Stimulating Higher Education Students' Entrepreneurial Intention: Observing the Influence of Entrepreneurship Education and Lecturers' Personal Competence

Sariat Arifia[1*], Katon Pratondo[2], Zaid[3], Ace Somantri[4], Mahbub Pasca Al Bahy[5]

[1]Department of Entrepreneurship, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Visi Nusantara, Indonesia
[2]Department of Retail Management, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Muhammadiyah Grobogan, Indonesia
[3]Department of Digital Business, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Visi Nusantara, Indonesia.
[4]Department of Food Technology, Facultyof Science and Technology, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, Indonesia
[5]Turizm və Qonaqpərvərlik, Azərbaycan Turizm və Menecment Universiteti, Azerbaijan

Abstract: Entrepreneurship is becoming an increasing topic of discussion. It has attracted the attention of academics worldwide due to its beneficial impact on economic and social development worldwide. For this reason, it is essential to stimulate the intention to engage in entrepreneurial endeavors as early as possible, preferably while still a student. Unfortunately, no research has explored the role of higher education, such as universities, as providers and supporters of a supportive environment in fostering entrepreneurial intentions, which can ultimately produce entrepreneurs. Based on these problems, this research examines essential factors such as entrepreneurship education and lecturers' competencies, which influence students' entrepreneurial intentions. Using a quantitative method involving 314 respondents through Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) analysis, this research concludes that entrepreneurship education and lecturers' personal competencies positively and significantly influence students' entrepreneurial intention. This research also offers educational institutions and the government an increase in students' intentions to become entrepreneurs. On the other hand, this study suggests that both the mixed methods approach and longitudinal models should be expanded to provide a more thorough knowledge of the readiness of individuals to engage in entrepreneurial enterprise.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is becoming an increasing topic of research and discussion (Sieg et al., 2023; Sousa et al., 2019). It has attracted the attention of academics worldwide today (Kusumojanto et al., 2021). In the context of business, entrepreneurship refers to the practice of actively seeking out and capitalizing on possibilities to develop new products and services, as well as market and production organization strategies, innovations in process and raw material, and other effects that may not be immediately apparent (Mahama et al., 2023).

Due to its beneficial impact on economic and social development on a world scale, entrepreneurship is gaining popularity. A country's economy can be strengthened through this creative and innovative process, which can increase profit yields, provide new opportunities, revitalize and develop companies, encourage welfare programs, and much more (Khuram et al., 2022). Unfortunately, Indonesia is currently among the countries with the lowest number of entrepreneurs globally. According to the Global Entrepreneurship Index, Indonesia ranked 94th out of the 137 assessed nations. When compared to countries that are geographically close by, such as "Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, and Malaysia," this accomplishment is not remarkable (Handayati et al., 2020a). This situation becomes apparent when more

and more college graduates choose to become workers rather than entrepreneurs.

Of course, this is a challenge for Indonesia. Indonesia has economic and social challenges, including unemployment and the imperative for sustainable development (Kusuma et al., 2023). Based on the study, those challenges highlight the importance of promoting entrepreneurship (Huang et al., 2023; Sendra-Pons et al., 2022). This is especially critical among higher education students, who are conventionally perceived as prospective employees rather than individuals who generate employment opportunities (Wardana et al., 2020). Therefore, it is essential to stimulate the intention to engage in entrepreneurial endeavors as early as possible, preferably while still a student. According to (Kusumojanto et al., 2021), an essential factor contributing to entrepreneurial development is the intention to become an entrepreneur among students. If this is the case, then education, especially in tertiary institutions, is an important indicator that plays a significant role in forming entrepreneurial intentions among students (Amofah & Saladrigues, 2022). Therefore, we are working to improve students' entrepreneurial intention (SEI) by taking strategic initiatives (Yahaya et al., 2022).

Unfortunately, so far, no research has explored the role of universities as providers and supporters of a supportive environment in fostering entrepreneurial intentions, which can ultimately produce entrepreneurs (Amofah & Saladrigues, 2022). Not only that, (Sampene et al., 2023) also revealed that empirical research supporting entrepreneurial intention (EI) in developing countries is still lacking (Sampene et al., 2023).

Based on these problems, this research aims to examine important factors that influence students' intention in entrepreneurship. According to several research sources, education can influence entrepreneurial behavior, especially intention (Handayati et al., 2020b; Saptono et al., 2020). Unfortunately, (Lavelle, 2021) revealed that the evidence from studies investigating the relationship and influence of Entrepreneurial Education (EE) on EI is still unclear because it provides mixed results.

Therefore, this research will re-examine the influence of EE on EI with a research focus on Indonesia. Considering Indonesia has a high unemployment rate among university graduates, the focus on Indonesia is relatively new (Handayati et al., 2021). Because the existing research so far has mainly been conducted in China (Liu et al., 2022), Vietnam (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2023), and other countries such as Ghana (Nunfam et al., 2022), Botswana (Svotwa et al., 2022), Oman (Shah et al., 2020), and many more.

Indeed, similar research has been conducted in Indonesia, such as by (Listyaningsih et al., 2023). However, the research is less extensive in scope (only in Bandar Lampung) and has very little data (only 180 respondents). Meanwhile, this research has a broader scope and more data. On the other hand, this research also uses entrepreneurship motivation. As a differentiator, apart from EE, this research also involves lecturers' personal competency (LPC) factors, which also have limited research, as another variable, according to Ismail (2022), that influences EI. Thus, this research examines whether EE (H1) and LPC (H2) can influence EI positively and significantly.

Thus, it is hoped that this research can beneficially strengthen entrepreneurship education programs, improve the quality of lecturers' competencies in teaching, and encourage innovation and creativity among students. With its contribution to the entrepreneurship literature, this research also strengthens the connection between education and the business world to support entrepreneurial development.

METHOD

This research was conducted on students of entrepreneurship study programs at universities in Indonesia. The majority are universities in Java and Sumatra because, so far, the majority of entrepreneurship study programs in Indonesia are only available on these two islands. The research design utilized in this study was a cross-sectional research design, which is appropriate for providing an overview of the subject matter. In order to collect information from 314 students, a structured questionnaire was employed during this process. The questionnaire was delivered online because it ensures accessibility and a higher response rate among the target demographic of university students. A sample size of this magnitude is sufficient to fulfill the prerequisites for conducting multivariate data analysis (J. F. Hair & Sarstedt, 2019), such as Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-

SEM), used in this study.

Of the 314 respondents, the characteristics of this study showed that 126 (40.13%) were men, and the remaining 188 (59.87%) were women. This indicates that the number of female students in tertiary institutions is greater than that of male students. In addition, the sample age categories show that all students involved in the research (314 students) were in the age category 19−23 years as many as 221 students (70.38%), 24 − 28 years as many as 66 students (21.02%), and the remaining 29 − 33 year as many as 27 students (8.60%). Therefore, a reasonable explanation is that in universities in Indonesia, the majority of students, especially undergraduate students, are aged between 19 and 23 years. The respondents from private universities were 253 students (80.57%) and 61 students from state universities (19.43%).

The respondents were asked for their opinions and chose which statement was more appropriate in describing themselves regarding EE, lecturer's personal competence (LPC), and EI. Each questionnaire contains four statements adopted from research (Zaid et al., 2024) relating to EE and three statements for each LPC and EI, which were adopted and developed from research (Ismail, 2022). Each variable has been adjusted. The measurement indicators were adopted from previous research, which has proven valid and reliable. After the questionnaire is filled in, it is collected for further analysis. PLS-SEM was chosen for this study.

According to J. Hair & Alamer (2022), PLS-SEM is a precious method for assessing intricate theoretical connections among many variables, particularly in social science research. It also can handle complex models (J. Hair & Alamer, 2022). Therefore, apart from being popular (Legate et al., 2023), this analysis method has also been used by previous researchers such as (Boubker et al., 2021; Boutaky & Sahib Eddine, 2022). Based on this, this analysis method is appropriate for exploratory studies like this research that examined the influence between EE and LPC on EI. The application used in this analysis is the SmartPLS 3.2.9 application.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In PLS-SEM analysis, the first thing important to analyze is the validity and reliability of each indicator and variable, usually known as manifest variables (Henseler, Hubona et al., 2016), which is observed in this research. This analysis is known in the PLS-SEM method as a measurement model test, usually called "the outer model" (Henseler, Hubona, et al., 2016). Table 1 below shows the results of data processing for the measurement model.

Table 1. Measurement Model Test Results

Variables	Loading	α	CR	AVE
EE		0.861	0.906	0.707
EE.1	0.835			
EE.2	0.868			
EE.3	0.791			
EE.4	0.866			
LPC		0.853	0.911	0.773
LPC.1	0.877			
LPC.2	0.903			
LPC.3	0.858			
EI		0.846	0.906	0.763
EI.1	0.874			
EI.2	0.905			
EI.3	0.841			

The loading value functions to explain the reliability of each indicator. Regarding that, Ringle et al. (2023) stated that when it comes to loading thresholds, the standard value is 0.50. More than that, it displays reliable indicators. Based on this assertion, it is possible to assert that all of the indicators in this study are reliable because they are more than 0.50. The α and CR values function to explain the reliability

of each variable studied. The recommended threshold for the α value is 0.708 (Guenther et al., 2023), while the CR is 0.60 (F. J. Jr. Hair et al., 2019). Considering that the data processing outcomes are shown in Table 1, it can be seen that the overall α value is > 0.708 and CR > 0.60. Thus, all variables in this study are convincingly reliable.

Table 2. Discriminant validity

	EE	LPC	EI
EE	0.841		
LPC	0.759	0.879	
EI	0.718	0.721	0.874

Furthermore, the AVE value listed in Table 1 describes the validity of a variable (in terms of convergent validity). A variable is valid if it exceeds the threshold value > 0.50 (Dash & Paul, 2021). As shown in Table 1 above, where each variable has an AVE value > 0.50, it can be concluded that in addition to being reliable, all the variables in this study are also valid. So that the validity value can be refined, it is also necessary to test discriminant validity. This type of validity guarantees that construct measures are empirically distinct and accurately describe phenomena of interest that other measures cannot capture in structural equation models (Henseler et al., 2015). Based on Table 2 above, all variables in this research are valid according to the discriminant validity function.

Table 3. R-square (R^2) Test Results

Variable	R^2
EI	0.589

After testing the measurement net model, it was time to test the structural model (also known as "the inner model") (Henseler, Ringle, et al., 2016). In this section, the coefficient of determination (R^2) and effect size redundancy index (f^2) are tested (Benitez et al., 2020). In SmartPLS, this value will be obtained through bootstrapping (Streukens & Leroi-Werelds, 2016). R^2 measures how effectively the model explains endogenous or dependent variable fluctuations. It also indicates how much the independent variables or constructs in the model explain the variability of the response variable (endogenous variable). Table 3 shows that the R-square value of EI is 0.589. With this value, it can be assessed that the influence of EE and LPC on EI is 58.9%.

Table 4. F-square (F^2) Test Results

	EE	LPC	EI
EE			0.168
LPC			0.178
EI			

Table 4 above is the result of testing the F-square. In short, this test evaluates the predictive influence of exogenous factors on endogenous variables in a model. The clue is 0.020 to 0.150 (weak influence), 0.150 to 0.350 (moderate influence), or greater than 0.350 (strong influence) (Benitez et al., 2020). If so, EE and LPC have a reasonably moderate influence because they have f-square values of 0.168 and 0.178, which still range from 0.150 to 0.350.

Table 5. Summary of the influence among Variables Results

Variable	β	T-Value	P-Value
EE → EI	0.403	4.450	0.000
LPC → EI	0.415	4.709	0.000

The final test in PLS-SEM is the influence test between variables. The first thing to be tested is EE against SEI. Referring to the data presented in Table 5 above, the influence value between the two is β = 0.403; T-value 4.450; P-value = 0.000. Based on these data, it can be said that the influence of EE on SEI is significantly positive. The significance of the influence can be seen from the P-value, which is <0.05

(Cheah et al., 2023). This result strongly indicates that the more often students receive entrepreneurship education, the more their interest in entrepreneurship and becoming entrepreneurs will increase.

On the other hand, the more often students do not receive entrepreneurship education, the more their interest in entrepreneurship decreases. These results are consistent with previous research (Handayati et al., 2020a; Lavelle, 2021; Otache et al., 2021). This result implies that entrepreneurship education must be disseminated using various strategies through "theory, practice, and collaboration with companies, industries, and startups" throughout Indonesia (Gianiodis & Meek, 2020).

Second, the influence of LPC on SEI was also tested. The result exhibits $\beta = 0.415$; T-value 4.709; P-value = 0.000. Based on these data, it can be said that the influence of LPC on SEI is also significantly positive. The significance of the influence can be seen from the P-value, which is <0.05 (Cheah et al., 2023). This result strongly indicates that the more competent a lecturer is in entrepreneurship, the more their interest in entrepreneurship and becoming an entrepreneur will increase. On the other hand, the more incompetent a lecturer is, the lower their intention in entrepreneurship will be. These results are consistent with previous research conducted by (Ismail, 2022; Iwu et al., 2021; Lewicka & Bollampally, 2022). These results imply that competence, in this case lecturers, is important for generating intention and realizing the goal of turning students into entrepreneurs (Brauer, 2021).

Based on these results, it is clear that EE and lecturer competency have a positive and significant influence in determining the readiness of the young generation of students to become entrepreneurs. Evaluations that can be taken are, first, education about entrepreneurship and lecturer competency, which must be further developed in higher education. The main aim is to foster "entrepreneurial knowledge, entrepreneurial attitudes, and entrepreneurial goals and to educate students for entrepreneurial roles." (Saptono et al., 2020). Second, the findings of this study can provide educational institutions and the government with information on how to boost the likelihood that students will pursue careers as entrepreneurs (Handayati et al., 2021).

However, it should be noted that this research still involved respondents on a small scale, so the findings from this research cannot be generalized. Second, the weakness of this research is that it only uses a quantitative approach. This approach can be expanded using mixed methods and longitudinal models to provide a more comprehensive understanding of entrepreneurial readiness and intention (Saptono et al., 2020). However, it cannot be ignored that this research still brings benefits, especially for stakeholders who want to increase students' intention in entrepreneurship.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, this research confirms EE and LPC's positive and significant influence on SEI. These results are essential for stimulating students' intention to become young entrepreneurs. These results make it increasingly convincing and supportive that education about entrepreneurship and lecturer competency must be developed further in higher education. The main aim is to foster "entrepreneurial knowledge, entrepreneurial attitudes, and entrepreneurial goals and to educate students for entrepreneurial roles." Second, this research can offer educational institutions and governments information on increasing students' entrepreneurial intentions. On the other hand, this study suggests that both the mixed methods approach and longitudinal models should be expanded to provide a more thorough knowledge of the readiness of individuals to engage in entrepreneurial enterprise.

REFERENCES

Amofah, K., & Saladrigues, R. (2022). Impact of attitude towards entrepreneurship education and role models on entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *11*(1), 36. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-022-00197-5

Benitez, J., Henseler, J., Castillo, A., & Schuberth, F. (2020). How to perform and report an impactful analysis using partial least squares: Guidelines for confirmatory and explanatory IS research. *Information & Management*, *57*(2), 103168. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IM.2019.05.003

Boubker, O., Arroud, M., & Ouajdouni, A. (2021). Entrepreneurship education versus management students' entrepreneurial intentions. A PLS-SEM approach. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *19*(1), 100450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100450

Boutaky, S., & Sahib Eddine, A. (2022). Determinants of entrepreneurial intention among scientific students: A social cognitive theory perspective. *Industry and Higher Education*, *37*(2), 279–293. https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222221120750

Brauer, S. (2021). Towards competence-oriented higher education: a systematic literature review of the different perspectives on successful exit profiles. *Education + Training*, *63*(9), 1376–1390. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2020-0216

Cheah, J. H., Amaro, S., & Roldán, J. L. (2023). Multigroup analysis of more than two groups in PLS-SEM: A review, illustration, and recommendations. *Journal of Business Research*, *156*, 113539. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2022.113539

Dash, G., & Paul, J. (2021). CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *173*, 121092. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TECHFORE.2021.121092

Gianiodis, P. T., & Meek, W. R. (2020). Entrepreneurial education for the entrepreneurial university: a stakeholder perspective. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *45*(4), 1167–1195. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-019-09742-z

Guenther, P., Guenther, M., Ringle, C. M., Zaefarian, G., & Cartwright, S. (2023). Improving PLS-SEM use for business marketing research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *111*, 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INDMARMAN.2023.03.010

Hair, F. J. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate Data Analysis, Eighth Edition*. Cengage Learning EMEA.

Hair, J., & Alamer, A. (2022). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in second language and education research: Guidelines using an applied example. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, *1*(3), 100027. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RMAL.2022.100027

Hair, J. F., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). Factors versus Composites: Guidelines for Choosing the Right Structural Equation Modeling Method. *Project Management Journal*, *50*(6), 619–624. https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972819882132/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_8756972819882132-FIG1.JPEG

Handayati, P., Wibowo, A., Narmaditya, B. S., Kusumojanto, D. D., Setiawan, A. B., & Tung, D. T. (2021). The university students enterprises development: Lesson from Indonesia. *Cogent Education*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1973286

Handayati, P., Wulandari, D., Soetjipto, B. E., Wibowo, A., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2020a). Does entrepreneurship education promote vocational students' entrepreneurial mindset? *Heliyon*, *6*(11), e05426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05426

Handayati, P., Wulandari, D., Soetjipto, B. E., Wibowo, A., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2020b). Does entrepreneurship education promote vocational students' entrepreneurial mindset? *Heliyon*, *6*(11), e05426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05426

Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, *116*(1), 2–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). Testing measurement invariance of composites using partial least squares. *International Marketing Review*, *33*(3), 405–431. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-09-2014-0304

Huang, Y., Li, P., Chen, L., & Wang, J. (2023). Opportunity or necessity entrepreneurship? A study based on the national system of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *8*(4), 100448. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100448

Ismail, I. J. (2022). My intentions, my choice! How does lecturers' competency influence entrepreneurial intention among undergraduate university students in Tanzania? *Cogent Education*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2151237

Iwu, C. G., Opute, P. A., Nchu, R., Eresia-Eke, C., Tengeh, R. K., Jaiyeoba, O., & Aliyu, O. A. (2021). Entrepreneurship education, curriculum and lecturer-competency as antecedents of student entrepreneurial intention. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *19*(1), 100295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2019.03.007

Khuram, S., Ahmed, H., & Ali, S. (2022). The impact of entrepreneurial education on the propensity of business students to support new ventures: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1046293

Kusuma, G. H., Kurniawati, A. D., Junaedi, M. F. S., & Widiastuti, T. D. (2023). The Artpreneurship: Innovate to Overcome the Challenge. *ASEAN Journal of Community Engagement*, *7*(2), 226–240. https://doi.org/10.7454/ajce.v7i2.1174

Kusumojanto, D. D., Wibowo, A., Kustiandi, J., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2021). Do entrepreneurship education and environment promote students' entrepreneurial intention? the role of entrepreneurial attitude. *Cogent Education*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1948660

Lavelle, B. A. (2021). Entrepreneurship Education's Impact on Entrepreneurial Intention Using the Theory of Planned Behavior: Evidence From Chinese Vocational College Students. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, *4*(1), 30–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127419860307

Legate, A. E., Hair, J. F., Chretien, J. L., & Risher, J. J. (2023). PLS-SEM : Prediction-oriented solutions for HRD researchers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *34*(1), 91–109. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21466

Lewicka, D., & Bollampally, N. (2022). Trust in lecturer–student relationships as a factor supporting entrepreneurship. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *16*(2), 128–149. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-03-2022-0017

Listyaningsih, E., Mufahamah, E., Mukminin, A., Ibarra, F. P., Santos, Ma. R. H. M. D., & Quicho, R. F. (2023). Entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship intentions, and entrepreneurship motivation on students' entrepreneurship interest in entrepreneurship among higher education students. *Power and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/17577438231217035

Liu, Y., Li, M., Li, X., & Zeng, J. (2022). Entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intention: The moderating role of the personality and family economic status. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.978480

Mahama, I., Eshun, P., Amos, P. M., Antwi, T., Amoako, B. M., & Eggley, V. E. (2023). Psychological precursors of entrepreneurial intentions among higher education students in Ghana. *Discover Education*, *2*(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-023-00047-w

Nguyen, Q. Do, & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of entrepreneurial capacity. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *21*(1), 100730. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100730

Nunfam, V. F., Asitik, A. J., & Afrifa-Yamoah, E. (2022). Personality, Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intention Among Ghanaian Students. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, *5*(1), 65–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420961040

Otache, I., Umar, K., Audu, Y., & Onalo, U. (2021). The effects of entrepreneurship education on students' entrepreneurial intentions. *Education + Training*, *63*(7/8), 967–991. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2019-0005

Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Sinkovics, N., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2023). A perspective on using partial least squares structural equation modelling in data articles. *Data in Brief*, *48*, 109074. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DIB.2023.109074

Sampene, A. K., Li, C., Khan, A., Agyeman, F. O., & Opoku, R. K. (2023). Yes! I want to be an entrepreneur: A study on university students' entrepreneurship intentions through the theory of planned behavior. *Current Psychology*, *42*(25), 21578–21596. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03161-4

Saptono, A., Wibowo, A., Narmaditya, B. S., Karyaningsih, R. P. D., & Yanto, H. (2020). Does entrepreneurial education matter for Indonesian students' entrepreneurial preparation: The mediating role of

entrepreneurial mindset and knowledge. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1836728

Sendra-Pons, P., Belarbi-Muñoz, S., Garzón, D., & Mas-Tur, A. (2022). Cross-country differences in drivers of female necessity entrepreneurship. *Service Business*, *16*(4), 971–989. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-021-00470-9

Shah, I. A., Amjed, S., & Jaboob, S. (2020). The moderating role of entrepreneurship education in shaping entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Economic Structures*, *9*(1), 19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40008-020-00195-4

Sieg, P., Posadzińska, I., & Jóźwiak, M. (2023). Academic entrepreneurship as a source of innovation for sustainable development. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *194*, 122695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122695

Sousa, M. J., Carmo, M., Gonçalves, A. C., Cruz, R., & Martins, J. M. (2019). Creating knowledge and entrepreneurial capacity for HE students with digital education methodologies: Differences in the perceptions of students and entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Research*, *94*, 227–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.02.005

Streukens, S., & Leroi-Werelds, S. (2016). Bootstrapping and PLS-SEM: A step-by-step guide to get more out of your bootstrap results. *European Management Journal*, *34*(6), 618–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.06.003

Svotwa, T. D., Jaiyeoba, O., Roberts-Lombard, M., & Makanyeza, C. (2022). Perceived Access to Finance, Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, Attitude Toward Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Ability, and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Botswana Youth Perspective. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2), 215824402210964. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221096437

Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Mahendra, A. M., Wibowo, N. A., Harwida, G., & Rohman, A. N. (2020). The impact of entrepreneurship education and students' entrepreneurial mindset: the mediating role of attitude and self-efficacy. *Heliyon*, *6*(9), e04922. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04922

Yahaya, M. H., Ismail, M. A. M., Rosli, M. S. D. A., Baharudin, Z. N., & Latib, N. A. A. (2022). Entrepreneurial Intention Among University Students: A Literature Review. In N. N. M. Shariff, A. Yakob, Z. S. Hamidi, Z. A. A. Aghwan, & N. Lateh (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings from the 1st International Conference on Contemporary Islamic Studies (ICIS 2021)* (pp. 139–147). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2390-6_13

Zaid, Z., Wahyuningsih, A., Pratondo, K., Ramadhan, R. N., & Bahy, M. P. Al. (2024). Factors Influencing Students' Entrepreneurial Intention: Examining the Role of Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy. *Eklektik : Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Dan Kewirausahaan*, *6*(2), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.24014/EKL.V6I2.27803