



Health Care Provider or Entrepreneur? A Cluster Analysis of Entrepreneurial Readiness Among Nutrition Students in

Laksmi Karunia Tanuwijaya^{1*},
Noermijati Noermijati, Sri Palupi Prabandari²,
Mintarti Rahayu², Eva Putri Arfiani¹

¹ Department of Nutrition, Faculty of Health Sciences, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

² Management Department, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

laksmi_karunia.fk@ub.ac.id

Abstract. This study investigated the entrepreneurial readiness of nutrition students who participated in a project-based entrepreneurship course at a public university in Indonesia. Using hierarchical cluster analysis with Ward's method on theory of planned behaviour (TPB) scores from 119 students, four readiness profiles were found. The Proactive-Ready group (29.4%) scored high on all TPB dimensions and had the strongest inclination toward near-term venture creation. The Supported-Ambivalent group (39.5%), which was the largest, showed a noticeable gap between perceived social support and personal self-efficacy. The Exploratory Developing group (21.8%) had moderate scores and the lowest rate of prior business experience. The non-entrepreneurial group (9.2%) had low personal attitudes and entrepreneurial intention despite moderate social norm scores. Family business background was not significantly related to profile membership ($\chi^2 = 2.082$, $p = 0.556$, $V = 0.132$), but it was significantly associated with the venture timing preferences ($\chi^2 = 12.854$, $p = 0.012$, $V = 0.329$; Monte Carlo $p = 0.010$), as all students planning to start a business immediately after graduation came from entrepreneurial families. Prior business experience was significantly related to profile membership ($\chi^2 = 10.740$, $p = 0.013$, $V = 0.300$; Monte Carlo $p = 0.012$). These findings suggest that hands-on experience matters more than passive family exposure in shaping readiness, and that the largest subgroup of students showed a pattern that may be suggestive of a tension between social encouragement and personal self-efficacy, although this interpretation needs to be confirmed through direct measurement of professional identity in future studies.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Readiness, Nutrition Students, Entrepreneurship Education, Project-Based Learning, Family Business.

1 Introduction

Entrepreneurship education has become a required part of university curricula in Indonesia as part of broader efforts to address graduate unemployment and promote economic growth [1], [2]. The Indonesian government has placed considerable emphasis on promoting entrepreneurship and strengthening youth participation in cooperative development, as reflected in its strategic agenda to encourage entrepreneurship, enhance the role of young people, and increase the contribution of cooperatives to national GDP [3]. However, the number of university graduates who start businesses after finishing their studies remains low [4], raising questions about how effective current entrepreneurship education really is.

One factor that is often assumed to play a positive role is family business background. Growing up in a family where someone runs a business can expose young people to entrepreneurial values and practical skills [5], [6]. At the same time, however, not all research supports this assumption. Some studies have found that family business exposure can also have a discouraging effect, as it reveals the hardships and risks involved in running a business [7], [8].

A gap in the current literature is that most studies treat entrepreneurial readiness as if it were a single score, when in fact students may have quite different combinations of attitudes, perceived social support, self-efficacy, and intention. This is especially relevant in health science programmes where students are mainly trained to become clinical practitioners, not business owners. To address this gap, the present study used cluster analysis on theory of planned behavior (TPB) constructs to identify different readiness profiles among nutrition students who took part in a project-based entrepreneurship course. Three research questions guided the study:

RQ1. What readiness profiles emerge from the students' TPB scores?

RQ2. How do family business background and prior business experience relate to these profiles?

RQ3. What venture timing preferences characterize each profile?

Ajzen's [9] theory of planned behavior proposes that behavioral intentions are shaped by three factors: personal attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms (perceived social pressure to perform or not perform the behavior), and perceived behavioral control (the individual's confidence in their ability to carry out the behavior). In the context of entrepreneurship, these three factors have been shown to be reliable predictors of entrepreneurial intention across different cultures and settings [10], [11].

An important but frequently overlooked point is that students may score high on one TPB dimension and low on another. A student might feel that people around them are supportive of entrepreneurship but still lack confidence in their own ability to start a business. These within-person differences are hard to detect using variable-centered approaches such as regression analysis. Person-centered methods like cluster analysis are better suited for this purpose [12], though they have not been widely used in entrepreneurship education research.

Regarding family business influence, the evidence has been mixed. While some researchers reported that parental entrepreneurship has a positive effect on the next generation's entrepreneurial intentions [5], [6], others found weak or negative relationships

[7], [8]. Criaco et al. [7] described this as a “double-edged sword”: family business provides useful resources and role models, but it also exposes young people to the uncertainties and sacrifices of business ownership [13]. How exactly family background relates to the different dimensions of readiness, rather than to intention as a single score, has received limited attention.

Project-based learning (PBL) is an experiential approach in which students learn by carrying out a real or simulated project [14], [15]. In entrepreneurship education, PBL typically involves activities such as developing a business idea, conducting market research, and managing operations [16]. Previous meta-analyses have reported that experiential approaches tend to produce stronger effects on entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention than lecture-based teaching [1], [17]. However, not all students respond to PBL in the same way, and individual differences in prior exposure and personal characteristics may affect how much students benefit from the experience [18], [19].

2 Methods

2.1 Participants and Context

The study was conducted at a state university in East Java, Indonesia. Participants were 119 nutrition science students who gave informed consent (one out of 120 approached students declined). Most participants were female ($n = 113$, 95.0%), which is typical for nutrition programmes in the country. The mean age was 20.97 years ($SD = 0.88$). The mean GPA was 3.706 ($SD = 0.399$) on a 4.00 scale ($n = 118$; one student did not report GPA data). As part of a compulsory entrepreneurship course, students worked in teams to organise a campus food event for one semester, which involved developing a business concept, handling production, and reflecting on what they had learned.

2.2 Instruments

A structured questionnaire was given to the students after the project was completed. The TPB constructs were measured on seven-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree): personal attitudes (PA; 5 items; $\alpha = 0.799$), subjective norms (SN; 4 items; $\alpha = 0.827$), perceived behavioural control (PBC; 6 items; $\alpha = 0.832$), and entrepreneurial intention (EI; 6 items; $\alpha = 0.901$). The overall 21-item scale had a reliability of $\alpha = 0.932$. Prior business experience was measured using a single self-report item: “Have you ever had prior business experience?” Students who answered ‘Yes’ were those who had been actively involved in running, co-running, or managing a business of any kind, including informal activities like online reselling. This variable did not include passive observation of a family member’s business, because that was already captured by a separate variable on family business background. Timing preferences were assessed by asking when students planned to start a business, with five options ranging from “during university” to “no near-term plans.” An open-ended follow-up asked them to explain their choice.

2.3 Data Analysis

All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 27 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY). Composite scores were computed for each TPB dimension, and the scores were then standardised into z-scores before clustering. Hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted using Ward's method with squared Euclidean distance. This method was selected because it is deterministic, meaning that it produces the same result every time regardless of software or initial conditions [20]. To decide how many clusters were most appropriate, solutions from two to six clusters were evaluated using the silhouette coefficient and the agglomeration schedule. These quantitative criteria were then considered together with the theoretical interpretability of each solution. The agglomeration schedule showed that there was a large increase in the merging distance when four clusters were combined into three ($\Delta = 3.982$), which was the second largest jump in the agglomeration schedule and indicates that the four-cluster solution has an important subgroup structure in it that would disappear if the clusters were merged further. The silhouette coefficients for all solutions with three or more clusters were moderate ($S = 0.193\text{--}0.222$), which is consistent with the nature of attitudinal data measured on Likert scales, where clusters tend to have some overlap on certain dimensions. The four-cluster solution was selected because it identified a substantively important low-intention subgroup (non-entrepreneurial, $n = 11$, EI mean = 2.76) that was merged into a neighboring cluster in the three-cluster solution. The five-cluster solution, on the other hand, only divided one existing cluster into a smaller subgroup of four students without adding new theoretical meaning. Differences in TPB scores across clusters were examined with one-way ANOVA and eta-squared (η^2) as effect size. Associations between cluster membership and categorical variables were tested using chi-square with Cramer's V. Adjusted standardized residuals were used to identify cells that contributed most to significant chi-square results.

3 Results

3.1 Sample Characteristics

Table 1. Sample characteristics ($n = 119$)

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	113	95.0
	Male	6	5.0
GPA ($n = 118$)	≤ 3.00	1	0.8
	3.01–3.50	23	19.3
	> 3.50	94	79.0
Family business	Yes	64	53.8
	No	55	46.2
Prior experience	Yes	48	40.3
	No	71	59.7

Note: mean age = 20.97 ($SD = 0.88$); mean GPA = 3.706 ($SD = 0.399$).

Table 1 summaries the demographic information. A large proportion of students (79.0%) had GPAs above 3.50. More than half (53.8%) had at least one family member who runs a business, and 40.3% reported having some previous business experience of their own.

3.2 TPB Scores

Subjective norms had the highest mean score among the four dimensions (mean = 5.462, SD = 0.835), indicating that students generally felt their social environment was supportive of entrepreneurship. Perceived behavioral control was the lowest (mean = 4.440, SD = 0.861), suggesting that students were less confident about their actual ability to start a business. Personal attitudes (mean = 5.064, SD = 0.911) and entrepreneurial intention (mean = 4.549, SD = 1.073) fell in between. Reliability for the overall 21-item scale was $\alpha = 0.932$.

3.3 Readiness Profiles

Ward’s hierarchical cluster analysis on the standardized TPB scores produced four clusters. The dendrogram and the agglomeration schedule both pointed to a four-cluster solution as the most appropriate. ANOVA confirmed that all four TPB dimensions differed significantly across the clusters with large effect sizes: PA ($F = 69.10, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.643$), SN ($F = 54.44, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.587$), PBC ($F = 33.16, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.464$), and EI ($F = 65.60, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.631$). Table 2 shows the profile of each cluster.

Table 2. Readiness profiles from Ward’s cluster analysis (n = 119)

Profile	n (%)	PA	SN	PBC	EI	Fam. (%)	Exp. (%)
Proactive-Ready	35 (29.4)	6.00 (0.56)	6.20 (0.64)	5.19 (0.84)	5.68 (0.64)	62.9	48.6
Supported-Ambivalent	47 (39.5)	5.04 (0.57)	5.60 (0.52)	4.40 (0.64)	4.32 (0.67)	53.2	51.1
Exploratory-Developing	26 (21.8)	4.45 (0.46)	4.62 (0.33)	4.02 (0.32)	4.21 (0.56)	46.2	15.4
Non-Entrepreneurial	11 (9.2)	3.64 (0.65)	4.52 (0.68)	3.23 (0.34)	2.76 (0.86)	45.5	27.3

Note: Values are mean (SD). PA = personal attitudes; SN = subjective norms; PBC = perceived behavioral control; EI = entrepreneurial intention; Fam. = family business background; Exp. = prior business experience.

The Proactive-Ready cluster (n = 35, 29.4%) had the highest scores on all four TPB dimensions. Almost two-thirds of these students (62.9%) had family business backgrounds and close to half (48.6%) had tried running some kind of business before. When asked about timing, 42.8% said they planned to start a venture during university

or right after graduation. One student from this group explained: “My family already runs a restaurant. I can learn from them while still studying and the campus gives me ready customers.”

The largest cluster was Supported-Ambivalent ($n = 47$, 39.5%). What stood out in this group was the gap between their subjective norms (mean = 5.60) and their perceived behavioural control (mean = 4.40). These students felt that people around them were encouraging entrepreneurship, but they did not feel capable of pursuing it themselves. Their timing preferences were spread out: 38.3% said they were uncertain and 27.7% had no near-term plans. A male student in this cluster described his thinking: “I want to work first to understand how things operate in a real setting and to save money. My father started his business after working for five years.”

The Exploratory-Developing cluster ($n = 26$, 21.8%) scored moderately on all TPB dimensions and had the lowest subjective norms (mean = 4.62) and the lowest rate of prior business experience (15.4%). None of the students in this group planned to start a business during university or right after graduation. Half of them (50.0%) indicated they were unsure about timing.

The non-entrepreneurial cluster ($n = 11$, 9.2%) had distinctly low scores for personal attitudes (mean = 3.64), PBC (mean = 3.23), and entrepreneurial intention (mean = 2.76). Their subjective norms, however, stayed at a moderate level (mean = 4.52), meaning that even these students perceived some degree of social support for entrepreneurship. A female student in this group reflected: “Seeing my parents work seven days a week in their shop with uncertain income... I prefer a stable job with regular hours.”

3.4 Family Background, Prior Experience, and Timing

Chi-square analysis showed no significant association between family business background and cluster membership ($\chi^2 = 2.082$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.556$, Cramer’s $V = 0.132$). Students from entrepreneurial families were found in all four clusters without a clear pattern. However, prior business experience was significantly related to the clusters ($\chi^2 = 10.740$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.013$, Cramer’s $V = 0.300$). The Exploratory-Developing group had a much lower rate of prior experience (15.4%) compared with the other groups. Because some cells in the cross-tabulations had expected frequencies that were below 5, Monte Carlo permutation tests with 100,000 iterations were used to check whether the chi-square results were still valid, and the results showed that the original findings did not change, as the association between family business background and cluster membership remained not significant (Monte Carlo $p = 0.559$) while the association between prior experience and cluster membership remained significant (Monte Carlo $p = 0.012$).

Regarding timing preferences, the largest proportion of students overall (37.0%) said they were uncertain about when they would start a business, and 20.2% said they had no near-term plans. Cluster membership was significantly associated with timing ($\chi^2 = 39.596$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.001$, Cramer’s $V = 0.333$). Family business background was also linked to timing ($\chi^2 = 12.854$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.012$, Cramer’s $V = 0.329$). The most striking finding was that all 11 students who chose “immediately after graduation” had family business backgrounds (adjusted residual = 3.23, $p < 0.01$). The Monte Carlo p -value

for the family business $\times$ timing cross-tabulation confirmed this result (Monte Carlo $p = 0.010$). A Fisher’s Exact Test on a collapsed 2×2 table (‘immediately after graduation’ versus all other categories) further confirmed this finding ($p < 0.001$). Table 3 presents this cross-tabulation.

Table 3. Cross-tabulation of family background and Timing ($n = 119$)

Timing	Family biz (n)	Family biz (%)	No family (n)	No family (%)
During university	4	6.2	5	9.1
Immediately after	11	17.2	0	0.0
1–3 years after	15	23.4	16	29.1
Uncertain	19	29.7	25	45.5
No near-term plans	15	23.4	9	16.4

Note: Percentages are within each column. Adjusted residual $> |1.96|$ only for “Immediately after” (± 3.23).

4 Discussion

Before discussing the findings, it is important to consider the specific context of this study, as the data were collected from a single public university in Indonesia and the participants were all nutrition students, most of whom were female (95.0%). In addition, the entrepreneurship course in which the data were collected was a compulsory course, not an elective one. Because of these characteristics, the students’ motivation to engage with the course may be different from students in other settings, and the findings may not be directly applicable to other contexts. The following discussion should be read with these contextual factors in mind.

4.1 Readiness Profiles and the SN–PBC Gap

The four profiles that emerged from the cluster analysis offer a more detailed picture of student entrepreneurial readiness than what a single intention score could provide. The most notable finding is the size and characteristics of the Supported-Ambivalent group, which made up nearly 40% of the sample. The gap between social support (SN = 5.60) and self-efficacy (PBC = 4.40) in this group may suggest that there is some kind of tension between the encouragement that the students receive toward entrepreneurship and the clinical focus of their professional training. However, this study did not measure professional identity directly, and no data was collected about how the students see their role as future health care providers. Therefore, this interpretation is still speculative and needs to be examined in future research that uses instruments which are specifically designed to measure professional identity, such as the entrepreneur identity aspiration scale by Farmer, Yao, and Kung-McIntyre[21].

This finding resonates with Bandura’s [22] distinction between vicarious experience (learning by observing others) and mastery experience (learning through personal accomplishment). Many of the Supported-Ambivalent students had family members in

business (53.2%), which may provide vicarious exposure, but this appears to be insufficient for building the personal confidence needed to pursue entrepreneurship. The practical implication is that this group would benefit most from activities that gradually build their perceived behavioral control through hands-on tasks, rather than from simply hearing about entrepreneurial success stories.

4.2 Family Background: Timing Facilitator, Not Readiness Shaper

A somewhat unexpected finding was that family business background had no significant association with cluster membership ($p = 0.556$). Students from entrepreneurial families were spread across all four profiles, including the non-entrepreneurial group (45.5%). This result suggests that having an entrepreneur in the family does not automatically lead to higher readiness.

Where family background did seem to matter was in the timing of venture plans. The fact that every single student who planned to start a business right after graduation came from a family with business background is a strong signal. It suggests that family entrepreneurial capital, such as networks, financial support, and practical knowledge [23], mainly helps with the timing of when students start their business, rather than with whether they want to become entrepreneurs or not. In other words, family resources can speed up the transition from intention to action for students who are already motivated, but they do not create the motivation itself.

This adds nuance to the “double-edged sword” idea proposed by Criaco et al. [7]. Family business exposure does not simply push students toward or away from entrepreneurship. Rather, it acts as a timing facilitator for some, while for others, particularly those in the non-entrepreneurial cluster, it may reinforce awareness of the risks and difficulties of business ownership.

Meanwhile, prior business experience was significantly related to profile membership ($p = 0.013$). The Exploratory-Developing group had a strikingly low rate of prior experience (15.4%), which suggests that personal hands-on involvement in a business, not just observing relatives, may play a more direct role in building readiness. This is consistent with the experiential learning perspective [14] and has practical implications for curriculum design: creating more opportunities for students to experience entrepreneurship first-hand could be more effective than relying on family background as a source of entrepreneurial socialization.

4.3 Implications for Entrepreneurship Education in Nutrition Programmes

The findings suggest that a one-size-fits-all approach to entrepreneurship education is unlikely to be effective. Proactive-Ready students (29.4%) are already motivated and could benefit from incubation support and mentoring on business planning. The Supported-Ambivalent group (39.5%) needs targeted self-efficacy building. What this group needs are not more encouragement, but more mastery experiences. Exploratory-Developing students (21.8%) require both mentoring and practical exposure, given their lack of prior experience. Non-Entrepreneurial students (9.2%) may benefit from intra-preneurship training that applies entrepreneurial skills within organizational settings,

since not all nutrition graduates will or should start businesses, but entrepreneurial competencies can still be valuable in a healthcare career.

5 Conclusion

This study identified four entrepreneurial readiness profiles among nutrition students through hierarchical cluster analysis on TPB constructs. The main finding of this study is that prior hands-on business experience was significantly associated with readiness profile membership ($\chi^2 = 10.740$, $p = 0.013$, $V = 0.300$; Monte Carlo $p = 0.012$), which suggests that being personally involved in a business, even if only informally, has a more important role in shaping entrepreneurial readiness compared to just observing family members who run businesses. Family business background, on the other hand, was not significantly related to which readiness profile the students belonged to ($\chi^2 = 2.082$, $p = 0.556$, $V = 0.132$). However, it did serve as a facilitator of venture timing, as all the students who planned to start a business immediately after graduation came from families with business background (Fisher's Exact $p < 0.001$). The Supported-Ambivalent profile, which was the largest group (39.5%), showed a pattern that may suggest a tension between the social encouragement that students received and their own sense of self-efficacy, although this interpretation needs to be verified through direct measurement of professional identity in future research.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The study involved a single institution with a predominantly female sample (95.0%), which limits how far the findings can be generalized. The cross-sectional design captures readiness at one point in time and cannot establish whether PBL caused the observed profiles. Although some chi-square cells had expected frequencies below 5, Monte Carlo permutation tests (100,000 iterations) confirmed that all the main conclusions did not change. Self-report measures may be subject to social desirability bias. Future research could adopt a pre-post design to measure how TPB scores change through PBL and could follow up with graduates to check whether the readiness profiles predict actual venture creation behavior.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank the participating students at Universitas Brawijaya.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. G. Nabi, F. Liñán, A. Fayolle, N. Krueger, and A. Walmsley, "The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda," *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 277–299, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.5465/amle.2015.0026.
2. V. Ratten and P. Usmanij, "Entrepreneurship education: Time for a change in research direction?," *The International Journal of Management Education*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 100367, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.IJME.2020.100367.

3. Ministry of Cooperatives of the Republic of Indonesia, *Regulation of the Minister of Cooperatives of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2025 on the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Cooperatives for 2025–2029*. Indonesia, 2025.
4. BPS, “Labor Force Survey February 2023,” Jakarta, 2023. Accessed: Jul. 23, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bps.go.id/id/publication/2023/06/09/5ce5c753f3ffabce2d6423c4a/keadaan-angkatan-kerja-di-indonesia-februari-2023.html>
5. J. C. Carr and J. M. Sequeira, “Prior family business exposure as intergenerational influence and entrepreneurial intent: A Theory of Planned Behavior approach,” *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 1090–1098, Oct. 2007, doi: 10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2006.12.016.
6. S. Laspita, N. Breugst, S. Heblich, and H. Patzelt, “Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions,” *J. Bus. Ventur.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 414–435, Jul. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2011.11.006.
7. G. Criaco, P. Sieger, K. Wennberg, F. Chirico, and T. Minola, “Parents’ performance in entrepreneurship as a ‘double-edged sword’ for the intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurship,” *Small Business Economics*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 841–864, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11187-017-9854-x.
8. E. Mungai and S. R. Velamuri, “Parental Entrepreneurial Role Model Influence on Male Offspring: Is it Always Positive and when does it Occur?,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 337–357, Mar. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00363.x.
9. I. Ajzen, “The theory of planned behavior,” *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 179–211, Dec. 1991, doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T.
10. C. Schlaegel and M. Koenig, “Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intent: A Meta-Analytic Test and Integration of Competing Models,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 291–332, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1111/etap.12087.
11. F. Liñán and Y. Chen, “Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intentions,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 593–617, May 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00318.x.
12. L. R. Bergman and H. Andersson, “The Person and the Variable in Developmental Psychology,” *Zeitschrift für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology*, vol. 218, no. 3, pp. 155–165, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1027/0044-3409/a000025.
13. T. Zellweger, P. Sieger, and F. Halter, “Should I stay or should I go? Career choice intentions of students with family business background,” *J. Bus. Ventur.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 521–536, Sep. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.04.001.
14. G. Hägg and J. Gabrielsson, “A systematic literature review of the evolution of pedagogy in entrepreneurial education research,” *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 829–861, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1108/IJEBR-04-2018-0272.
15. H. M. Neck and A. C. Corbett, “The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Entrepreneurship,” *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 8–41, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1177/2515127417737286.
16. M. Lackéus, “Entrepreneurship in Education: What, Why, When, How,” *OECD Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Papers*, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.1787/CCCAC96A-EN.
17. T. J. Bae, S. Qian, C. Miao, and J. O. Fiet, “The Relationship between Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Meta-Analytic Review,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 217–254, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1111/etap.12095.
18. N. E. Peterman and J. Kennedy, “Enterprise Education: Influencing Students’ Perceptions of Entrepreneurship,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 129–144, Mar. 2003, doi: 10.1046/J.1540-6520.2003.00035.X.

19. J. M. Unger, A. Rauch, M. Frese, and N. Rosenbusch, "Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review," *J. Bus. Ventur.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 341–358, May 2011, doi: 10.1016/J.JBUSVENT.2009.09.004.
20. D. A. Lind, W. G. Marchal, and S. A. Wathen, *Statistical Techniques in Business & Economics*, 15th ed., no. 9. McGraw-Hill, 2012. Accessed: Jul. 23, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://openlibrary.telkomuniversity.ac.id/home/catalog/id/15507/slug/statistical-techniques-in-business-economics-15-e-.html>
21. S. M. Farmer, X. Yao, and K. Kung-Mcintyre, "The Behavioral Impact of Entrepreneur Identity Aspiration and Prior Entrepreneurial Experience," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 245–273, Mar. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00358.x.
22. A. Bandura, *Social Learning Theory*. in Prentice-Hall series in social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, 1977.
23. P. Sieger and T. Minola, "The Family's Financial Support as a 'Poisoned Gift': A Family Embeddedness Perspective on Entrepreneurial Intentions," *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 55, pp. 179–204, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12273.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

