HYBRID LEARNING AS A TRANSFORMATIVE PATHWAY: SUPERIOR OUTCOMES OF INTEGRATED FORMAL EDUCATION AND APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING FOR NIGERIAN YOUTH ENTREPRENEURS

ERHIMU, Kathleen Omamode
Department of Business Administration, Unicaf university, Zambia
erhimuk@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study examined the effectiveness of integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship training to enhance youth entrepreneurial outcomes in Nigeria, addressing systemic barriers and formalization challenges. Employing a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, quantitative data were collected from 595 youth entrepreneurs (aged 21-35) across six locations (Lagos, Onitsha, Rivers State, Abuja, Kano, and others) using a 49-item structured questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale. Qualitative data were gathered via semi-structured interviews with 15 purposively selected participants. Quantitative analysis utilized SPSS and AMOS for descriptive statistics, t-tests, ANOVA, chi-square, correlation, multiple regression, and structural equation modeling. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis with NVivo. Findings indicate strong support for hybrid models (composite M=4.40), which yield superior venture viability (M=4.28 vs. 3.49 for education-only), 84.6% three-year survival rates (vs. 53.9% education-only), 27.3% annual revenue growth, and 5.1 average employees. Formalization intentions rise 88% under integrated incentive packages, with hybrid training increasing odds by 120%. The study concludes that hybrid learning bridges theory-practice gaps, fostering resilient, scalable ventures, while incentive frameworks can double formalization rates from 31.4%. Recommendations include mandating hybrid curricula with private sector partnerships, phased tax holidays and simplified registration, coordinated ecosystem support targeting demographics, and standardized metrics for program evaluation.

Introduction

Youth entrepreneurship has emerged as a central policy and academic concern across developing economies, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where demographic transitions intersect with persistent unemployment, underemployment, and economic informality. Nigeria, Africa's most populous nation, exemplifies this challenge. With over 70 percent of its population under the age of 30, the country faces mounting pressure to create sustainable livelihood opportunities for young people in an economy unable to absorb new labor market entrants through wage employment alone

(World Bank, 2022). In response, entrepreneurship has increasingly been positioned as a strategic pathway for youth economic inclusion, poverty reduction, and long-term economic transformation (Agyapong et al., 2020; Nwokolo & Eze, 2021).

Despite widespread policy endorsement and high rates of youth entrepreneurial participation, evidence from Nigeria reveals a troubling paradox: while many young people engage in entrepreneurial activity, few achieve sustainable or growth-oriented outcomes. Youth-owned enterprises remain disproportionately concentrated in low-productivity sectors, experience high failure rates, and rarely transition beyond subsistence-level operations (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor [GEM], 2023). This persistent gap between entrepreneurial participation and entrepreneurial success has prompted scholars to shift attention away from entrepreneurial intention alone toward the quality of entrepreneurial capability formation, particularly the role of education and training systems in shaping entrepreneurial outcomes (Kuratko et al., 2021).

Entrepreneurship education has therefore become a dominant intervention strategy. In Nigeria, entrepreneurship education has been institutionalized across universities, polytechnics, and vocational institutions, often as a compulsory component of undergraduate curricula. These programs aim to equip youth with business knowledge, managerial skills, and innovative mindsets required for venture creation. However, a growing body of empirical research suggests that formal entrepreneurship education in Nigeria remains largely theoretical, emphasizing classroom instruction, business plan writing, and abstract managerial concepts with limited exposure to real-world entrepreneurial practice (Nabi et al., 2018; Lorz et al., 2021). As a result, many graduates emerge with conceptual awareness but lack the practical competencies, networks, and adaptive skills necessary to navigate Nigeria's volatile entrepreneurial environment.

In contrast, Nigeria possesses long-standing indigenous apprenticeship systems, most notably the Igbo Apprenticeship System, which emphasize experiential learning, mentorship, gradual capital accumulation, and immersion in commercial practice. These systems have historically produced successful entrepreneurs by embedding learning within lived business contexts and leveraging strong social capital networks (Hoermle et al., 2023). Apprentices acquire tacit knowledge, negotiation skills, risk management capabilities, and market intuition that are difficult to transmit through formal instruction alone. Yet, apprenticeship systems are often informal, uneven in quality, and disconnected from modern business knowledge, technological innovation, and regulatory compliance requirements.

The coexistence of these two parallel learning pathways, formal entrepreneurship education and informal apprenticeship training, raises a critical question for youth entrepreneurship development in Nigeria: can the integration of formal education and apprenticeship training produce superior entrepreneurial outcomes compared to either pathway in isolation? Emerging evidence from entrepreneurship education research suggests that hybrid learning models, which combine structured theoretical instruction with experiential, practice-based learning, are more effective in

developing entrepreneurial competence, resilience, and performance (Kolb, 2015; Nabi et al., 2018). However, empirical investigation of such integrated models within the Nigerian context remains limited.

From a theoretical perspective, this question aligns with human capital theory, which posits that education enhances productivity by increasing individuals' knowledge and skills (Becker, 2018). While formal education contributes to cognitive and analytical capabilities, experiential learning theories argue that knowledge is most effectively constructed through direct engagement, reflection, and practice (Kolb, 2015). Social capital theory further emphasizes the importance of networks, mentorship, and embeddedness in entrepreneurial success, elements that apprenticeship systems inherently provide (Coleman, 1988). An integrated education–apprenticeship approach therefore offers a compelling framework for addressing the multidimensional nature of entrepreneurial capability formation.

However, the Nigerian entrepreneurial ecosystem presents significant structural constraints that complicate this integration. Youth entrepreneurs operate within environments characterized by limited access to finance, inadequate infrastructure, regulatory complexity, and political and economic instability. These systemic weaknesses disproportionately affect young entrepreneurs, who typically lack collateral, experience, and institutional leverage (Stam, 2015; World Bank, 2022). Consequently, the effectiveness of any entrepreneurship training model must be evaluated not only in terms of skill acquisition but also in terms of how well it equips youth to navigate structural adversity.

Statement of the Problem

Despite extensive investment in entrepreneurship education and youth empowerment programs in Nigeria, youth entrepreneurial outcomes remain suboptimal, with high failure rates and limited business scalability. Formal entrepreneurship education has expanded rapidly, yet evidence suggests that its impact on venture survival and growth is weak due to excessive theoretical orientation and insufficient experiential grounding. Conversely, apprenticeship systems produce practical competence but often lack formal business knowledge, innovation exposure, and regulatory literacy. The absence of an empirically grounded framework that integrates the strengths of both learning pathways represents a critical gap in youth entrepreneurship development policy and practice.

Furthermore, existing research tends to examine formal education and apprenticeship training as separate or competing systems, rather than as complementary components of a unified learning model. This fragmented approach obscures understanding of how hybrid learning pathways may generate synergistic benefits that enhance entrepreneurial resilience, adaptability, and performance. In the Nigerian context, where youth entrepreneurs face severe structural and demographic barriers, this gap is particularly consequential. Without evidence-based integration

strategies, policy interventions risk perpetuating ineffective training models that fail to translate entrepreneurial participation into sustainable outcomes.

Research Questions

RQ1: To what extent can a synergistic approach integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship experiences effectively mitigate identified weaknesses and enhance the viability, sustainability, and growth potential of youth-led businesses in Africa?

RQ2: What are the core components of a strategic framework necessary to foster the voluntary and gradual formalization of youth entrepreneurs, effectively addressing both incentive structures for formalization and the reduction of administrative and financial burdens?

Hypotheses

H_{03}: Integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship training does not lead to a statistically significant improvement in the viability, survival rates, and success indicators of youth-led ventures compared to existing single-pathway programs (either education alone or apprenticeship alone).

H_{04}: A strategic framework designed to incentivize formalization through reduced burdens and enhanced benefits does not result in a statistically significant increase in the rate of voluntary business registration among youth entrepreneurs compared to current formalization rates.

Methodology

Research Design

The study adopted a mixed-methods research design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine the determinants of youth entrepreneurial success in Nigeria and to develop a robust success model for youth entrepreneurship. The choice of a mixed-methods design was informed by the complex and multidimensional nature of entrepreneurship, which involves measurable structural factors as well as subjective experiences and contextual realities. By combining quantitative and qualitative methods, the study was able to generate both breadth and depth of understanding, thereby enhancing the explanatory power of the findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Specifically, the study employed a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, in which quantitative survey data and qualitative interview data were collected concurrently, analyzed separately, and later integrated during interpretation. This design enabled triangulation of findings and reduced the methodological weaknesses associated with reliance on a single data source. The pragmatic research paradigm underpinning this design allowed the researcher to prioritize research questions over methodological rigidity, ensuring that the most appropriate tools were used to address the study objectives.

Population, Sample Size, and Sampling Technique

The population of the study comprised youth entrepreneurs aged between 21 and 35 years who owned and managed business ventures in Nigeria. The study focused on youth-owned enterprises that had operated for not more than five years, as early-stage ventures are most susceptible to failure and are directly influenced by entrepreneurial capability formation and ecosystem conditions. Both formal and informal sector entrepreneurs were included to reflect the structure of Nigeria's entrepreneurial landscape.

A total sample size of 595 youth entrepreneurs participated in the quantitative phase of the study. This sample size was considered adequate for multivariate statistical analysis, including regression analysis and structural equation modeling, as recommended in entrepreneurship research (Hair et al., 2019). The respondents were drawn from six major entrepreneurial locations in Nigeria, Lagos, Onitsha, Rivers State, Abuja, Kano, and other emerging commercial centers, selected to ensure regional diversity and representativeness. The study employed systematic random sampling for the quantitative component. This technique minimized selection bias and ensured that entrepreneurs across different sectors, gender categories, and locations had equal probability of inclusion. For the qualitative component, purposive sampling was used to select 15 youth entrepreneurs for in-depth interviews. Maximum variation sampling ensured diversity in gender, education level, geographic location, and business sector, enabling rich comparative insights.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using two primary instruments: a structured questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide. The structured questionnaire was designed to collect quantitative data on demographic characteristics, entrepreneurial education and apprenticeship exposure, systemic barriers, ecosystem support, and business outcomes. The instrument consisted of 49 items arranged across multiple sections and measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *Strongly Agree (5)* to *Strongly Disagree (1)*. The questionnaire items were adapted from validated instruments in entrepreneurship and education research, including constructs grounded in the Theory of Planned Behaviour and entrepreneurial ecosystem frameworks (Ajzen, 1991; Stam, 2015).

The semi-structured interview guide comprised 18 open-ended questions aligned with the research questions. It explored participants' lived experiences regarding formal education, apprenticeship training, mentorship, access to finance, regulatory challenges, and business survival strategies. The flexible structure of the interview guide allowed for probing and clarification, thereby capturing nuanced insights not obtainable through survey data alone.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Content validity of the instruments was established through extensive review of relevant literature and expert evaluation. Draft versions of the questionnaire and interview guide were reviewed by

entrepreneurship scholars and practitioners, including experts affiliated with youth entrepreneurship development agencies. Their feedback ensured clarity, relevance, and contextual appropriateness of the items. Construct validity was assessed through factor analysis during data analysis, confirming that questionnaire items adequately measured the intended constructs. Convergent validity was supported by strong factor loadings, while discriminant validity was established through acceptable inter-construct correlations. The reliability of the quantitative instrument was tested using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. All constructs recorded alpha values exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70, indicating strong internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A pilot study involving 30 youth entrepreneurs was conducted prior to the main survey, leading to refinement of ambiguous items and enhancement of instrument reliability. For qualitative data, reliability was enhanced through inter-coder agreement, with thematic coding independently verified to ensure consistency and credibility of interpretations.

Procedure for Data Collection

Data collection followed ethical research standards, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymity. Quantitative data were collected using a hybrid approach, combining online questionnaires administered via Google Forms and physical questionnaires distributed at entrepreneurship hubs, markets, and business clusters. This approach maximized response rates and inclusivity, particularly for entrepreneurs with limited internet access. Qualitative data were collected through face-to-face and telephone interviews**,** depending on participant availability and geographic location. All interviews were recorded with participants' consent and later transcribed verbatim for analysis. Data collection was conducted over a three-month period to ensure adequate coverage across locations.

Method of Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS Version 27 and AMOS Version 27. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies) were used to summarize respondent characteristics and key variables. Inferential analyses included independent samples *t*-tests, one-way ANOVA, chi-square tests, correlation analysis, multiple regression, and structural equation modeling to test hypotheses and examine relationships among variables at a 0.05 significance level (Hair et al., 2019). Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach. NVivo software facilitated systematic coding and theme development. Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings was achieved through triangulation, strengthening the validity and robustness of the study's conclusions.

Analysis and Results

Normality Assessment

Normality of continuous variables was assessed using both statistical tests (Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests). Table 4.4 summarizes normality test results for key composite variables.

Table 4.4: Normality Tests for Composite Variables

Composite Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Shapiro-Wilk	Skewness	Kurtosis	Visual Inspection
Education-Apprentice	p = .061	p = .073	-0.45	0.28	Approximately normal
Formalization Index	p = .112	p = .129	-0.38	-0.15	Approximately normal

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: All skewness and kurtosis values within acceptable range of ±1.0 for approximate normality

While several variables showed statistically significant departures from normality in the highly sensitive Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (common with large samples; Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012), examination of skewness and kurtosis values revealed that all composite variables fell within the acceptable range of ±1.0 suggested by Hair et al. (2010) for parametric tests. Moreover, given the large sample size (n = 595), the Central Limit Theorem ensures that sampling distributions of means approach normality, rendering parametric tests robust to modest departures from normality (Lumley et al., 2002).

Table 4.5: Qualitative Interview Completion and Transcription Summary

Interview Characteristic	Count/Description
Participants Contacted	20
Participants Who Agreed	17
Interviews Completed	15
Interviews Not Completed (scheduling conflicts)	2
Response Rate	**75.0%**
Face-to-Face Interviews	10 (66.7%)
Telephone Interviews	3 (20.0%)
Video Conference Interviews	2 (13.3%)
Average Interview Duration	58 minutes (range: 42-87 min)

Total Recording Time	14 hours, 32 minutes
Transcription Method	Otter.ai + Manual Verification
Average Transcript Length	7,245 words (range: 5,890-9,670)
Total Corpus	108,675 words
Member Checking Completed	15/15 (100%)
Transcripts Requiring Revision	3 (minor clarifications)

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

All 15 completed interviews were audio-recorded with explicit participant consent and transcribed verbatim within 48 hours of each interview. The transcription process employed Otter.ai automated transcription software followed by manual verification by the researcher while listening to audio recordings to ensure accuracy, capture verbal nuances, and note non-verbal cues (laughter, pauses, emphasis).

Member checking was conducted by emailing transcripts to all 15 participants with a request to review for accuracy and provide clarifications or corrections within one week. All participants confirmed accuracy, with three requesting minor clarifications of technical terms or contextual details, which were incorporated into final transcripts. The high rate of member checking completion (100%) and minimal need for revisions enhance the credibility of qualitative data.

4.2.1 Age Distribution

Table 4.6 presents the age distribution of respondents, categorized into four groups spanning the youth entrepreneurship age range of 21-35 years.

Table 4.6: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
21-25 years	128	21.5	21.5
26-30 years	247	41.5	63.0
31-35 years	206	34.6	97.6
Above 35 years*	14	2.4	100.0
Total	**595**	**100.0**	-

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

*Note: *14 respondents slightly exceeded 35 years (35.2-35.8 years) but were retained as they initiated their businesses within the target age range*

Table 4.6 reveals that the majority of respondents (76.1%) fell within the 26-35 age bracket, representing entrepreneurs in their late twenties and early thirties. The largest single category comprised those aged 26-30 years (41.5%), suggesting that entrepreneurial activity peaks in this age range in Nigeria, possibly reflecting the period following completion of higher education and initial work experience. Younger entrepreneurs aged 21-25 constituted 21.5% of the sample, indicating substantial entrepreneurship activity among those in their early twenties, often driven by necessity in the absence of formal employment opportunities.

The mean age of respondents was 28.73 years (SD = 3.89), with a median of 29 years and mode of 28 years. This age distribution aligns with theoretical expectations from youth development literature, which suggests that the late twenties represent a critical period for entrepreneurial entry, combining sufficient maturity, risk tolerance, and limited family obligations (Lévesque & Minniti, 2006). The distribution also reflects Nigeria's youthful demographic structure, with approximately 70% of the population under 30 years old (National Bureau of Statistics, 2020).

4.2.2 Gender Distribution

Table 4.7 presents the gender composition of the sample.

Table 4.7: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	337	56.6
Female	258	43.4
Total	**595**	**100.0**

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

The sample comprised 337 male entrepreneurs (56.6%) and 258 female entrepreneurs (43.4%), reflecting a relatively balanced gender distribution with a moderate male predominance. This gender ratio closely approximates the national entrepreneurship demographics reported by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) for Nigeria, which indicates that male entrepreneurial activity rates exceed female rates by approximately 10-15 percentage points (GEM, 2022). The substantial representation of female entrepreneurs (43.4%) in the sample is noteworthy and higher than observed in many African contexts, possibly reflecting increasing women's participation in entrepreneurship driven by economic necessity, policy interventions targeting female entrepreneurs, and changing social norms (Adom & Anambane, 2020).

The gender distribution enables robust statistical comparisons between male and female entrepreneurs regarding perceived barriers, support needs, and business outcomes, directly addressing Research Question 2's focus on demographic disparities.

4.2.6 Geographic Distribution

Table 4.11 presents the geographic distribution of respondents across the five primary study locations and the "Others" category.

Table 4.11: Geographic Location of Respondents

Location	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Urban/Rural Classification
Lagos	166	27.9	Urban
Onitsha (Anambra)	130	21.8	Urban
Rivers State	89	15.0	Mixed Urban-Rural
Abuja (FCT)	77	12.9	Urban
Kano	113	19.0	Urban
Others	20	3.4	Mixed
Total	**595**	**100.0**	-

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Table 4.11 demonstrates geographic diversity across Nigeria's major commercial and entrepreneurial hubs. Lagos, Nigeria's commercial capital and Africa's largest city, accounted for the largest proportion (27.9%), reflecting its status as the epicenter of entrepreneurial activity with relatively developed infrastructure, access to markets, and support systems. Onitsha (21.8%) represents the Southeast's commercial prowess, known for its extensive trading networks and strong apprenticeship culture rooted in Igbo entrepreneurial traditions.

Kano (19.0%), the largest city in Northern Nigeria, represents Islamic commercial culture and cross-border trade dynamics. Rivers State (15.0%), centered on Port Harcourt, reflects the Niger Delta's oil-based economy with diverse service sector entrepreneurship. Abuja (12.9%), as the seat of government, represents policy-influenced entrepreneurship and public sector linkages.

The "Others" category (3.4%) includes respondents from neighboring states or those who relocated after business establishment but met inclusion criteria. This geographic distribution ensures representation across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones (excluding the Northeast due to security concerns), capturing variations in entrepreneurial ecosystems, infrastructure quality, cultural norms, and policy environments critical for addressing Research Question 2.

Education-Apprenticeship Synergy (Research Question 3)

Table 4.16 presents descriptive statistics assessing the perceived effectiveness of integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship experiences.

Table 4.16: Descriptive Statistics for Education-Apprenticeship Synergy

Descriptive Statistics for Education–Apprenticeship Items

Item Code	Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
D1	Combining formal education with apprenticeship is more effective than either alone	4.47	0.71	Agree
D2	Practical apprenticeships better prepare youth for entrepreneurial realities	4.38	0.75	Agree
D3	Curriculum blending theory with mandatory apprenticeship increases venture viability	4.51	0.68	Strongly Agree
D4	Apprenticeship models effectively develop problem-solving and resilience	4.29	0.78	Agree
D5	University–private sector partnerships for apprenticeships are crucial	4.42	0.73	Agree
D6	Integrated program graduates more likely to sustain businesses beyond startup phase	4.33	0.76	Agree
D7	Synergistic approach effectively teaches navigation of local African business context	4.41	0.72	Agree
Composite Score: Education–Apprenticeship	—	**4.40**	**0.55**	**Agree**

Source. Field Survey Data (2025).

Key: SA = Strongly Agree (5), A = Agree (4), U = Undecided (1), D = Disagree (3), SD = Strongly Disagree (2).

Decision Rule: 1–1.49 = Undecided; 1.5–2.49 = Strongly Disagree; 2.5–3.49 = Disagree; 3.5–4.49 = Agree; 4.5–5.0 = Strongly Agree

Table 4.16 reveals exceptionally strong support for integrated education-apprenticeship approaches, with the composite score of 4.40 (SD = 0.55) representing the highest among all six thematic sections. Item D3, advocating for curriculum integration with mandatory apprenticeship components, achieved the highest individual score (M = 4.51, SD = 0.68), reaching the threshold for "Strongly Agree" interpretation. This finding suggests youth entrepreneurs believe structured integration rather than optional or voluntary apprenticeship supplements would most effectively enhance venture preparation.

Item D1 (M = 4.47, SD = 0.71) directly addresses the core research premise, with strong agreement that synergistic approaches surpass single-pathway models. This perception holds across respondents regardless of their own educational backgrounds or apprenticeship experiences, indicating recognition that both theoretical knowledge and practical skills are essential for entrepreneurial success. The endorsement transcends self-interest; even highly educated respondents without apprenticeship backgrounds acknowledged its value, while those with apprenticeship experience recognized limitations of purely experiential learning.

University-private sector partnerships (Item D5: M = 4.42, SD = 0.73) and contextual relevance for African business environments (Item D7: M = 4.41, SD = 0.72) received nearly equivalent strong support. The emphasis on partnerships reflects awareness that educational institutions alone cannot provide authentic business experiences and that private sector engagement is essential for quality apprenticeship placements and mentorship.

Practical apprenticeships' superiority in preparing youth for entrepreneurial realities (Item D2: M = 4.38, SD = 0.75) and their effectiveness in developing adaptive capabilities (Item D4: M = 4.29, SD = 0.78) underscore that respondents value experiential learning's role in building resilience, problem-solving skills, and tacit knowledge difficult to transmit through classroom instruction alone.

The belief that integrated program graduates would demonstrate superior business sustainability (Item D6: M = 4.33, SD = 0.76) indicates confidence that hybrid models produce more capable, better-prepared entrepreneurs rather than simply imparting credentials. This perception validates the study's hypothesis regarding education-apprenticeship synergy's positive relationship with venture viability.

The consistently high means (4.29–4.51) and narrow standard deviations (0.68–0.78) across all seven items indicate remarkable consensus, suggesting that the education-apprenticeship integration concept resonates strongly across diverse entrepreneur profiles. This strong endorsement provides empirical support for policy recommendations emphasizing hybrid model development.

4.3.4 Section E: Core Components for Gradual Formalization (Research Question 4)

Table 4.17 presents descriptive statistics examining preferred components and incentives for facilitating voluntary business formalization among youth entrepreneurs.

Table 4.17: Descriptive Statistics for Formalization Framework Components

Descriptive Statistics for Formalization Framework Items

Item Code	Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
E1	Simplified single-window registration would strongly incentivize formalization	4.36	0.74	Agree
E2	Tax incentives and holidays for newly registered businesses encourage formalization	4.44	0.71	Agree
E3	Linking public procurement access to registration motivates formalization	4.18	0.82	Agree
E4	Gradual formalization with increasing benefits is more realistic than immediate compliance	4.29	0.76	Agree

E5	Integrating formalization education into training programs is essential	4.11	0.84	Agree
E6	Reducing compliance costs is more critical than punitive measures	4.38	0.73	Agree
E7	Access to formal financial services (loans, insurance) motivates registration	4.41	0.72	Agree
Composite Score: Formalization Framework	—	**4.31**	**0.59**	**Agree**

Source. Field Survey Data (2025).

Key: SA = Strongly Agree (5), A = Agree (4), U = Undecided (1), D = Disagree (3), SD = Strongly Disagree (2).

Decision Rule: 1–1.49 = Undecided; 1.5–2.49 = Strongly Disagree; 2.5–3.49 = Disagree; 3.5–4.49 = Agree; 4.5–5.0 = Strongly Agree

Table 4.17 demonstrates strong agreement regarding specific mechanisms that would incentivize voluntary business formalization, with the composite score of 4.31 (SD = 0.59) indicating youth entrepreneurs clearly articulate preferred formalization pathways. Item E2, addressing tax incentives and holidays for newly registered businesses, received the highest endorsement (M = 4.44, SD = 0.71). This finding suggests financial incentives particularly tax relief during vulnerable startup phases would be the most compelling formalization driver, as they directly address entrepreneurs' cost-benefit calculations regarding formalization.

Access to formal financial services (Item E7: M = 4.41, SD = 0.72) ranked second, reflecting that bank loans, insurance, and other financial products restricted to registered businesses represent powerful formalization motivators. Many informal entrepreneurs cite financing constraints as critical growth barriers; if formalization unlocks capital access, the benefits may outweigh compliance costs.

Reducing compliance costs over punitive enforcement (Item E6: M = 4.38, SD = 0.73) indicates youth entrepreneurs respond better to incentive-based "carrot" approaches than threat-based "stick" approaches. This preference aligns with behavioral economics insights suggesting positive reinforcement produces more sustainable compliance than coercion, particularly when informal operation has become normalized (Williams et al., 2017).

Simplified registration procedures (Item E1: M = 4.36, SD = 0.74) addresses administrative barriers, with youth entrepreneurs emphasizing that bureaucratic complexity, multiple agency requirements, and lengthy processes deter formalization. Single-window systems consolidating registration steps would remove significant friction points.

The emphasis on gradual, phased formalization (Item E4: M = 4.29, SD = 0.76) reflects pragmatism; entrepreneurs recognize that immediate full compliance with all formal sector obligations (taxation, labor regulations, accounting standards) may be unrealistic for nascent ventures with limited resources and capacity. Graduated approaches allowing progressive formalization as businesses mature and revenues grow would accommodate developmental realities.

Public procurement access (Item E3: M = 4.18, SD = 0.82) and formalization education integration (Item E5: M = 4.11, SD = 0.84), while receiving somewhat lower scores, remain firmly in the "Agree" range. Government contracts represent significant market opportunities, but access restricted to registered businesses; this creates formalization incentive, though perhaps less compelling than financial services access or tax relief. Education about formalization processes, benefits, and compliance requirements addresses knowledge gaps contributing to informal sector persistence.

The consistently strong agreement (means 4.11–4.44) and moderate standard deviations (0.71–0.84) suggest broad consensus regarding formalization framework design. These findings provide empirical guidance for policymakers developing formalization strategies, emphasizing incentive structures, cost reduction, process simplification, and graduated approaches over punitive enforcement.

4.4 Test of Assumptions

Before conducting parametric inferential statistical tests (t-tests, ANOVA, correlation, regression, SEM), it is essential to verify that data meet the underlying assumptions of these techniques. This section systematically assesses normality, homogeneity of variance, linearity, multicollinearity, and independence of observations the key assumptions underpinning parametric analyses.

4.4.1 Normality Assessment

Normality was assessed for continuous variables and composite scores using multiple methods as recommended by Razali and Wah (2011): statistical tests (Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk), skewness and kurtosis examination, and visual inspection (histograms, Q-Q plots).

Table 4.20: Tests of Normality for Composite Variables

Composite Variable	N	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Shapiro-Wilk	Skewness	Kurtosis	Assessment
		Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.	(SE=0.100)
Education-Apprentice	595	.046	.061	.984	.073	-0.45
Formalization Index	595	.039	.112	.987	.129	-0.38

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: Normality supported when Skewness and Kurtosis fall within ±1.0; p > .05 indicates non-significant departure from normality

Table 4.20 shows that the composite variables demonstrated non-significant Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (p > .05), indicating that distributions did not significantly deviate from normal distribution. However, given that these tests are highly sensitive with large samples (n = 595) and may detect trivial departures from normality (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012), additional criteria were examined. Skewness values ranged from -0.21 to -0.45 (all within ±1.0 threshold), indicating slight negative skew but within acceptable limits. Kurtosis values ranged from -0.42 to 0.28 (all within ±1.0), suggesting distributions were neither excessively peaked nor flat. According to Hair et al. (2010), skewness and kurtosis values between ±1.0 indicate acceptable approximation to normality for parametric tests. Visual inspection of histograms (Figure 4.1, not shown for brevity) confirmed approximately bell-shaped distributions for all composite variables, while Q-Q plots showed data points clustering closely around the diagonal reference line, supporting normality assumption.

Given the large sample size (n = 595), which invokes the Central Limit Theorem ensuring sampling distribution normality regardless of population distribution shape (Lumley et al., 2002), combined with acceptable skewness/kurtosis values and visual inspection confirmation, the normality assumption for parametric tests is considered satisfied.

Hypothesis Three: Education-Apprenticeship Integration and Venture Viability

H_{03}: Integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship training does not lead to a statistically significant improvement in the viability, survival rates, and success indicators of youth-led ventures compared to existing single-pathway programs (either education alone or apprenticeship alone).

Table 4.36: Descriptive Statistics for Venture Viability by Learning Pathway

Learning Pathway	N	Mean Viability Score	SD	95% CI	Min	Max
Education Only	153	3.42	0.67	[3.31, 3.53]	2.00	4.86
Apprenticeship Only	127	3.68	0.71	[3.56, 3.80]	2.14	5.00
Hybrid (Both)	289	4.21	0.63	[4.14, 4.28]	2.57	5.00
Neither (Informal)	26	2.89	0.82	[2.56, 3.22]	1.71	4.29
Total	**595**	**3.87**	**0.76**	[3.81, 3.93]	1.71	5.00

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: Venture Viability Score is composite measure of business survival likelihood, revenue stability, growth trajectory, and operational efficiency (5-point scale)

Table 4.37: One-Way ANOVA for Venture Viability by Learning Pathway

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	98.347	3	32.782	78.652	<.001	.285
Within Groups	246.328	591	0.417			
Total	344.675	594				

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Table 4.37 demonstrates highly significant differences in venture viability across learning pathways, $F(3, 591) = 78.652$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .285$. The effect size is large (28.5% of variance explained), indicating that entrepreneurial preparation pathway has substantial practical significance in predicting venture viability. This represents one of the strongest effects observed in this study.

Table 4.36 reveals that entrepreneurs with hybrid preparation (M = 4.21, SD = 0.63) demonstrated the highest venture viability, followed by apprenticeship-only (M = 3.68, SD = 0.71), education-only (M = 3.42, SD = 0.67), and neither (M = 2.89, SD = 0.82). The hybrid group exceeded education-only by 0.79 points (23.1% higher) and apprenticeship-only by 0.53 points (14.4% higher) differences representing more than one standard deviation in some cases.

Table 4.38: Tukey HSD Post-Hoc Comparisons for Learning Pathway Differences

(I) Pathway	(J) Pathway	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI	Cohen's d
Hybrid	Education Only	0.79*	0.062	<.001	[0.64, 0.94]	1.21
Hybrid	Apprenticeship Only	0.53*	0.066	<.001	[0.37, 0.69]	0.78
Hybrid	Neither	1.32*	0.135	<.001	[0.99, 1.65]	1.83
Apprenticeship Only	Education Only	0.26*	0.070	.001	[0.09, 0.43]	0.37
Apprenticeship Only	Neither	0.79*	0.139	<.001	[0.45, 1.13]	1.04
Education Only	Neither	0.53*	0.137	<.001	[0.20, 0.86]	0.72

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

*Note: * indicates $p < .05$*

Post-hoc Tukey HSD tests (Table 4.38) confirmed that all pairwise differences were statistically significant. Most critically, the hybrid approach significantly outperformed both single pathways: hybrid exceeded education-only by 0.79 points ($p < .001$, Cohen's d = 1.21, a very large effect) and apprenticeship-only by 0.53 points ($p < .001$, Cohen's d = 0.78, a large effect). These effect sizes substantially exceed conventional thresholds for practical significance.

Furthermore, apprenticeship-only entrepreneurs demonstrated significantly higher viability than education-only entrepreneurs (mean difference = 0.26, p = .001, Cohen's d = 0.37), suggesting that practical training has stronger direct effects on venture viability than theoretical knowledge alone. However, both single pathways significantly exceeded the informal ("neither") pathway, confirming that structured preparation whether educational or experiential enhances entrepreneurial outcomes.

4.5.3.2 Business Survival Rates by Learning Pathway

Table 4.39: Business Survival Rates (3+ Years) by Learning Pathway

Learning Pathway	N (Total)	Survived 3+ Years	Survival Rate (%)	χ^2	p-value
Education Only	89	48	53.9%		
Apprenticeship Only	76	51	67.1%	28.763	<.001
Hybrid (Both)	182	154	84.6%		
Neither (Informal)	18	7	38.9%		
Total	**365**	**260**	**71.2%**		

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: Analysis restricted to entrepreneurs with 3+ years business experience (n=365); Cramer's V = .281

Table 4.39 presents survival analysis for entrepreneurs whose businesses had reached the critical 3-year threshold. Chi-square analysis revealed highly significant differences in survival rates across learning pathways, $\chi^2(3, N=365) = 28.763$, $p < .001$, Cramer's V = .281. The hybrid pathway demonstrated a remarkable 84.6% survival rate, substantially exceeding apprenticeship-only (67.1%), education-only (53.9%), and neither (38.9%).

The 30.7 percentage point gap between hybrid and education-only survival rates is particularly striking, representing a 57% relative increase in survival probability. Even compared to apprenticeship-only, the hybrid approach improved survival by 17.5 percentage points (26% relative increase). These findings provide compelling evidence that integrated preparation significantly reduces early-stage failure rates a critical policy-relevant outcome given that startup mortality represents substantial resource waste and psychological costs.

4.5.3.3 Revenue Growth Rates by Learning Pathway

Table 4.40: Average Annual Revenue Growth Rates by Learning Pathway

Learning Pathway	N	Mean Growth Rate (%)	SD	Median	F	Sig.
Education Only	153	12.4%	18.6%	8.2%		
Apprenticeship Only	127	18.7%	21.3%	14.5%	24.158	<.001
Hybrid (Both)	289	27.3%	23.1%	22.8%		
Neither (Informal)	26	6.8%	15.4%	5.1%		

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: Revenue growth calculated as average annual percentage change over business lifetime; $\eta^2 = .109$

One-way ANOVA revealed significant differences in revenue growth rates, $F(3, 591) = 24.158$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .109$. Hybrid pathway entrepreneurs achieved mean annual revenue growth of 27.3% more than double the education-only rate (12.4%) and 46% higher than apprenticeship-only (18.7%). Post-hoc tests (detailed table omitted for brevity) confirmed that hybrid significantly exceeded both single pathways (all $p < .001$).

Notably, apprenticeship-only entrepreneurs achieved higher growth than education-only (18.7% vs. 12.4%, $p = .008$), reinforcing that practical skills have stronger direct effects on business performance than theoretical knowledge alone. However, the hybrid approach's superiority suggests that theoretical knowledge becomes potent when combined with practical application consistent with Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory, which posits that reflection on concrete experience produces deeper learning than either experience or theory alone.

4.5.3.4 Employment Generation by Learning Pathway

Table 4.41: Average Number of Employees by Learning Pathway

Learning Pathway	N	Mean Employees	SD	Median	% with ≥5 Employees
Education Only	153	2.8	2.1	2.0	18.3%
Apprenticeship Only	127	3.4	2.6	3.0	26.0%
Hybrid (Both)	289	5.1	3.2	4.0	47.8%
Neither (Informal)	26	1.9	1.4	2.0	7.7%

$F(3, 591) = 35.427$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .152$

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Hybrid pathway entrepreneurs employed an average of 5.1 people 82% more than education-only (2.8) and 50% more than apprenticeship-only (3.4). Nearly half (47.8%) of hybrid entrepreneurs employed 5 or more people, compared to only 18.3% of education-only and 26.0% of apprenticeship-only entrepreneurs. This employment generation difference has profound socio-economic implications; given Nigeria's youth unemployment crisis, preparation pathways that enable greater job creation multiply entrepreneurship's developmental impact beyond individual business owners.

4.5.3.5 Multiple Regression Analysis: Predicting Venture Success

To isolate the independent contribution of learning pathway while controlling for demographic and contextual factors, hierarchical multiple regression was conducted predicting a composite venture success index.

Table 4.42: Hierarchical Regression Predicting Venture Success

Model	Predictors	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F	Sig.
1	Demographics (age, gender, location, education)	.341	.116	.116	19.274	<.001
2	+ Business Experience, Sector	.428	.183	.067	21.863	<.001
3	+ Learning Pathway (dummy variables)	.612	.374	.191	58.436	<.001

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Table 4.43: Regression Coefficients (Final Model 3)

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	Sig.	95% CI
(Constant)	2.147	0.234		9.176	<.001	[1.688, 2.606]
Age	0.018	0.008	.091	2.250	.025	[0.002, 0.034]
Gender (Female=1)	-0.142	0.052	-.098	-2.731	.007	[-0.244, -0.040]
Location (Urban=1)	0.203	0.057	.126	3.561	<.001	[0.091, 0.315]
Education Level	0.089	0.029	.107	3.069	.002	[0.032, 0.146]
Business Experience	0.124	0.021	.201	5.905	<.001	[0.083, 0.165]
Sector (Service=1)	0.087	0.051	.056	1.706	.089	[-0.013, 0.187]
Hybrid (vs. Neither)	**1.247**	**0.142**	**.384**	**8.782**	**<.001**	[0.968, 1.526]
Apprenticeship Only (vs. Neither)	**0.724**	**0.148**	**.215**	**4.892**	**<.001**	[0.434, 1.014]
Education Only (vs. Neither)	**0.481**	**0.145**	**.147**	**3.317**	**.001**	[0.196, 0.766]

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: "Neither" (informal) pathway serves as reference category; N=595, Adjusted R^2=.367

Table 4.42 demonstrates that learning pathway variables (Model 3) contributed an additional 19.1% of explained variance beyond demographics and business characteristics ($\Delta R^2 = .191$, $p < .001$). The final model explained 37.4% of variance in venture success a substantial proportion for entrepreneurship research, where multiple unmeasured factors inevitably influence outcomes.

Table 4.43 reveals that after controlling for all covariates, the hybrid pathway remained the strongest predictor of venture success ($\beta = .384$, $p < .001$), with a standardized coefficient nearly double that of business experience ($\beta = .201$) and more than triple education level ($\beta = .107$). The unstandardized coefficient (B = 1.247) indicates that hybrid-trained entrepreneurs score 1.247 points higher on the 5-point success scale than informally trained entrepreneurs a 25% improvement.

Both single pathways also significantly predicted success relative to the informal pathway (apprenticeship-only: $\beta = .215$, $p < .001$; education-only: $\beta = .147$, $p = .001$), but with substantially smaller effects than the hybrid approach. The regression coefficients confirm the hierarchy observed in ANOVA: Hybrid > Apprenticeship-only > Education-only > Neither.

Notably, even after accounting for learning pathway, gender disparities persisted ($\beta = -.098$, $p = .007$), indicating that female entrepreneurs face success penalties beyond preparation differences. Urban location ($\beta = .126$, $p < .001$) and business experience ($\beta = .201$, $p < .001$) also independently predicted success, highlighting that multiple factors jointly determine outcomes.

The null hypothesis H_{03} is Not accepted at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level which implies that integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship training leads to statistically significant and practically meaningful improvements in youth venture viability, survival rates, revenue growth, and employment generation compared to single-pathway approaches.

Hypothesis Four: Formalization Framework and Registration Rates

H_{04}: A strategic framework designed to incentivize formalization through reduced burdens and enhanced benefits does not result in a statistically significant increase in the rate of voluntary business registration among youth entrepreneurs compared to current formalization rates.

4.5.4.1 Current Formalization Status

Table 4.44: Current Business Registration Status

Registration Status	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative %
Fully Registered (CAC + Tax)	187	31.4%	31.4%
Partially Registered (CAC only)	142	23.9%	55.3%

Informal (Unregistered)	266	44.7%	100.0%
Total	**595**	**100.0%**	

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: CAC = Corporate Affairs Commission (business name/company registration)

Table 4.44 reveals that 44.7% of youth entrepreneurs operate entirely informally, while an additional 23.9% are only partially formalized (registered business name but not tax-compliant). Only 31.4% are fully formalized. This 68.6% informal/partial formalization rate substantially exceeds SMEDAN's (2021) national estimate of 65%, suggesting youth entrepreneurs are even less formalized than the broader MSME population likely due to limited resources, shorter business lifespans, and lower awareness of formalization benefits.

4.5.4.2 Barriers to Formalization

Table 4.45: Ranking of Formalization Barriers (Mean Scores)

Barrier	Mean	SD	Rank
High registration and compliance costs	4.38	0.71	1
Complex, time-consuming procedures	4.29	0.76	2
Fear of increased tax burden	4.26	0.78	3
Unclear benefits of formalization	4.17	0.82	4
Multiple agencies/payment points	4.11	0.84	5
Corruption and bribe demands	3.98	0.91	6
Lack of information/guidance	3.87	0.89	7

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: Measured on 5-point scale (1=Not a barrier, 5=Major barrier)

High costs (M=4.38) and procedural complexity (M=4.29) emerged as the most severe formalization barriers, followed closely by tax fears (M=4.26). These findings validate Item E6's high endorsement (reducing compliance costs more critical than punitive measures, M=4.38) and indicate that formalization strategies must primarily address cost-benefit calculations and administrative friction rather than rely on enforcement.

Interestingly, corruption (M=3.98) ranked lower than anticipated, possibly reflecting improvements in Nigeria's business registration processes following digitalization initiatives. However, it remains a substantial barrier (approaching "major barrier" threshold of 4.0), particularly for entrepreneurs lacking connections or resources to navigate rent-seeking officials.

4.5.4.3 Formalization Intentions under Policy Scenarios

Respondents were presented with hypothetical policy scenarios incorporating different formalization incentives and asked to indicate their likelihood of formalizing (5-point scale: 1=Definitely would not, 5=Definitely would).

Table 4.46: Formalization Likelihood Under Different Policy Scenarios

Policy Scenario	Currently Informal (n=266)	Partially Formal (n=142)	Combined Mean	SD
Baseline (Current System)	2.14	2.87	2.39	1.12
Scenario 1: Simplified Registration (Single-window, online, 48-hour process)	3.28	3.94	3.51	0.89
Scenario 2: Tax Incentives (3-year tax holiday, then gradual increase)	3.87	4.21	3.98	0.82
Scenario 3: Access to Procurement (Eligibility for government contracts)	3.64	4.08	3.79	0.87
Scenario 4: Financial Services Access (Formal banking, credit, insurance access)	3.91	4.28	4.03	0.79
Scenario 5: Integrated Package (All above benefits combined)	4.42	4.67	4.51	0.68

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Table 4.47: Repeated Measures ANOVA for Policy Scenario Effects

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Policy Scenario	1,847.326	5	369.465	428.751	<.001	.420
Error	2,553.187	2,965	0.861			

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: Analysis conducted on combined sample (n=408 informal + partially formal); Greenhouse-Geisser correction applied

Table 4.47 demonstrates a highly significant effect of policy scenario on formalization intention, $F(5, 2965) = 428.751$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .420$. The effect size is very large (42% of variance), indicating that policy design profoundly influences formalization willingness.

Table 4.46 reveals that the integrated package scenario (Scenario 5) generated the highest formalization intention (M=4.51), representing an 88% increase over baseline (M=2.39). Pairwise comparisons (detailed table omitted) confirmed that the integrated package significantly exceeded all individual incentive scenarios (all $p < .001$).

Among individual incentives, financial services access (Scenario 4, M=4.03) and tax incentives (Scenario 2, M=3.98) were most compelling, while simplified procedures alone (Scenario 1, M=3.51), though improving intentions substantially over baseline, was less motivating than economic benefits. This pattern suggests that while reducing administrative friction is necessary, it is insufficient without tangible economic advantages.

The integrated package could potentially increase formalization rates from the current 31.4% fully registered (Table 4.44) to approximately 78.9% more than doubling formalized youth ventures. Even conservative adjustment for intention-behavior gaps suggests potential formalization rates exceeding 65%, representing transformative impact.

4.5.4.4 Logistic Regression: Predictors of Formalization

Binary logistic regression was conducted to identify factors predicting current formalization status (fully registered=1 vs. informal/partial=0).

Table 4.48: Logistic Regression Predicting Formalization Status

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% CI for Exp(B)
Age	0.087	0.031	7.871	1	.005	1.091	[1.027, 1.159]
Gender (Female=1)	-0.423	0.198	4.562	1	.033	0.655	[0.444, 0.967]
Education Level	0.346	0.089	15.102	1	<.001	1.413	[1.187, 1.683]
Business Experience	0.267	0.065	16.877	1	<.001	1.306	[1.149, 1.485]
Urban Location (=1)	0.612	0.207	8.745	1	.003	1.844	[1.229, 2.767]
Revenue Level	0.0003	0.0001	9.234	1	.002	1.000	[1.000, 1.000]
Hybrid Learning (=1)	0.789	0.214	13.587	1	<.001	2.201	[1.447, 3.349]
Perceived Formalization Benefits	0.524	0.142	13.611	1	<.001	1.689	[1.279, 2.231]

Constant	-6.147	1.023	36.092	1	<.001	0.002

Source: Field Survey Data (2025).

Note: N=595; $\chi^2(8)=127.364$, $p<.001$; Nagelkerke $R^2=.289$; Hosmer-Lemeshow test $p=.417$ (good fit)

Hybrid learning pathway (Exp(B)=2.201, p<.001): Entrepreneurs with integrated education-apprenticeship preparation were 120% more likely (2.2 times odds) to formalize than those without, even controlling for education level separately. This suggests that hybrid training instills greater awareness of formalization benefits and capabilities to navigate registration processes.

Education level (Exp(B)=1.413, p<.001): Each additional education level (primary→secondary→undergraduate→postgraduate) increased formalization odds by 41%, reflecting literacy, bureaucratic navigation skills, and formalization awareness.

Perceived formalization benefits (Exp(B)=1.689, p<.001): Each one-point increase in perceived benefits increased formalization odds by 69%, indicating that formalization is fundamentally a cost-benefit decision. Policies must enhance benefit perceptions while reducing costs.

Business experience (Exp(B)=1.306, p<.001): Each additional year of operation increased formalization odds by 31%, suggesting ventures formalize gradually as they mature, resources accumulate, and need for formal financial services/contracts intensifies.

Gender disparities (Exp(B)=0.655, p=.033): Female entrepreneurs were 34.5% less likely to formalize, even controlling for business size, revenue, and education indicating gender-specific formalization barriers beyond measured factors.

Urban location (Exp(B)=1.844, p=.003): Urban entrepreneurs were 84% more likely to formalize, reflecting better access to registration services, greater enforcement, and stronger formal market linkages.

The null hypothesis H_{04} is not accepted at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. A strategic formalization framework incorporating reduced burdens and enhanced benefits would result in statistically significant and practically substantial increases in voluntary business registration rates among youth entrepreneurs. The very large effect sizes (partial $\eta^2=.420$ for policy scenarios, Cramer's V up to .499 for performance associations) demonstrate not only statistical significance but transformative potential. The qualitative data reveal that formalization resistance stems primarily from cost-benefit calculations and trust deficits rather than fundamental opposition suggesting that well-designed incentive structures could dramatically shift entrepreneurial behavior.

Discussion of Findings

The findings on education-apprenticeship synergy (RQ3) reveal strong endorsement for hybrid models, with a composite mean of 4.40 indicating agreement that integrating formal education and practical apprenticeships enhances entrepreneurial readiness. Item D3, emphasizing curriculum blending with mandatory apprenticeships for increased venture viability, scored highest (M=4.51, "Strongly Agree"), suggesting structured integration outperforms optional components. This aligns with Nabi et al. (2018), who found experiential methods like simulations boost intentions and competencies, and Henry and Lewis (2022), reporting hybrid programs yield stronger outcomes than lecture-based ones. The consensus (narrow SD=0.55) across respondents, regardless of background, supports Adom et al. (2023), who argued apprenticeships foster problem-solving and resilience (Item D4, M=4.29), while formal education provides theoretical grounding. However, it contrasts Álvarez-Herranz and Valencia-DeLara (2023), where theoretical programs showed weak or negative impacts due to risk awareness without practical mitigation. The present study extends this by quantifying hybrid superiority in African contexts, where Palmer et al. (2018) noted apprenticeships dominate informal sectors but lack scalability without formal integration. Qualitative insights from interviews (e.g., "theory provides vision, practice builds execution") elucidate mechanisms: education enhances strategic foresight, apprenticeships build operational grit, creating "bilingual" entrepreneurs adaptable to Nigeria's volatile markets. This resolves Fatoki (2020)'s education-only limitations, validating hybrid as a pragmatic bridge for resource-constrained settings.

For RQ4, the formalization framework garnered agreement (composite M=4.31), with tax incentives (Item E2, M=4.44) and financial access (Item E7, M=4.41) as top motivators, emphasizing cost-benefit calculations. Gradual approaches (Item E4, M=4.29) and reduced compliance over punishment (Item E6, M=4.38) reflect pragmatism for nascent ventures. This concurs with Williams et al. (2017), who advocated behavioral economics-based "carrot" incentives over "stick" coercion for sustainable compliance in informal economies. Banerjee et al. (2019)'s microfinance findings align with financial services as a key driver, as formalization unlocks loans/insurance, outweighing burdens. However, it contrasts Dvouletý et al. (2018), where simplified regulations alone sufficed in some European contexts; here, administrative ease (Item E1, M=4.36) is necessary but insufficient without economic gains, given Nigeria's trust deficits and corruption. Procurement links (Item E3, M=4.18) extend Uche (2021), showing market access motivates beyond survival. The consensus (SD=0.59) validates phased models, as interviews highlighted "immediate costs vs. distant benefits" mismatches. Overall, findings affirm incentive-driven strategies, extending Mensah (2020) by prioritizing tax relief and finance in African settings, where punitive measures exacerbate informality.

Integrating RQ3 and RQ4, hybrid training correlates with 120% higher formalization odds (Exp(B)=2.201, $p<.001$), as it builds awareness/capabilities for compliance, linking education to

ecosystem engagement. This advances Nwosu (2022) and Emecheta (2022), suggesting hybrids not only boost viability but facilitate formal transitions, mitigating weaknesses like skills gaps. Contrasting Adeyemi (2018)'s apprenticeship sufficiency, results advocate synergy for holistic readiness, informing policies blending education with incentives for sustainable African entrepreneurship

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study provides compelling evidence that integrating formal entrepreneurship education with practical apprenticeship training represents a transformative pathway for enhancing youth entrepreneurial success in Nigeria. The hybrid model consistently outperformed single-pathway approaches, achieving significantly higher venture viability compared to apprenticeship-only and education-only), three-year survival rates. The large effect sizes and regression results demonstrate that synergistic learning bridges the theory-practice gap, producing adaptable, resilient entrepreneurs capable of navigating Nigeria's challenging ecosystem. Formalization resistance, driven by high costs and perceived tax burdens can be overcome through incentive-based, gradual frameworks, with integrated packages projecting formalization rates from 31.4% to 78.9%. These findings underscore the need for holistic, ecosystem-oriented interventions rather than fragmented programs.

Recommendations

1. **Curriculum Reform**: National educational authorities should mandate hybrid entrepreneurship programs combining classroom instruction with structured apprenticeships, prioritizing university-private sector partnerships to ensure contextual relevance and practical exposure.
2. **Incentive-Driven Formalization**: Policymakers should implement phased formalization pathways featuring three-year tax holidays, simplified single-window registration, and guaranteed access to formal finance and public procurement for registered youth ventures.
3. **Ecosystem Integration**: Shift from siloed initiatives to coordinated national frameworks linking skills development, seed funding, mentorship, and market access, with targeted support for female and rural entrepreneurs to address intersectional disparities.
4. **Standardized Impact Measurement**: Adopt the proposed metrics framework, emphasizing three-year survival, job creation, revenue growth, innovation, and demographic disaggregation, to enable rigorous, comparable evaluation of youth entrepreneurship programs.

These evidence-based actions can unlock Nigeria's youth demographic dividend, fostering sustainable, inclusive entrepreneurial growth across the continent.

REFERENCES

Agyapong, D., Mensah, L., & Afriyie, S. (2020). Entrepreneurship and youth employment in developing economies: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(4), 573–590. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-01-2020-0021

Amankwah-Amoah, J. (2020). Stepping up and stepping out of COVID-19: New challenges for environmental sustainability policies in Africa. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 271, 122–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122282

Becker, G. S. (2018). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Brush, C. G., de Bruin, A., & Welter, F. (2009). A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 8–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/17566260910942318

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Suppl.), S95–S120. https://doi.org/10.1086/228943

Essers, C., Doorewaard, H., & Benschop, Y. (2017). A gendered analysis of entrepreneurial processes. *Human Relations*, 70(4), 435–459. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716658470

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. (2023). *Global entrepreneurship monitor: Africa regional report*. GEM Consortium.

Hainz, C., & Hvide, H. K. (2022). Gender differences in financial constraints. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 72, 102–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.102118

Henry, C., Foss, L., & Ahl, H. (2021). Gender and entrepreneurship research: A review of methodological approaches. *International Small Business Journal*, 39(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242620959639

Hoermle, J., Kranz, J., & Picot, A. (2023). Learning by doing: Apprenticeship, entrepreneurial learning, and venture performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47(2), 356–382. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211029852

Isenberg, D. J. (2010). How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(6), 40–50.

Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Kuratko, D. F., Morris, M. H., & Schindehutte, M. (2021). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, process, and practice* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Lorz, M., Mueller, S., & Volery, T. (2021). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the methods in impact studies. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 29(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218495821500013

Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2018). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 17(2), 277–299. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2016.0020

Nwokolo, E. E., & Eze, C. C. (2021). Youth entrepreneurship and unemployment reduction in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 8(2), 85–101.

Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique. *European Planning Studies*, 23(9), 1759–1769. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484

World Bank. (2022). *World development report 2022: Finance for an equitable recovery*. World Bank Publications. https://www.worldbank.org