0.678). Multiple regression was used to analyse data through IBM SPSS version 25.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The instruments were administered to the final year students of the selected Departments in the three Universities in Nigeria. Three hundred fifty-seven copies of the questionnaire were administered, and 334 were completed correctly and returned. This represents a 93.6 percent response rate. Below is a presentation and discussion of the results.

**$Ho_1$:** Teaching methods have no significant effect on the entrepreneurship development of millennials in Nigerian universities.

Table 2 shows the correlation coefficient (r = 0.604, p 0.05) between EE pedagogical approaches (teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship, and teaching through entrepreneurship) and entrepreneurship development. The table of correlation coefficients reveals that EE teaching approaches have a significant positive relationship with the dependent variable (entrepreneurship development). The correlation coefficient is 0.604 or 60.4 percent, and the p-value is less than 0.05. The null hy-

**Table 2: Pearson's correlation between EE teaching methods and entrepreneurship development of students in Nigerian Universities**

| | | *EE teaching methods* | *Entrepreneurship development* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *EE Teaching Methods* | Pearson's Correlation | 1 | 604** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .002 |
| | N | 334 | 334 |
| *Entrepreneurship Development* | Pearson's Correlation | 604** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .002 | |
| | N | 334 | 334 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Source:* IBM SPSS statistics version 25

pothesis was rejected with this level of significance. This finding suggests that EE teaching approaches have a favourable and considerable impact on students' entrepreneurial growth in Nigerian universities. The correlation between the two variables, on the other hand, is not only significant but also strong and positive. After recognising the link between EE teaching techniques and entrepreneurship development, researchers used multiple regression analysis to determine the contribution of each EE teaching method to the entrepreneurship development of students at Nigerian universities. Table 3 shows the EFA findings, which show the factor loading for each EE theme.

Cronbach's alpha coefficient and IBM SPSS statistics version 25 were used to examine the internal reliability of components or factors in the EFA test. Teaching via entrepreneurship (0.696), teaching for entrepreneurship (0.623) and teaching about entrepreneurship have Cronbach's alpha values of 0.696, 0.623 and 0.623, respectively (0.602). Internal consistency of 0.703 was found for a factor including a four-item measure of entrepreneurial development. Because the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients were over 0.600, no factor was ruled out of the measurement model. The multiple regression analysis shown in Table 4 was used to assess the EE teaching techniques in this work based on the EFA results. The result also combines the model summary, ANOVA, and coefficients into a single broad table, providing a clear and comprehensive picture.

The regression model's R2 is 0.526, with an adjusted R2 of 0.421, as shown in Table 4. The model (EE teaching approaches) accurately predicts 42.1 percent of entrepreneurship development differences. This is significant at $p<0.05$, indicating that the independent variables of different EE teaching methods and the dependent variable have a substantial association (entrepreneurship development). These findings refute the null hypothesis, suggesting that the EE teaching style (teaching for, teaching about, and teaching via entrepreneurship) substantially impacts entrepreneurship development. The standardised Beta and corresponding P-values for teaching about entrepreneurship ($\beta = 0.119$, $p<0.000$), teaching for entrepreneurship ($\beta = 0.192$, $p< 0.002$), and teaching through entrepreneurship ($\beta = 0.281$, $p<0.001$) show that teaching through entrepreneurship contributed the most to the model, followed by teaching for entrepreneurship and teaching about entrepre-

**Table 3: Exploratory factor analysis of the measurement of EE teaching methods**

| *Item* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Factor loading* | *Item total correlation* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *EE Teaching Methods Factor* | | | | |
| Teaching through entrepreneurship | 4.32 | 1.411 | .836 | .598 |
| Teaching for entrepreneurship | 2.74 | .799 | .721 | .532 |
| Teaching about entrepreneurship | 2.62 | .748 | .642 | .524 |

*Source:* IBM SPSS statistics version 25
*KMO = .784; X2 = 727.252; DF= 3; P < .001; Cronbach's $\alpha$ = .618; Percentage of variance explained = 65.73%.*

**Table 4: Themes of EE teaching method as predictors of entrepreneurship development**

| | *R* | *R2* | *Adjusted R2* | *F* | *Beta* | *t* | *Sig* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching about entrepreneurship | .783a | .526 | .421 | 18.478 | - | - | .000b |
| Teaching for entrepreneurship | | | | | .119 | 1.844 | .000 |
| Teaching through entrepreneurship | | | | | .192 | 2.012 | .002 |
| (Constant) | | | | | .281 | 2.041 | .001 |
| a. Dependent Variable: entrepreneurship development | | | | | - | 2.221 | .002 |
| b. Predictors: (Constant) Teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship, teaching through entrepreneurship | | | | | | | |

*Source:* IBM SPSS statistics version 25

neurship. These data show that the EE teaching approach (teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship and teaching via entrepreneurship) predicts millennials' entrepreneurship growth in Nigerian institutions. This study's findings establish that teaching through entrepreneurship is an essential teaching method that should be embraced to improve the development of entrepreneurial skills among university students. This corroborates Sirelkhatimand and Gangi's (2015) argument that learning "through" real-world entrepreneurship allows students to get hands-on experience of "becoming" entrepreneurs instead of "pretending" to be one. Incubators, live projects which offer students the opportunity to collaborate with real entrepreneurs, business simulation, and internships in an entrepreneurial venture are examples of teaching through entrepreneurship (Chang and Rieple 2013; Vincett and Farlow 2008; Wang and Verzat 2011).

For further exploration of this theme, the study examines the second hypothesis as stated below:

**Ho**$_2$: Teaching methods used in Nigerian universities are not effective to turn millennials into start-up entrepreneurs.

The findings are in accord with the second hypothesis, revealing an inter-correlation coefficient between teaching methods (teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship, and teaching through entrepreneurship) and entrepreneurship development. In Tables 5 and 6, the correlation coefficients were significant with R = 0. 646, R2 = 0.437 and adjusted R2 = 0.394. This means that the predictor factors of teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship, and teaching through entrepreneurship as criterion

**Table 5: Model summary**

| *Model* | *R* | *R square* | *Adjusted R square* | *Std. error of the estimate* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .646a | .437 | .394 | .592 |

*a. Predictors:* (Constant), Teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship, teaching through entrepreneurship
*Source*: IBM SPSS statistics version 25

**Table 6: ANOVAa**

| *Model* | | *Sum of squares* | *Df* | *Mean square* | *F* | *Sig.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 68.263 | 3 | 7.014 | 21.179 | .001b |
| | Residual | 109.320 | 331 | .329 | | |
| | Total | 177.583 | 334 | | | |

*a. Dependent Variable:* Entrepreneurship development
*b. Predictors:* (Constant), Teaching for entrepreneurship, teaching about entrepreneurship, teaching through entrepreneurship

*Source:* IBM SPSS statistics version 25

**Table 7: Coefficientsa**

| *Model* | | *Unstandardised coefficients* | | *Standardised coefficients* | *t* | *Sig.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *B* | *Std. error* | *beta* | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .459 | .263 | | 2.620 | .003 |
| | Teaching about entrepreneurship | -.121 | .059 | -.191 | -1.251 | .004 |
| | Teaching for entrepreneurship | .083 | .037 | .085 | 1.219 | .001 |
| | Teaching through entrepreneurship | .089 | .022 | .127 | 2.052 | .000 |

*a. Dependent:* Entrepreneurship development

*Source:* IBM SPSS statistics version 25

variables combined to account for 39.4 percent of the variability in entrepreneurial development.

The regression model also highlighted the impact of each teaching approach in predicting millennials' entrepreneurial growth in Nigerian universities. The result in Table 7 shows that the teaching techniques (teaching about entrepreneurship) are significant and negatively influence the entrepreneurial development of millennials at Nigerian universities, as indicated by the regression weight. Because the sign associated with the regression weights (b) indicates the direction of prediction, only teaching about entrepreneurship has a negative impact on millennial entrepreneurship development in Nigerian universities, whereas teaching for entrepreneurship and teaching through entrepreneurship have a positive effect. This finding depicts that teaching methods have a significant and positive effect on the entrepreneurship development of millennials in Nigerian universities. This result shows that though teaching methods are significant to the entrepreneurship development of millennials in Nigerian universities, teaching methods used in Nigerian universities are not effective in turning millennials into start-up entrepreneurs. Therefore, if Nigerian lecturers continue to adopt teaching about entrepreneurship, there are more chances that millennials may not have the skills to start their respective entrepreneurial ventures. In the Nigerian university system today, the Nigerian University Commission has made it mandatory that before any student graduates from the university, they must have entrepreneurship skills to address graduate unemployment in Nigeria (Igbokwe-Ibeto et al. 2018). However, Nigerian universities' teaching methods (teaching about entrepreneurship) have seen little or no changes among Nigerian university graduates, thus putting a surge in unemployment in Nigeria.

## CONCLUSION

The study has found that Nigerian universities tend to adopt teaching about entrepreneurship which is theoretically driven and has a little or negative effect on the entrepreneurship development of millennials. It is less surprising that many Nigerian graduates who had in their period in the university acquired entrepreneurship training using teaching about entrepreneurship approaches have ended up being unemployed because of a lack of practical entrepreneurship training (teaching "for" and "through" entrepreneurship). The article aimed to examine the effect of teaching methods on the entrepreneurship development of millennials in three Nigerian universities. Generally, the teaching methods in EE can be categorised into three broad themes. The first theme is a teacher-centred teaching technique that teaches "about" entrepreneurship and heavily relies on theoretical knowledge. In teaching about entrepreneurship, the aim is to raise students' knowledge of entrepreneurship as a possible fruitful career. The second and third themes of teaching "for" and "through" entrepreneurship are more suitable to turn graduates into entrepreneurs. These constitute teaching methods which are more learner-centred to develop an entrepreneur's abilities rather than just providing knowledge. These instructional approaches frequently establish an atmosphere in which students can simulate real-world business issues or start or contribute to the formation of new ventures. The study asserts that teaching "for" and "through" entrepreneurship is more likely to contribute to entrepreneurship development in Nigeria and beyond.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper recommends that lecturers in Nigerian Universities should reduce teaching methods

about entrepreneurship and instead adopt and support the implementation of practice-oriented teaching and learning "for" and "through" entrepreneurship if they are to develop students who become entrepreneurs after graduation.

## REFERENCES


Andah R, Hauwa LA, Isichei E 2019. Entrepreneurial education and venture creation: An emerging economy perspective, *International Journal of Scientific Research in Social Sciences and Management Studies*, 4(2): 184-200.

Audu R, Kamin Y, Musta'amal AHB, Sukri M 2014. Assessment of the teaching methods that influence the acquisition of practical skills. *Asian Social Science*. DOI:10.5539/ASS.V10N21P35.

Bager T 2011. The camp model for entrepreneurship teaching. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7: 279-296.

Bridge S, Hegarty C, Porter S 2010. Rediscovering Enterprise: Developing Appropriate University Entrepreneurship Education. Education and Training, 52(8/9): 722-734. From <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0040-0912.htm> (Retrieved on 22 February 2022).

Chang J, Rieple A 2013. Assessing students' entrepreneurial skills development in live projects. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 20: 225–241.

Donkor A 2021. Africa's Youth Unemployment Crisis is a Global Problem. From <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/10/19/africa-youth-unemployment-crisis-global-problem/?tpcc=recirc_latest062921> (Retrieved on 12 February 2022).

Esmi K, Marzoughi R, Torkzadeh J 2015. Teaching learning methods of an entrepreneurship curriculum. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education and Professionalism*, 3(4): 172-177.

Fayolle A, Klandt B 2006. Using the Theory of Planned Behaviour to Assess Entrepreneurship Teaching Program: A First Experimentation. *Paper presented at 14th Annual International Entrepreneurship Conference*, University of Napoli Federicoii, Italy, 4-7 July 2004.

Freire P 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gartner WB, Vesper KH 1994. Experiments in Entrepreneurship Education: Successes and Failures. Journal of Business Venturing, 9: 179-187. From<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(94)90028-0> (Retrieved on 20 February 2022).

Gibb A 2006. Towards the Entrepreneurial University: Entrepreneurship Education as a Lever For Change, *NCGE Policy Paper Series*, Birmingham.

Hagg G, Gabrielsson J 2020. A systematic literature review of the evolution of pedagogy in entrepreneurial education research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 26(5): 829-861.

Hattie J, Zierer K 2018. *10 Mind frames for Visible Learning: Teaching for Success*. New York: Routledge.

Igbokwe-Ibeto CJ, Agbodike FC, Osakede KO 2018. Entrepreneurial curriculum in African universities: A panacea to graduates' unemployment if? *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 6(1): a222. https://doi.org/10.4102/apsdpr.v6i1.222.

McNeill RG Jr. 2011. Adapting Teaching to the Millennial Generation: A Case Study of a Blended/Hybrid Course. International CHRIE Conference-Refereed Track. 3. From <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/refereed/ICHRIE_2011/Thursday/3> (Retrieved on 20 February 2022).

Murphy P 2008. Defining pedagogy. In: K Hall, P Murphy, J Soler (Eds.): *Pedagogy and Practice: Culture and Identities*. London: Sage/The Open University, pp. 28-39.

National Bureau of Statistics 2020. Labor Force Statistics: Unemployment and Underemployment Report: Abridged Labour Force Survey Under Covid-19. From <https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/pdfuploads/Q2_2020_ Unemployment_Report.pdf> (Retrieved on 12 February 2022).

Neck HM, Corbett AC 2018. The scholarship of teaching and learning entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1): 8-41.

Okoye AC 2017. Entrepreneurship education: A panacea for graduate unemployment in Nigeria. *Online Journal of Arts, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1): 56-63.

Shah DK, Campus S 2021. Conceptualising and defining pedagogy. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 11(1): 6-29.

Sirelkhatim F, Gangi Y 2015. Entrepreneurship education: A systematic literature review of curricula contents and teaching methods. *Cogent Business and Management*, 2: 1. DOI: 10.1080/23311975.2015.1052034.

Strauss W, Howe N 2010. *Millennials Go To College*. 2nd Edition. Great Falls, VA: Life Course Associates.

Vavrus F 2016. *Dean's Lecture on When 'What Works' Doesn't: Comparative Pedagogies and Epistemological Diversity in Education*. University of Sydney, Sydney.

Vincett P, Farlow S 2008. Start-a-business: An experiment in education through entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15: 274–288.

Wang Y, Verzat C 2011. Generalist or specific studies for engineering entrepreneurs? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 18: 366–383.

Zhou M, Brown D 2015. Educational Learning Theories. 2nd Edition. Education Open Textbooks. From <https://oer.galileo.usg.edu/education-textbooks/1/> (Retrieved on 14 February 2022).


**Paper received for publication in, April, 2022**
**Paper accepted for publication in June, 2022**