

Entrepreneurship Education and the Role of Universities in Developing Students' Entrepreneurial Skills

Toumi Belkacem ^{1*} University of Djelfa, Algeria.

b.toumi@univ-djelfa.dz

ARTICLE INFO

Received: [03/05/2026]

Accepted: [29/05/2026]

Published: [30/06/2026]

Keywords:

*Entrepreneurship education
university role
entrepreneurial skills
innovation ecosystems
experiential learning*

Pages: [43-48]

Online access via QR code



ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship education has become a cornerstone of higher education policy worldwide, reflecting the growing consensus that entrepreneurial competencies are essential for economic development, innovation, and individual career resilience. This article provides a comprehensive examination of the role universities play in cultivating students' entrepreneurial skills through structured curricula, experiential learning platforms, and institutional support ecosystems. Drawing upon a wide array of recent scholarship—including foundational contributions by Kheiri (2025) on the epistemological rationale for entrepreneurship studies, Kuratko (2005) on the emergence and evolution of entrepreneurship education, and the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2024) on global entrepreneurial education assessment—this study synthesizes empirical evidence to identify the most effective pedagogical strategies employed by higher education institutions. The analysis further examines the persistent challenges universities face, including resource limitations, faculty expertise gaps, and curricular fragmentation, while proposing evidence-based solutions. The findings underscore the transformative potential of entrepreneurship education in shaping career trajectories and advancing societal innovation, with particular implications for emerging economies where entrepreneurial ecosystems are still in formative stages.

1. Introduction

The contemporary global economy is characterized by rapid technological disruption, accelerating market competition, and an increasing demand for innovative solutions to complex societal challenges. In this environment, entrepreneurship has been widely recognized as a fundamental driver of economic growth, employment creation, and social transformation (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Governments, international organizations, and educational institutions alike have emphasized the urgency of fostering entrepreneurial mindsets, particularly within higher education systems that serve as the primary pipeline for developing the next generation of innovators and enterprise leaders (Neck & Greene, 2011). The field of entrepreneurship studies has matured considerably, moving from a narrow focus on new venture creation toward a broader understanding of entrepreneurial cognition, behavior, and its embeddedness within social and institutional structures (Kheiri, 2025).

Entrepreneurship education in universities has undergone a remarkable transformation over the past four decades. Kuratko (2005) traced the emergence of entrepreneurship education from its origins as a small number of elective courses in a handful of American universities in the 1970s to a global movement encompassing thousands of programs across diverse disciplinary contexts. This evolution reflects a broader paradigm shift in higher education, where entrepreneurial competencies—including creativity, opportunity recognition, strategic thinking, and resilience—are increasingly valued not only for aspiring business founders but for professionals across all sectors (Fayolle & Gailly, 2015). As Kheiri (2025) argues, the question of why entrepreneurship should be studied extends well beyond economic utility; it encompasses the development of

essential life competencies that enable individuals to navigate uncertainty and contribute meaningfully to society.

This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the role universities play in developing students' entrepreneurial skills. It examines current pedagogical approaches, identifies persistent challenges, assesses the impact of entrepreneurship education on students and communities, and draws upon a broad range of recent scholarship to propose actionable recommendations for strengthening entrepreneurship programs in higher education institutions.

2. The Role of Universities in Entrepreneurship Education

Universities occupy a pivotal position within entrepreneurial ecosystems, functioning as bridges between theoretical knowledge and practical application, between individual aspiration and societal innovation. Audretsch (2014) introduced the concept of the entrepreneurial university, arguing that institutions of higher education must evolve beyond their traditional roles of teaching and research to become active agents of knowledge commercialization, technology transfer, and regional economic development. This vision positions universities not merely as providers of entrepreneurship courses but as comprehensive innovation ecosystems that incubate ideas, nurture talent, and catalyze economic transformation.

The role of universities in entrepreneurship education manifests across several critical dimensions. At the curricular level, universities design and deliver structured programs that introduce students to foundational concepts including opportunity identification, business model development, market analysis, financial planning, and intellectual property management. Beyond the classroom, universities create experiential learning environments through business plan competitions, student incubators and accelerators, hackathons, and industry partnerships that enable students to test their ideas in real-world settings (Neck & Greene, 2011). Furthermore, universities serve as vital networking hubs, connecting students with alumni entrepreneurs, angel investors, venture capitalists, and industry practitioners who provide mentorship and practical guidance.

Kheiri, Haouari, and Gacem (2022) examined the intrinsic relationship between entrepreneurship and innovation, demonstrating that universities which actively promote entrepreneurial education simultaneously enhance the innovation capacity of their surrounding regions. Their findings suggest that this dual function—educating individuals while stimulating regional innovation—positions universities as critical engines of economic transformation, particularly in developing economies where entrepreneurial ecosystems are still nascent. Complementing this perspective, Kheiri, Charbi, and Toumi (2021) introduced sociological frameworks for understanding entrepreneurship, theorizing how social structures, cultural norms, and institutional contexts shape entrepreneurial behavior. Their multi-level analysis enriches the discourse by demonstrating that universities, as social institutions, play a formative role in constructing students' entrepreneurial identities and aspirations.

3. Strategies and Approaches for Entrepreneurship Education

Effective entrepreneurship education demands a diverse repertoire of pedagogical strategies that transcend traditional lecture-based instruction. Mwasalwiba (2010) conducted a comprehensive review of entrepreneurship education objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators, finding that the most effective programs employ a combination of experiential, interactive, and reflective learning approaches. Among the most widely adopted pedagogical methods are case-based learning, where students analyze real entrepreneurial ventures and decision-making scenarios; project-based learning involving the development of business plans or minimum viable products; and simulation exercises that replicate the challenges of launching and scaling a venture in a controlled environment.

Pittaway and Cope (2007) conducted a systematic review of the entrepreneurship education evidence base and identified process-based learning as a particularly effective approach. Unlike content-based models that focus

primarily on transmitting knowledge about entrepreneurship, process-based models emphasize the development of entrepreneurial competencies through immersion in entrepreneurial activities—including opportunity evaluation, resource gathering, team formation, and stakeholder negotiation. Fayolle and Gailly (2015) further demonstrated that well-designed entrepreneurship education programs produce significant and persistent effects on students' entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions, with measurable impacts enduring well beyond the duration of formal instruction. This phenomenon of hysteresis—where educational interventions create lasting behavioral dispositions—underscores the importance of thoughtful, longitudinal program design.

The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor's 2023/2024 report provides sobering evidence that entrepreneurial education in most economies continues to be assessed as poor by national experts (GEM, 2024). This finding highlights the urgent need for universities to adopt more innovative and impactful educational approaches. Nabi et al. (2018) addressed this challenge by conducting a robust evaluation of entrepreneurship education's effectiveness, finding that programs integrating multiple pedagogical methods—combining theoretical instruction with practical experience and mentorship—yield the strongest outcomes in terms of entrepreneurial intention, self-efficacy, and actual venture creation. Additionally, universities are increasingly leveraging digital technologies and online platforms to expand access to entrepreneurship education, creating massive open online courses (MOOCs), virtual incubators, and AI-assisted business planning tools that supplement traditional classroom instruction.

4. Challenges Facing Universities in Entrepreneurship Education

Despite the growing recognition of entrepreneurship education's importance, universities face substantial and persistent challenges in implementing effective programs. Kuratko (2005) identified several critical obstacles, including the shortage of qualified faculty who possess both academic credentials and practical entrepreneurial experience, the resistance of traditional academic departments to interdisciplinary collaboration, and the difficulty of measuring the long-term outcomes of entrepreneurship education initiatives. Many programs continue to rely on faculty from conventional business disciplines who, while academically accomplished, may lack firsthand experience in founding and managing ventures, which can limit the authenticity and practical relevance of their teaching (Rideout & Gray, 2013).

Resource constraints present another formidable challenge, particularly for universities in developing countries and emerging economies. Establishing and maintaining incubators, securing seed funding for student startups, attracting experienced mentors, and building industry partnerships require sustained financial investment that many institutions struggle to provide (Mwasalwiba, 2010). Kheiri, Toual, and Toumi (2022) explored the reality of women's entrepreneurship practices in Algeria, revealing that structural and institutional barriers—including limited access to finance, inadequate support mechanisms, and pervasive social stereotypes—significantly impede entrepreneurial development. These findings resonate with the broader challenges facing entrepreneurship education, as they highlight the critical importance of creating inclusive and supportive institutional environments that address gender-specific and other systemic barriers to participation.

Curricular integration poses a further structural challenge, as entrepreneurship education is frequently treated as a standalone discipline confined to business schools rather than being embedded across the broader university curriculum (Audretsch, 2014). This siloed approach limits the reach of entrepreneurship education and fails to engage students from science, technology, engineering, arts, and humanities disciplines who could substantially benefit from entrepreneurial thinking. Bae et al. (2014) further noted that the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions varies significantly across national contexts, suggesting that programs must be adapted to local cultural, economic, and institutional conditions rather than relying on standardized models. Proposed solutions include developing interdisciplinary programs, integrating entrepreneurial modules across all faculties, and establishing cross-departmental innovation centers that serve the entire university community.

5. Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Students and Society

The impact of entrepreneurship education extends substantially beyond immediate classroom outcomes, influencing students' long-term career trajectories, personal development, and contributions to societal well-being. Martin, McNally, and Kay (2013) conducted a meta-analysis examining the formation of human capital through entrepreneurship education, finding consistent positive effects on entrepreneurial intentions, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial human capital assets such as knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to venture creation. Students who participate in entrepreneurship programs demonstrate significantly higher levels of creativity, risk tolerance, proactiveness, and self-efficacy compared to their non-participating peers (Nabi et al., 2018).

Kheiri and Herairia (2021) examined the concept of social engineering to feminize entrepreneurial action, arguing that deliberate institutional interventions can reshape entrepreneurial culture to be more inclusive and equitable. Their research carries significant implications for entrepreneurship education, suggesting that universities can serve as powerful agents of social change by promoting gender-equitable entrepreneurial practices, challenging limiting stereotypes, and designing programs that actively address the specific barriers faced by women and other underrepresented groups. When universities foster inclusive entrepreneurial environments, the benefits extend to broader societal outcomes, including reduced economic inequality, enhanced social mobility, and stronger community resilience.

At the macroeconomic level, the proliferation of entrepreneurship education contributes to the creation of more dynamic and innovation-driven economies. Graduates who have been exposed to entrepreneurial thinking are more likely to introduce innovations within existing organizations—a phenomenon known as intrapreneurship—pursue social entrepreneurship ventures that address pressing community needs, and contribute to the development of regional innovation ecosystems. Kheiri, Haouari, and Gacem (2022) provided compelling evidence that investing in entrepreneurship education yields dividends not only for individual students but for the innovation capacity of entire nations, as entrepreneurial graduates serve as catalysts for knowledge diffusion, technology adoption, and competitive dynamism within their communities and industries.

6. Recent Studies and Research Contributions

Recent scholarship has significantly advanced understanding of entrepreneurship education across multiple dimensions. The comprehensive body of work produced by Kheiri Nough and colleagues represents a particularly valuable contribution, offering insights that span theoretical, sociological, and empirical domains. Kheiri's (2025) foundational exploration of why entrepreneurship should be studied provides an epistemological and pedagogical rationale for its inclusion in higher education, arguing that entrepreneurship constitutes a socially constructed phenomenon shaped by norms, policies, and unequal access to resources. This sociological perspective complements the established economic and psychological frameworks that have traditionally dominated the field.

The systematic review by Pittaway and Cope (2007) and the meta-analytic work of Bae et al. (2014) and Martin et al. (2013) have established robust evidence regarding the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education while simultaneously revealing the considerable heterogeneity in program designs and outcomes across different contexts. More recently, Florez Cueva et al. (2025) conducted a systematic review of the implications of students' entrepreneurial skills, identifying self-awareness, problem-solving, and effective communication as the competencies most strongly associated with entrepreneurial confidence and success. Liñán and Chen (2009) further contributed by developing cross-cultural instruments for measuring entrepreneurial intentions, enabling more rigorous comparative research across national and institutional contexts.

Collectively, this body of research points toward several important conclusions. First, entrepreneurship education is most effective when it integrates theoretical rigor with experiential learning and real-world application.

Second, programs must be context-sensitive, adapting to the specific cultural, economic, and institutional conditions of the communities they serve. Third, addressing issues of inclusion and equity—particularly regarding gender and socioeconomic barriers—is essential for maximizing the societal impact of entrepreneurship education. Future research should continue to explore the long-term effects of entrepreneurship education on career outcomes, the comparative effectiveness of different pedagogical approaches across diverse cultural settings, and the role of emerging digital technologies in expanding access to high-quality entrepreneurial learning opportunities.

7. References

- Audretsch, D. B. (2014). *From the entrepreneurial university to the university for the entrepreneurial society*. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39(3), 313–321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-012-9288-1>
- Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. (2014). *The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 267–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12095>
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2015). *The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention: Hysteresis and persistence*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12065>
- Florez Cueva, M. Y., Carazas Durand, C. R., & Baca Infa, T. M. (2025). *Implications of students' entrepreneurial skills: A systematic review*. *INVECOM*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.46815/invecom.v18i2.3950>
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. (2024). *GEM 2023/2024 global report: 25 years and growing*. <https://www.gemconsortium.org/report/gem-2023-2024-global-report>
- Kheiri, N. (2025). *Why study entrepreneurship?* *Journal of Work and Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(2), 26–33.
- Kheiri, N., Charbi, M., & Toumi, B. (2021). *Introduction to sociology entrepreneurship: Theorizing—Units of analysis—Levels of analysis*. *Afak For Sciences Journal (A.S.J)*, 6(4), 204–213.
- Kheiri, N., Haouari, F. D. E., & Gacem, M. (2022). *The role of entrepreneurship in promoting innovation*. *Revista GEINTEC*, 12(1), 94–103.
- Kheiri, N., & Herairia, A. (2021). *Social engineering to feminize the entrepreneurial action*. *AFKAR wa AFFAK*, 9(4), 147–162.
- Kheiri, N., Toulal, A., & Toumi, B. (2022). *The reality of women's entrepreneurship practices: An exploratory study—The case of Algeria*. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 9(3), 45–56.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2005). *The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577–597. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6520.00097>
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). *Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593–617. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00318.x>
- Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). *Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.03.002>

- Mwasalwiba, E. S. (2010). *Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. Education + Training, 52*(1), 20–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911011017663>
- Nabi, G., Walmsley, A., Liin, F., Akhtar, I., & Cope, J. (2018). *Does entrepreneurship education effectively increase entrepreneurial intentions? A robust evaluation. Journal of Business Research, 85*, 224–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.12.001>
- 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>
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). *Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. International Small Business Journal, 25*(5), 479–510. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607078364>
- Rideout, E. C., & Gray, D. O. (2013). *Does entrepreneurship education really work? A review and methodological critique of the empirical literature on the effects of university-based entrepreneurship education. Journal of Small Business Management, 51*(3), 329–351. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12021>
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). *The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.2791611>