Journal of Emerging Trends in Management Sciences and Entrepreneurship
Volume 8(4), Pages 103-117 Oct-Dec Edition, 2026
ISSN: 2384-762X
https://www.jetmase.com

Practical Delivery of Entrepreneurship Education and Perceived Work Readiness among DELSU Graduates: Implications for Curriculum and Skills Development

KAPPE, P.M. (Ph.D.)[1*] and OGHAJU, S.O.[2]
1Department of Management Studies, Karl Kümm University, Vom Jos Plateau State, Nigeria
2Department of Business Administration, Federal University Wukari, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria
Corresponding Author's Email: petermkappe1960@gmail.com*
lightogheneovo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This study examined whether graduates who rated the practical delivery of their entrepreneurship education more favourably also rated themselves as more ready for work. It is a cross-sectional secondary analysis of existing questionnaire responses from 100 graduates of Delta State University, Abraka (DELSU), 2023/2024 session, who were selected through purposive and convenience sampling; the same responses were used in a related study. The two dimentions used are perceived practical delivery of entrepreneurship education and graduates' perceptions of the adequacy of practical training tools and facilities. Perceived practical delivery was a five-item composite ($\alpha = .83$; $M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.86$) and perceived work readiness a seven-item self-reported composite ($\alpha = .88$; $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.49$). The two composites were positively associated (Pearson $r = .30$, 95% CI [.10, .46], $p = .003$; Spearman $\rho = .35$, $p < .001$). In a simple linear regression, a one-point higher practical-delivery score corresponded to a work-readiness score 0.17 points higher (HC3 95% CI [0.04, 0.30]; $R^2 = .087$). A single questionnaire item on the adequacy of tools and facilities for practical vocational training had the lowest agreement (64%) and the strongest item-level rank correlation with work readiness ($\rho = .39$, $p < .001$). The findings are correlational, rest on self-reports with near-ceiling readiness ratings, and describe these respondents only. They suggest that practical resources merit attention in Business Administration curriculum review.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship education; practical training; perceived work readiness; graduate skills; curriculum development; DELSU

INTRODUCTION

Whether entrepreneurship education prepares graduates for work depends partly on how it is delivered. A syllabus can list entrepreneurship content, but graduates' later confidence and capability are more plausibly related to whether they practised something themselves: ran a project, used workshop tools, or trained in a trade they can actually perform. Reviews of the field note that research on entrepreneurship education has often relied on short-term and subjective outcomes (Nabi et al., 2017) and that teaching methods differ widely in how far they involve learners in action (Neck & Greene, 2011). Experiential approaches are widely advocated, yet the evidence on them is mixed. Lackéus (2020)

compared three experiential approaches and reported that they differed in their outcomes for entrepreneurial competencies, motivation, and knowledge and skills, and Kassean et al. (2015) argued, from a survey of undergraduates at a United States university, that entrepreneurship classrooms need more reflection and real-world experience.

In Nigerian universities, the practical side of entrepreneurship training is a recurring curriculum concern. Ezeani (2018), drawing on qualitative research with Nigerian graduates, identified poor investment in education and graduates' limited technical skills among the barriers to graduate employment and entrepreneurship, and argued that education and skills curricula need review.

For national context, the National Bureau of Statistics reported an unemployment rate of 4.3% and a youth unemployment rate of 6.5% among people aged 15–24 in Q2 2024. These are national estimates, not graduate-specific rates; unemployment is defined as being without work, actively seeking work and available for work (National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 2024). The International Labour Organization identifies technical and vocational skills development among policy approaches to Nigeria's labour-market challenges (Morgan & Kim, 2024).

This article asks a narrower question than whether entrepreneurship education "works." It asks how graduates of one Nigerian university perceive the practical delivery of their entrepreneurship education, and whether those perceptions are associated with how ready they feel for work. The question is deliberately correlational. The data cannot show that practical delivery produces readiness, and the analysis is framed throughout as a description of how two sets of self-reported ratings vary together in one sample.

Problem Statement and Rationale

Business Administration programmes increasingly carry entrepreneurship and vocational components, yet institutions rarely have evidence on how graduates themselves judge the practical quality of that provision, or on whether those judgements are related to how ready graduates feel for work. Broad indices of "entrepreneurship education" can obscure this. A composite that mixes the availability of programmes, personal attendance and the practicality of training says little about where curriculum effort might be directed. Separating the practical features of delivery (hands-on practice, usable tools and facilities, training in a trade that graduates can actually practise) from the general availability of programmes gives curriculum committees a more specific object to examine.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the is to examine practical delivery of entrepreneurship education and perceived work readiness among DELSU graduates. Specifically, the study set to:

1. examine the relationship between perceived practical delivery of entrepreneurship education and perceived work readiness among the sampled DELSU graduates.
2. investigate the relationship between graduates' perceptions of the adequacy of practical training tools and facilities and their perceived work readiness among the sampled DELSU graduates.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between perceived practical delivery of entrepreneurship education and perceived work readiness among the sampled DELSU graduates?
2. What is the relationship between graduates' perceptions of the adequacy of

practical training tools and facilities and their perceived work readiness?

Research Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no statistically significant relationship between perceived practical delivery of entrepreneurship education and perceived work readiness among the sampled DELSU graduates.

H_{02}: There is no statistically significant relationship between graduates' perceptions of the adequacy of practical training tools and facilities and their perceived work readiness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Practical Delivery in Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education has moved from lecture-based teaching about business towards methods that put learners in situations of action and reflection. Neck and Greene (2011) describe entrepreneurship as a method that can be practised and argue for a portfolio of pedagogies rather than reliance on lectures and business-plan writing. Bell and Bell (2020) apply educational theory to propose a framework for delivering experiential entrepreneurship education, which gives the notion of "practical delivery" a pedagogical grounding. Lackéus (2020) distinguishes between experiential approaches and reports that they differ in how strongly they are associated with entrepreneurial competencies, motivation and knowledge and skills, so that "practical" is not a single, uniform feature of teaching. Kassean et al. (2015) similarly call for reflection, real-world experience and action, and report that some common classroom activities were associated with lower entrepreneurial self-efficacy among the students they surveyed. A systematic review concludes that evidence on entrepreneurship education in higher education is uneven and highlights the prevalence of short-term, subjective outcome measures (Nabi et al., 2017). These sources motivate looking at practical delivery separately from the mere availability of programmes. None of them reports how DELSU graduates rated their own training.

Curriculum, Facilities and Skills Development in the Nigerian Context

Curriculum design is one route through which universities can make practice a defined part of entrepreneurship education, but practice depends on resources. Ezeani (2018) reports that, in qualitative work with Nigerian graduates, poor government policy and investment in education and low graduate skills were prominent barriers to employment and entrepreneurship, and calls for urgent review of education and skills curricula and related policy. Her study is qualitative and does not measure the association examined here, but it makes graduates' own accounts of resources and skills a legitimate object of curriculum inquiry. In the present data, the questionnaire item on tools and facilities captures one such account: whether graduates judged that their institution provided adequate tools and facilities for practical vocational training.

Perceived Work Readiness and Self-Perceived Employability

Employability is generally understood as a set of achievements that is necessary but not sufficient for gaining employment (Yorke, 2006). Graduates' own assessments of their skills, confidence and readiness are one component of a broader picture that includes human, social, cultural, identity and psychological capital (Tomlinson, 2017). Dacre Pool and Sewell (2007) likewise present employability as combining experience and generic skills with self-efficacy, confidence and self-esteem. The notion of "job readiness" is also contested: Moore and Morton (2017) question simple readiness narratives and the "skills gap" claims attached to them. In this

article, perceived work readiness is therefore a self-reported judgement, not a verified attribute. No claim is made about employer assessments, job performance or actual employment.

Self-Report Measurement

When the same respondents supply both sets of ratings in one sitting, shared method variance can inflate observed associations (Podsakoff et al., 2003, 2012). Self-ratings of competence also tend to cluster at the favourable end of a scale, which restricts variation and can attenuate associations. Both concerns apply to the present data and are returned to in the Discussion and Limitations sections.

Theoretical Framing

Two established ideas frame the analysis; neither is tested directly. First, experiential learning theory holds that learning arises from a cycle of concrete experience and reflection (Kolb, 1984). Training that combines theory with hands-on practice, adequate tools and a practicable trade offers more concrete experience than lectures alone. Second, self-efficacy theory identifies mastery experiences as an important source of perceived capability (Bandura, 1977).

If graduates experienced practical training as authentic, they may judge themselves more capable of performing in work settings. Together, these ideas make a positive association between perceived practical delivery and perceived work readiness plausible. The argument is one of plausibility, not a prediction that these data can confirm causally. Graduates who feel generally confident may also rate both their training and themselves more generously, and unmeasured characteristics may be related to both sets of ratings.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Secondary-Analysis Statement

The study is a cross-sectional quantitative secondary analysis of an existing questionnaire dataset. The same 100 responses were used in a related study of entrepreneurship education and perceived graduate employability at DELSU (Oghaju, n.d.). No new data were collected, and no data were estimated or imputed. The analysis was planned after the questionnaire wording was inspected, but it was not pre-registered, and the data had already been analysed for a different purpose.

Participants and Sampling

The dataset contains 100 responses from DELSU graduates. According to related study, respondents were selected by non-probability (purposive and convenience) sampling from graduates of the 2023/2024 academic session, and responses were exported from an online form. Respondents comprised 52 men and 48 women; 3 were under 20 years old, 38 were aged 20 to 24, 42 were aged 25 to 29 and 17 were 30 or older. The sample describes these graduates only. The findings should not be statistically generalised to all DELSU graduates or to graduates of other universities. Participants were recruited through Google Forms. The author confirmed that 100 individuals were contacted and all 100 responded; workbook timestamps show data collection from 12 to 28 October 2026, giving a 100% response rate.

Instrument and Operational Definitions

Responses were recorded on a five-point agreement scale (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Undecided = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly Agree = 5). Table 1 lists the items analysed and the construct to which each was assigned. *Perceived practical delivery* is the mean of five items concerning whether training was practical rather than theoretical,

combined theory with hands-on practice, was supported by adequate tools and facilities, trained graduates in a trade they can practise, and trained them in specific trades or crafts. *Perceived work readiness* is the mean of seven items covering the skills employers require, communication, teamwork, adaptability, problem-solving, confidence of securing a job, and overall readiness. Both are graduates' self-reports. The study did not observe teaching, audit facilities, or measure actual employment, income, employer evaluations or job performance.

The *tools-and-facilities indicator* is the single item "DELSU provides adequate tools and facilities for practical vocational training" (PD3). It is one questionnaire item, not a separate validated scale, and it is also one of the five items in the practical-delivery composite. A self-employment item (SEP) was left out of the work-readiness composite because it concerns perceived capability to create a job, which is conceptually distinct from readiness for wage employment. An item on whether graduates can earn a living from skills acquired in seminars (LIV) is outcome-oriented and was not included in either composite; it is described in Table 3 but is not analysed inferentially here.

The five practical-delivery items were drawn from three blocks of the original questionnaire (programmes, vocational lectures and seminars). Two items refer to "lectures," and others to "programmes" or "seminars." The composite is therefore a pragmatic summary of practice-oriented items, not a validated scale of a single theoretical construct.

Data Preparation

Responses were coded numerically as above. Three entries among the analysed items used non-standard capitalisation (for example, "Strongly disagree") and were mapped to the same category; no value was left unmapped, no values were missing, and no case was excluded from the main analysis. Composite scores are the mean of their items on the original 1 to 5 metric. The workbook audit found 100 complete response records across the 12 analysed items, no exact duplicate rows or duplicate timestamps, and three lower-case response variants that were standardized before coding.

Reliability and Measurement Limitations

Internal consistency of each composite was estimated with Cronbach's (1951) alpha. Alpha indicates how consistently items vary together; it is not evidence of validity, and it does not show that the items measure a single construct. The practical-delivery composite was assembled after the data were collected, from items placed in different questionnaire sections, and the work-readiness composite was assembled from the employability block of the questionnaire. Readiness ratings were also expected to sit near the top of the scale (see Results), which limits their capacity to discriminate among graduates.

Statistical Analysis

Analyses were carried out in Python. Item frequencies, means, standard deviations and percentage agreement (Agree or Strongly Agree) are descriptive; percentage agreement does not imply a validated cut-off. For H_{01}, the association between the two composites was estimated with Pearson's r (with a Fisher-transformed 95% confidence interval) and Spearman's ρ, the latter because the composites are bounded and derived from ordinal items. A simple linear regression of perceived work readiness on perceived practical delivery gave the slope in scale points. Because the outcome is bounded and close to ceiling, constant error variance cannot be assumed, so the slope's confidence interval and p value are based on heteroscedasticity-consistent (HC3) standard errors, with ordinary least squares (OLS) values shown for

comparison. Residual diagnostics gave Shapiro–Wilk W = .976, p = .066; Breusch–Pagan LM = 4.54, p = .033; and White LM = 4.92, p = .086. The largest absolute externally studentized residual was 2.59 and the maximum Cook's D was .279. For H_{02}, the association between the single tools-and-facilities item and the work-readiness composite was tested with Spearman's ρ, which suits a single five-category item. To describe how the other four items compare, Spearman correlations were also computed for each practical-delivery item and adjusted with the Holm procedure across the five tests. For both hypotheses, the significance level was .05, two-tailed.

With $N = 100$, the design has 80% power to detect a correlation of about $|r| = .28$ ($\alpha = .05$, two-tailed), so smaller associations could be missed. *P* values are interpreted alongside estimates and confidence intervals, not as stand-alone indicators of importance (Wasserstein & Lazar, 2016). Because sampling was non-probability, inferential statistics describe the sampled graduates and are not statements about a population.

RESULTS

Sample Description

The analysed sample comprised 100 graduates (52 men, 48 women), 80% of whom were aged between 20 and 29 years. All 100 respondents provided complete responses on the analysed items.

Item-Level Findings on Perceived Practical Delivery

Table 2 shows the distribution of responses to the five practical-delivery items. Graduates agreed with all five statements more often than they disagreed, but a substantial minority did not agree. Agreement ranged from 64% for adequate tools and facilities (PD3) to 72% for hands-on practice within vocational lectures (PD2). Between 17% and 24% disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement, and between 7% and 19% were undecided. The tools-and-facilities item had the lowest mean (3.61) and the largest undecided share (19%).

Work-readiness ratings were uniformly high (Table 3). Every readiness item had a mean of 4.20 or above, and between 90% and 98% of respondents agreed with each. The overall readiness item (WR7) had the highest mean (4.50) and the item on having the skills employers require (WR1) the lowest (4.20). The self-employment item (SEP) resembled the readiness items ($M = 4.35$; 91% agreement). In contrast, the livelihood item (LIV) had the lowest mean of all items analysed (3.49; 59% agreement; 27% disagreement).

Composite Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency

Table 4 presents the composites. The five-item perceived practical delivery composite had $M = 3.69$ ($SD = 0.86$) and Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$. The seven-item perceived work readiness composite had $M = 4.38$ ($SD = 0.49$) and $\alpha = .88$. Both alpha values are conventionally regarded as acceptable to good internal consistency, which is not evidence of validity. The spread of work readiness was far narrower than that of practical delivery, consistent with the ceiling pattern visible at item level.

Research Question 1 and Hypothesis 1: Composite Association

Higher perceived practical delivery was associated with higher perceived work readiness (Table 5). The Pearson correlation was $r = .30$ (95% CI [.10, .46], $p = .003$), and the rank-based correlation was of similar size (Spearman $\rho = .35$, $p < .001$). The confidence interval for *r* runs from about .10 to .46, so the data are compatible with anything from a small to a moderate association. H_{01} was rejected at the .05 level: in this sample, the relationship was statistically significant and positive.

In the simple regression, the slope of work readiness on practical delivery was B = 0.169 (HC3 SE = 0.066, 95% CI [0.038, 0.300], p = .012; OLS SE = 0.055, p = .003), with R^2 = .087, F(1, 98) = 9.32. In practical terms, a one-point higher practical-delivery score was associated with a work-readiness score 0.17 points higher, and a difference of one standard deviation in practical delivery (0.86 points) corresponded to a difference of about 0.15 points in work readiness, roughly 0.30 standard deviations of the outcome. Practical delivery shared 8.7% of the variance in work readiness; most of the variation in work readiness was unrelated to it. Because the outcome is bounded and near ceiling, a linear model is a simplification, and the rank correlation is a check on that simplification; it points in the same direction.

Research Question 2 and Hypothesis 2: Tools and Facilities

The tools-and-facilities item (PD3) had the lowest agreement among the five practical-delivery items (64%) and the strongest rank correlation with the work-readiness composite (ρ = .386, p < .001; approximate 95% CI [.20, .55], from the Fisher transformation with the Bonett–Wright standard error applied to the reported ρ and N). This single-item test was unadjusted. In the five-item comparison in Table 6, the Holm-adjusted p for this item was also below .001. H_{02} was rejected at the .05 level.

The other four items had rank correlations with work readiness between .24 and .27 (Table 6), all below .05 after Holm adjustment. The five coefficients overlap and come from one small sample, so differences among them are not interpreted as evidence that one aspect of delivery matters more than another.

Sensitivity Analyses

Sensitivity analyses were consistent in direction with the main association. With a six-item work-readiness composite excluding the global item, Pearson r = .281, p = .005, and Spearman ρ = .333, p < .001. Excluding the 10 respondents who gave identical answers across all 12 analysed items left N = 90 and yielded r = .239, p = .023, and ρ = .290, p = .006. Adjustment for gender and age group gave a positive practical-delivery slope (B = .176, HC3 95% CI [.041, .310], p = .010). Leave-one-item-out slopes ranged from .146 to .176, all p ≤ .021.

Discussion

Principal Findings

Graduates in this sample rated the practical delivery of their entrepreneurship training moderately favourably, with roughly two-thirds to three-quarters agreeing with each practice-oriented statement and the weakest agreement for tools and facilities. They rated their own work readiness considerably higher. Within that picture, graduates who rated practical delivery more highly also tended to rate themselves as more ready for work. The association was modest (r = .30; ρ = .35) and shared under a tenth of the variance.

What the Association Can and Cannot Show

The direction of the association is what experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984) and self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977) would lead one to expect: graduates who experienced more hands-on, equipped and practisable training may feel more capable. The data cannot show that, and several other accounts fit a modest correlation equally well. Graduates who feel generally confident may rate both their training and themselves more generously; respondents who already felt ready may remember their training more favourably; and prior experience, field of study or personal

attributes may be related to both ratings. Both sets of ratings came from the same people on the same questionnaire, so shared method variance may inflate the association (Podsakoff et al., 2003, 2012). Conversely, the ceiling on work readiness restricts variation and may attenuate it. The result is best read as a description of how these ratings vary together in this sample.

Facilities and Hands-On Practice

The tools-and-facilities item had the lowest agreement and the largest share of undecided responses, and it had the strongest rank correlation with work readiness among the five items. Because the five coefficients are close, they overlap substantially, and the item is a single indicator from one small sample, this is a pointer for further investigation, not evidence that facilities matter more than other aspects of delivery. It is noteworthy, however, that the aspect of delivery that depends most on institutional resources, and that graduates rated least favourably, is also the one most strongly associated with readiness in these data. This resonates with the concern about investment in education and technical skills raised in Nigerian qualitative work (Ezeani, 2018), though the present data neither test nor confirm that account.

High Readiness and Lower Livelihood Confidence

Two features of the outcome data deserve attention. First, work readiness was rated so highly that the composite offers little room to discriminate among graduates. The readiness items are general competencies (communication, teamwork, adaptability, problem-solving), which respondents may find easy to endorse about themselves; they say little about whether employers would agree (Moore & Morton, 2017). Second, the one item tied to the seminars and to income, whether graduates can earn a living from the skills acquired, was the lowest-rated item in the analysed set (59% agreement). Graduates therefore appear to feel ready as persons without being equally sure that the specific skills they were trained in can be turned into income. This reading is tentative, because the two kinds of item measure different things and the livelihood item was not analysed inferentially here.

Relation to the Related Study

The present results should not be taken as independent confirmation of the related study (Oghaju, n.d.). They use the same respondents and a subset of the same items. What this article adds is a narrower view: it isolates practice-oriented items, separates wage-employment readiness from self-employment confidence, and reports estimates with confidence intervals for one focused association and one single-item association.

Implications for Business Administration Curriculum and Skills Development

The following are suggestions for consideration. The study did not test whether any of them would change graduates' perceptions or outcomes.

First, practical resources could be reviewed before further content is added. Tools and facilities received the least agreement, and the item was most strongly associated with readiness. A facilities and equipment review, using records and instructor input as well as graduate opinion, would show whether the perception reflects a real shortfall.

Second, assessed practice could be built into entrepreneurship and vocational courses. Between 28% and 36% of respondents did not agree (they disagreed or were undecided) with each of the practice-oriented statements. Supervised projects, workshop sessions or venture simulations carrying course credit would make practice a defined part of the curriculum, in line with calls for reflection and

real-world experience in entrepreneurship teaching (Kassean et al., 2015; Neck & Greene, 2011).

Third, skills training could be connected to income generation. Only 59% agreed that seminar skills could earn them a living. Seminars could pair trade or craft training with costing, pricing, record-keeping and market access, subjects that sit naturally within Business Administration.

Fourth, programmes could track what graduates do, not only what they say. Perceived readiness was near ceiling, so it cannot separate graduates who are well prepared from those who are not. Graduate tracer studies and employer feedback would supply the outcomes that self-reports cannot.

Fifth, a short monitoring instrument could be validated. The five practical-delivery items could be developed into a brief programme-monitoring tool once their wording, dimensionality and relation to objective outcomes have been examined in a larger and more varied sample.

Limitations and Future Research

The sample is 100 graduates from one university, selected non-probabilistically, so results describe these respondents and cannot be generalised to all DELSU graduates or to other institutions. The data are cross-sectional, so no causal or temporal claims are possible.

Both the practical-delivery and work-readiness ratings are graduates' own, given in one sitting; shared method variance, social desirability and general positivity may inflate the association (Podsakoff et al., 2003, 2012), while the ceiling in the readiness ratings may attenuate it. Work readiness is perceived, not demonstrated: no employment, employer assessment, earnings or tested skills were measured.

The practical-delivery composite was assembled after the fact from five existing items that refer to programmes, lectures and seminars and sit in different questionnaire sections. Cronbach's alpha shows internal consistency, not validity. The questionnaire was reviewed by a reviewer identified as "Dr" at an institution in Ekpoma, but item development and review criteria remain undocumented; no pilot test was conducted. The tools-and-facilities indicator is a single item, so its reliability cannot be estimated and it may reflect a general impression of the institution as much as facilities specifically. The same respondents were used in the related study and the analysis was not pre-registered, which leaves room for analytic flexibility. With $N = 100$, only correlations of about .28 or larger were detectable with 80% power, and the confidence interval for the main association is wide. Sensitivity analyses were reproduced and are reported in Results; recruitment and data-collection details are reported in Methodology.

Future research could use probability or multi-institution samples, validated and pre-specified measures of practical delivery, longitudinal designs that follow graduates into the labour market, and objective or employer-reported outcomes, so that the questions this article can only describe could be examined with stronger designs.

CONCLUSION

In this secondary analysis of 100 DELSU graduates, perceived practical delivery of entrepreneurship education was positively but modestly associated with self-reported work readiness, and the single item on tools and facilities, the lowest-rated aspect of delivery, showed the strongest item-level association. Graduates were least positive about tools and facilities and about being able to earn a living

from seminar skills, while rating their own readiness very highly. Because the data are cross-sectional, self-reported and drawn from a non-probability sample at one university, the results do not show that practical delivery produces work readiness or employment, and they cannot be generalised to all DELSU graduates. The findings justify a closer look at practical resources and at the link between skills training and income in Business Administration curricula, ideally with objective outcome data and a validated instrument.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215.

Bell, R., & Bell, H. (2020). Applying educational theory to develop a framework to support the delivery of experiential entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 27*(6), 987–1004. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-01-2020-0012

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Dacre Pool, L., & Sewell, P. (2007). The key to employability: Developing a practical model of graduate employability. *Education + Training, 49*(4), 277–289. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910710754435

Ezeani, E. (2018). Barriers to graduate employment and entrepreneurship in Nigeria. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 10*(3), 428–446. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-02-2017-0009

Kassean, H., Vanevenhoven, J., Liguori, E., & Winkel, D. E. (2015). Entrepreneurship education: A need for reflection, real-world experience and action. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 21*(5), 690–708. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-07-2014-0123

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.

Lackéus, M. (2020). Comparing the impact of three different experiential approaches to entrepreneurship in education. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 26*(5), 937–971. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-04-2018-0236

Moore, T., & Morton, J. (2017). The myth of job readiness? Written communication, employability, and the "skills gap" in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(3), 591–609. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1067602

Morgan, T., & Kim, K. B. (2024, November). Navigating Nigeria's economic and labour market challenges: Pathways to inclusive growth and structural transformation (ILO Brief). International Labour Organization. https://doi.org/10.54394/NABP6637

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

National Bureau of Statistics. (2024). Nigeria labour force report statistics: 2024 Q2.

https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/pdfuploads/NLFS_Q2_2024.pdf

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

Oghaju, S. O. (n.d.). *Entrepreneurship education and perceived graduate employability: A study of selected 2023/2024 graduates from Delta State University, Abraka* [Unpublished undergraduate project]. Department of Business Administration, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology, 63*, 539–569. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452

Tomlinson, M. (2017). Forms of graduate capital and their relationship to graduate employability. *Education + Training, 59*(4), 338–352. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-05-2016-0090

Wasserstein, R. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2016). The ASA statement on *p*-values: Context, process, and purpose. *The American Statistician, 70*(2), 129–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2016.1154108

Yorke, M. (2006). *Employability in higher education: What it is – what it is not*. Higher Education Academy. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/employability-higher-education-what-it-what-it-not

Table 1
Items Analysed and Construct Mapping

Construct	Item (as worded in the questionnaire)
Perceived practical delivery (PD)	PD1: The programmes were practical and not only theoretical.
	PD2: The vocational lectures I attended combined theory with hands-on practice.
	PD3: My institution provides adequate tools and facilities for practical vocational training.
	PD4: The lectures trained me in a trade or occupation that I can practise after graduation.
	PD5: The seminars trained me in specific trades or crafts (for example, tailoring, catering, ICT skills or crafts).
Perceived work readiness (WR)	WR1: I have the skills that employers require for the job I want.
	WR2: I communicate effectively in speaking and in writing.
	WR3: I can work well in a team.
	WR4: I can adapt easily to new work conditions and tasks.
	WR5: I can solve problems and make decisions at work.
	WR6: I am confident that I can secure a job after graduation.
	WR7: Overall, I feel ready for the world of work.
Reported separately	SEP: I am able to create my own job or business if paid employment is not available.
	LIV: I can earn a living from the skills I acquired through the seminars.

Note. All items use a five-point agreement scale. PD3 is the tools-and-facilities indicator used for Hypothesis 2; it is a single item and is also part of the PD composite. SEP and LIV are not part of either composite.

Table 2

Perceived Practical Delivery: Response Counts and Item Statistics (N = 100)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	*M*	*SD*	% Agree
PD1 Programmes practical, not only theoretical	4	19	10	39	28	3.68	1.19	67
PD2 Lectures combined theory with hands-on practice	3	15	10	44	28	3.79	1.10	72
PD3 Adequate tools and facilities	3	14	19	47	17	3.61	1.02	64
PD4 Trained in a trade I can practise	4	20	7	48	21	3.62	1.14	69
PD5 Seminars trained me in trades or crafts	3	16	10	46	25	3.74	1.10	71

Note. Columns 1–5 are counts for Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. % Agree = Agree + Strongly Agree. Means, standard deviations and percentages were recomputed from the counts.

Table 3

Work-Readiness Items and Separately Reported Items: Response Counts and Item Statistics (N = 100)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	*M*	*SD*	% Agree
WR1 Skills employers require	0	1	9	59	31	4.20	0.64	90
WR2 Communicate effectively	1	2	1	47	49	4.41	0.71	96
WR3 Work well in a team	1	0	1	47	51	4.47	0.63	98
WR4 Adapt to new conditions	1	0	3	54	42	4.36	0.64	96
WR5 Solve problems, make decisions	0	0	2	53	45	4.43	0.54	98
WR6 Confident of securing a job	0	2	6	50	42	4.32	0.68	92
WR7 Overall ready for work	0	0	8	34	58	4.50	0.64	92
SEP Can create own job or business	0	0	9	47	44	4.35	0.64	91
LIV Can earn a living from seminar skills	7	20	14	35	24	3.49	1.25	59

Note. Coding as in Table 2. SEP and LIV are reported separately and are not part of the work-readiness composite.

Table 4

Composite Scores: Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency (N = 100)

Composite	Items	Cronbach's α	*M*	*SD*
Perceived practical delivery	5	.83	3.69	0.86
Perceived work readiness	7	.88	4.38	0.49

Note. Composite scores are item means on the 1–5 scale. Alpha indicates internal consistency only and is not evidence of validity.

Table 5

Association Between Perceived Practical Delivery and Perceived Work Readiness (N = 100)

Statistic	Value
Pearson *r* [95% CI]	.295 [.104, .464], p = .003
Spearman ρ	.354, p < .001
Slope *B* (work readiness on practical delivery), OLS *SE*	0.169, SE = 0.055, p = .003
Slope *B*, HC3 robust *SE* [95% CI]	0.169, SE = 0.066 [.038, .300], p = .012
Standardised slope	.295
R^2 (adjusted R^2)	.087 (.078); F(1, 98) = 9.32

Note. The 95% CI for *r* is a Fisher-transformed interval. The Pearson *p* value, R^2, *F*, adjusted R^2 and HC3 *p* value are internally consistent with the reported *r* and standard errors.

Table 6

Item-Level Spearman Correlations of Practical-Delivery Items With Perceived Work Readiness (N = 100)

Item	Spearman ρ	p	Holm-adjusted p
PD1 Programmes practical	.237	.018	.029
PD2 Lectures with hands-on practice	.271	.006	.025
PD3 Tools and facilities	.386	< .001	< .001
PD4 Trade I can practise	.272	.006	.025
PD5 Seminar trades or crafts	.244	.015	.029

Note. Holm adjustment is across the five item-level tests. The unadjusted PD3 result is the test of Hypothesis 2. Differences among the coefficients are not interpreted.