

DETERMINANTS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION IN SCHOOLS: EVIDENCE FROM PROJECT-BASED SURVEY DATA IN NORTHERN VIETNAM

Dr. Tran Thi Dien¹, Dr. Pham Duy Hung^{*1}

¹Tan Trao University, Tuyen Quang, Vietnam.

Email address: ttdien@tqu.edu.vn ; phamduyhung.dhhv@gmail.com

*Corresponding authors: Pham Duy Hung

<https://doi.org/10.51453/3093-3076/>

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: 06/01/2026	Entrepreneurship education is increasingly regarded as a key approach to fostering innovative thinking, self-reliance, and adaptability among students, particularly in mountainous and disadvantaged regions. However, the extent to which entrepreneurship education is implemented in schools varies considerably and is influenced by multiple organizational, institutional, and local contextual factors. This study examines the determinants of entrepreneurship education implementation in schools using project-based survey (PKS) data collected from mountainous areas in Northern Vietnam. The study employs a quantitative approach based on 180 valid observations. Entrepreneurship education implementation is measured through a composite index capturing the integration of entrepreneurship content into teaching activities, experiential learning, and project-based guidance for students. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Ordered Logit models are applied to assess the effects of school support, institutional support, local resource integration (OCOP), and selected teacher-related control variables. The empirical results indicate that school support and local resource integration exert the most significant and robust positive effects on entrepreneurship education implementation. Institutional support from local authorities also shows a positive but less stable influence. In contrast, individual teacher characteristics do not exhibit consistent effects once organizational and contextual factors are considered. The findings provide important empirical evidence on the role of organizational and local contextual conditions in entrepreneurship education and offer policy implications for improving implementation effectiveness in mountainous and disadvantaged regions.
Revised: 21/01/2026	
Published: 28/02/2026	
KEYWORDS	
<i>Entrepreneurship education;</i>	
<i>Implementation level;</i>	
<i>School support;</i>	
<i>Local resources;</i>	
<i>Project-based survey;</i>	
<i>Mountainous regions.</i>	

1. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is increasingly seen as a crucial driver of economic growth, job creation, and enhancing the self-reliance of individuals and communities, especially in the context of developing economies. Many studies suggest that entrepreneurship education plays a key role in shaping innovative thinking, the ability to identify opportunities, and the capacity to transform ideas into concrete socio-economic activities (Fayolle & Gailly, 2015; Neck & Greene,

2011). Therefore, entrepreneurship education is increasingly integrated into the education system in many countries, not only at the university level but also extending to general education.

In Vietnam, entrepreneurship education has been identified as one of the key directions in educational reform, linked to the goal of developing human resources and promoting the national entrepreneurial spirit. In recent years, many programs, projects, and activities supporting entrepreneurship have been implemented through educational institutions, organizations, and local governments. However, in practice, the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education varies significantly between localities and educational institutions, especially in mountainous and disadvantaged areas where socio-economic conditions and support resources are limited.

International studies on entrepreneurship education primarily focus on assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions, personal capabilities, or learning outcomes of learners (Martin et al., 2013; Rauch & Hulsink, 2015). Meanwhile, quantitative studies analyzing the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education in schools and the factors influencing this implementation are still relatively limited, especially in mountainous, rural, and underdeveloped areas. This research gap indicates the need for more empirical evidence to clarify the role of institutional, organizational environment, and local context factors in entrepreneurship education.

Several recent studies emphasize that the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education depends not only on the individual capacity of teachers or learners, but also on the strong influence of school support, the involvement of local authorities, and the ability to exploit available local resources (Gibb, 2011; Hannon, 2007). Particularly in mountainous regions, linking entrepreneurship education with distinctive products, local resources, and the OCOP program is expected to contribute to enhancing the practicality and feasibility of entrepreneurship education activities.

Stemming from the aforementioned issues, this study aims to analyze the factors influencing the level of entrepreneurship education implementation in schools based on survey data collected from the mountainous region of Northern Vietnam. Through the use of OLS and Ordered Logit regression models, the study hopes to provide empirical evidence on the role of school support, institutional support, and the integration of local resources in entrepreneurship education.

Academically, the research contributes to supplementing empirical literature on entrepreneurship education in the context of mountainous regions – an area that is still understudied in existing literature. Practically, the research results provide a scientific basis for designing and adjusting policies and programs to support entrepreneurship education in a way that is more suitable to the socio-economic conditions of mountainous and disadvantaged areas.

2. RESEARCH OVERVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Entrepreneurship education and its implementation in schools

Entrepreneurship education is approached as a process of fostering innovative thinking, the ability to identify opportunities, and the capacity to transform ideas into concrete socio-economic activities. Many studies suggest that entrepreneurship education should not only focus on imparting knowledge but also aim to develop entrepreneurial skills, attitudes, and behaviors through experiential activities and practical projects (Neck & Greene, 2011; Fayolle & Gailly, 2015).

The level of entrepreneurship education implementation in schools is often reflected in the degree of integration of entrepreneurship content into the curriculum, the frequency of experiential activities, the ability to guide projects, and the level of student participation. However, most current empirical studies focus on higher education or urban contexts, while quantitative studies on the level of entrepreneurship education implementation at the secondary school level and in mountainous and disadvantaged areas are relatively limited (Martin et al., 2013). This research gap necessitates a deeper analysis of the factors determining the feasibility of implementing entrepreneurship education in secondary schools in specific contexts.

2.2. The role of the school and the organizational environment

A key line of research emphasizes that the organizational environment and supportive conditions from schools play a crucial role in the implementation of entrepreneurship education. Schools are not only places where training programs are implemented but also institutional spaces where decisions are made regarding resource allocation, incentive mechanisms, and the level of priority given to educational innovation activities (Gibb, 2011).

Studies show that when schools provide favorable conditions in terms of time, facilities, assessment mechanisms, and professional guidance, teachers tend to be more proactive in organizing and implementing entrepreneurship education activities (Hannon, 2007). Especially in mountainous areas, where teachers often have to take on many different roles, support from the school becomes even more important in reducing pressure and motivating teachers to participate in entrepreneurship education. Based on this, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis H1: Support from the school has a positive impact on the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education.

2.3. Leveraging local resources and integrating the OCOP program

Leveraging local resources in entrepreneurship education is considered a suitable approach for mountainous and rural areas, where entrepreneurial activities are often linked to indigenous resources, traditional knowledge, and the need for local livelihood development. Integrating OCOP products and programs into entrepreneurship education helps increase practicality, bridge the gap between theory and practice, and enhance community acceptance of entrepreneurial projects (OECD, 2019).

Some studies suggest that entrepreneurship education linked to the local context has the potential to promote learner participation and enhance the implementation of small-scale

entrepreneurial projects, especially in areas with limited markets and resources (Ratten, 2017). However, quantitative evidence on the impact of integrating OCOP and local resources into entrepreneurship education at the secondary school level is still relatively scarce. Therefore, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis H2: The integration of OCOP and local resources has a positive impact on the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education.

2.4. Institutional Support and Local Context

Besides the role of schools, support from local governments and related organizations is considered a crucial factor in promoting entrepreneurship education. Support policies, training programs, business networking activities, and trade promotion can create a favorable environment for implementing entrepreneurship education activities in schools (Audretsch, 2015).

However, previous studies have shown that the impact of institutional factors is often indirect and depends on the level of coordination with schools. In mountainous regions, where support resources are scattered and not synchronized, the role of local governments needs to be considered empirically to assess the actual impact on entrepreneurship education. Based on this, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis H3: Support from local governments and related organizations has a positive impact on the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education.

2.5. Personal factors and characteristics of the teacher

In addition to environmental and institutional factors, some studies suggest that teachers' individual competence, work experience, and participation in training courses can influence their ability to implement entrepreneurship education (Rauch & Hulsink, 2015). Teachers with knowledge, skills, and experience are expected to be more proactive in organizing entrepreneurship activities for students.

However, empirical research results on the role of individual factors remain inconsistent, particularly in the context of disadvantaged areas where organizational and institutional conditions may exert a stronger influence than individual factors. Therefore, this study incorporates individual factors into the model as control variables to assess their impact when considered in relation to environmental and institutional factors.

3. DATA AND RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. Research data

This study utilizes the Project-Based Survey (PKS) dataset, collected from entrepreneurship education activities implemented in junior and senior high schools in the mountainous region of Northern Vietnam. The dataset reflects teachers' perceptions and assessments of the level of entrepreneurship education implementation in schools, and also

records the degree of connection between entrepreneurship education and local resources and the local socio-economic context.

Data were collected via structured questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 – “strongly disagree” to 5 – “strongly agree”), consistent with previous studies in the fields of education and entrepreneurship (Fayolle & Gailly, 2015; Rauch & Hulsink, 2015). After removing invalid questionnaires and observations with missing information, the final dataset consisted of 180 valid observations, ensuring sufficient sample size for multivariate quantitative analyses.

3.2. Construct research variables

3.2.1. Dependent variable

The dependent variable of the study is the level of implementation of entrepreneurship education in schools (IMP). This variable is constructed as a composite index, reflecting the degree to which entrepreneurship education is integrated into teaching, organizing experiential activities, and guiding entrepreneurial projects for students. Specifically, the IMP index is calculated as the average value of four observed variables (H1–H4), representing the core aspects of implementing entrepreneurship education in schools.

To facilitate the hierarchical regression analysis, the study further developed the variable IMP_cat, in which the level of entrepreneurship education implementation is categorized into three levels: low, medium, and high. This approach allows for the assessment of the potential for movement between different implementation levels, consistent with the hierarchical nature of the dependent variable (Greene, 2018).

3.2.2. Independent variables

The independent variables in the study are constructed as average indices, representing the main groups of factors influencing the level of entrepreneurship education implementation:

+ School support conditions (SCHSUP): measured through the average of five observed variables (D1–D5), reflecting the level of support in terms of mechanisms, time, facilities, and professional orientation from the school. This variable represents the organizational and institutional environment at the school level, considered a key factor in studies on entrepreneurship education (Gibb, 2011).

+ Integration of OCOP and local resources (OCOP): constructed from the average of seven observed variables (G1–G7), reflecting the level of integration of OCOP products, local resources, and local practical issues into entrepreneurship education. This variable represents the local context and the level of connection between entrepreneurship education and local socio-economic development (OECD, 2019).

+ Institutional and Local Support (INSTSUP): measured through the average of five observed variables (E1–E5), reflecting support from local authorities and relevant organizations, including policy, training, and resource connections.

In addition, the study included several control variables, including teachers' individual competence (COMP), students' readiness (STUD), gender, work experience, participation in entrepreneurship education training, and high school level. The use of control variables aims to limit estimation bias and separate the impact of institutional factors from individual characteristics (Wooldridge, 2016).

3.3. Analytical methods

This study employs a quantitative analysis method with two complementary regression models. First, an OLS linear regression model is used to estimate the impact of independent variables on the continuous IMP index. Because sociological survey data often contain heteroskedasticity, the study uses robust standard errors (HC3) to improve the reliability of the estimation results (Long & Ervin, 2000).

Next, to test the durability of the results and consider the impact of research factors on the ability to transition between levels of entrepreneurship education implementation, the Ordered Logit model was applied with the dependent variable IMP_cat. This model is suitable when the dependent variable is hierarchical in nature and allows for the assessment of the probability of achieving a higher implementation level under the influence of explanatory factors (Greene, 2018).

Combining the two estimation methods helps the study comprehensively evaluate the research relationships, while enhancing the reliability and generalizability of the empirical results.

Table 1. Definitions of variables and scales in the research model

Variable group	Symbol	Variable name	Definition and Measurement Method	Scale	Reference Source
Dependent variable	IMP	Level of implementation of entrepreneurship education	The composite index reflects the level of integration of entrepreneurship education into teaching, organizing experiential activities, and guiding entrepreneurship projects in schools; it is calculated as the average of variables H1–H4.	Likert 1–5	Fayolle & Gailly (2015); Neck & Greene (2011)
	IMP_cat	Level of implementation of entrepreneurship education (ranked)	The classification variable from IMP is divided into three levels: low, medium, and high; used for the Ordered Logit model.	Rank	Greene (2018)
Principal	SCHSUP	Support from the	The level of school	Likert	Gibb

Variable group	Symbol	Variable name	Definition and Measurement Method	Scale	Reference Source
independent variables		school	support in terms of mechanisms, time, facilities, and professional guidance for entrepreneurship education; average of variables D1–D5	1–5	(2011); Hannon (2007)
	OCOP	Integrating OCOP and local resources	The level of integration of OCOP products, local resources, and local practical issues into entrepreneurship education; average of G1–G7 variables.	Likert 1–5	OECD (2019); Ratten (2017)
	INSTSUP	Institutional and local support	Level of support from local authorities and related organizations through policies, training, and resource connections; average of variables E1–E5	Likert 1–5	Audretsch (2015); OECD (2019)
Control variables	COMP	Teacher capabilities	Teachers' self-assessment of their knowledge, skills, and ability to organize entrepreneurship education; average of variables C1–C6.	Likert 1–5	Rauch & Hulsink (2015)
	STUD	Student readiness	The level of readiness, interest, and ability of students to participate in entrepreneurial activities; average of variables F1, F2, F5, F6 (F3, F4 are inverted).	Likert 1–5	Martin et al. (2013)
	FEMALE	Teacher's gender	Dummy variables: 1 = female; 0 = male	Binary	Wooldridge (2016)
	EXP_YEARS	Years of service	Number of years of service of the teacher (converted into year groups)	Number	Wooldridge (2016)
	TRAINED	Received training in entrepreneurship education	Dummy variable: 1 = participated in training; 0 = did not participate	Binary	Fayolle & Gailly (2015)

Variable group	Symbol	Variable name	Definition and Measurement Method	Scale	Reference Source
	LEVEL_THPT	School level	Dummy variables: 1 = high school teacher; 0 = middle school teacher	Binary	Martin et al. (2013)

Source: Compiled and set up by the authors

- Variables are measured using a 5-point Likert scale to reflect the level of agreement of respondents, suitable for studies on education and entrepreneurship.

- Index variables are constructed using the average values of observed variables to reduce noise and increase the reliability of the scale.

- The IMP_cat variable is used in the Ordered Logit model to test the durability of the results.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. OLS regression results

Table 2 presents the estimation results of the OLS linear regression model with robust adjusted standard errors (HC3), where the dependent variable is the index of entrepreneurial education implementation level (IMP) constructed from project survey data. The model has a coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.506$, indicating that the independent variables in the model explain approximately 50.6% of the variation in the level of entrepreneurial education implementation, a suitable level of explanation for the sociological survey data.

Table 2. OLS regression results (robust standard errors – HC3)

Dependent variable: *Level of implementation of entrepreneurship education (IMP)*

Number of observations: 180

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
Teacher Competency (COMP)	-0.110	0.124	0.373
School Support (SCHSUP)	0.434	0.124	0.000***
Institutional Support (INSTSUP)	0.241	0.127	0.059*
Student Readiness (STUD)	-0.051	0.143	0.724
OCOP Integration (OCOP)	0.547	0.147	0.000***
Training Received	-0.002	0.100	0.984
Gender (female = 1)	-0.183	0.089	0.041**
Work Experience	0.006	0.006	0.331
High School Level	0.086	0.135	0.524

$R^2 = 0.506$; Adj. $R^2 = 0.479$

Note: *** $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.05$; * $p < 0.10$.

Source: Author's calculations from PKS survey data

The results showed that school support conditions (SCHSUP) had a positive and statistically significant impact ($\beta = 0.434$; $p < 0.01$). This implies that when schools provide favorable conditions in terms of facilities, organizational mechanisms, time, and professional

orientation, the level of entrepreneurship education implementation by teachers increases significantly. This result is consistent with previous studies emphasizing the role of the institutional environment in entrepreneurship education.

Furthermore, the variable of integrating OCOP and local resources into entrepreneurship education (OCOP) also showed a positive and statistically significant impact at the 1% level ($\beta = 0.547$; $p < 0.01$). This result indicates that exploiting OCOP products, local resources, and local practical issues plays a crucial role in enhancing the practicality and implementation capacity of entrepreneurship education, especially in mountainous regions.

Institutional support from local authorities and related organizations (INSTSUP) had a positive and significant impact at the 10% level ($\beta = 0.241$; $p < 0.10$). Although the significance level is not high, this result still shows a certain role of local authorities and external support programs in promoting entrepreneurship education in schools.

Conversely, teacher individual competence (COMP) and student readiness (STUD) were not statistically significant in the OLS model. This result suggests that, in the context of the study, individual factors are only effective when placed within a sufficiently favorable organizational and institutional environment.

Notably, the gender variable (FEMALE) had a negative coefficient and was statistically significant at the 5% level ($\beta = -0.183$; $p < 0.05$), suggesting that female teachers tend to face more barriers in implementing entrepreneurship education. However, these results need to be interpreted cautiously and further tested in other models.

4.2. Ordered Logit Regression Results

To test the robustness of the results, the study further used the Ordered Logit model, in which the dependent variable was classified into three levels: low, medium, and high. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Ordered Logit Regression

Dependent variable: *Level of entrepreneurship education implementation* (Low – Medium – High)

Number of observations: 180

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
Teacher Competency (COMP)	-0.069	0.425	0.871
School Support (SCHSUP)	1.841	0.408	0.000***
Institutional Support (INSTSUP)	0.704	0.379	0.064*
Student Readiness (STUD)	-0.013	0.631	0.983
OCOP Integration (OCOP)	1.329	0.457	0.004***
Training Received	0.328	0.344	0.340
Gender (female = 1)	-0.261	0.356	0.463
Work Experience	0.022	0.023	0.342
High School Level	-0.007	0.476	0.989

Note: *** $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.05$; * $p < 0.10$.

Source: Author's calculations from PKS survey data.

The Ordered Logit results show that the school support condition (SCHSUP) continues to have a positive and highly statistically significant impact ($\beta = 1.841$; $p < 0.01$). This result confirms the central role of schools in determining the feasibility of implementing entrepreneurship education at different levels.

Similarly, the OCOP variable maintained a positive and statistically significant impact at the 1% level ($\beta = 1.329$; $p < 0.01$), indicating that linking entrepreneurship education with local resources and products not only enhances implementation but also helps teachers move from lower to higher levels.

The institutional support variable (INSTSUP) was significant at the 10% level ($\beta = 0.704$; $p < 0.10$), consistent with the results from the OLS model. This reinforces the argument that the involvement of government and support organizations is an important supplementary factor, although it is not a determining factor.

In the Ordered Logit model, variables such as gender, training received, years of service, and high school level are no longer statistically significant. This result shows that the impact of individual characteristics is not sustainable when considered in relation to the level of implementation, thereby emphasizing the dominant role of environmental and institutional factors.

4.3. Discuss the results

Overall, regression results from both models indicate that institutional factors at the school level and the exploitation of local resources (OCOP) are the two factors with the strongest and most consistent impact on the level of entrepreneurship education implementation. This finding suggests that programs promoting entrepreneurship education in mountainous areas need to shift their focus from individual interventions to building a supportive environment that integrates education with local socio-economic development practices.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The research findings indicate that the level of entrepreneurship education implementation is strongly influenced by institutional and environmental factors, particularly the role of schools and the utilization of local resources. Based on this, the study proposes several policy implications to enhance the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education implementation in mountainous and disadvantaged areas.

5.1. Strengthening the coordinating and supportive role of schools

The regression results show that school support is the most powerful and consistent factor influencing the level of entrepreneurship education implementation. Therefore, educational institutions need to play a central role in coordinating, organizing, and creating a favorable environment for entrepreneurship education activities. Specifically, schools need to:

- + Allocate reasonable time for experiential activities, projects, and learning oriented towards entrepreneurship in both the main curriculum and extracurricular programs;
- + Develop mechanisms to encourage teachers to actively participate in teaching and guiding entrepreneurship projects through performance evaluation, recognition of standard teaching hours, and professional support;

+ Invest in facilities, creative spaces, and minimum support resources so that teachers and students can implement entrepreneurial ideas linked to local realities.

5.2. Linking entrepreneurship education with local resources and products (OCOP)

One of the key findings of the study is that integrating OCOP (One Commune One Product) and local resources has a positive and statistically significant impact on the level of entrepreneurship education implementation. This indicates that entrepreneurship education is only truly effective when placed within the specific socio-economic context of the locality.

Therefore, entrepreneurship education programs need to be designed in the following ways:

+ Encouraging students to utilize OCOP products, local resources, and practical local issues as a foundation for developing entrepreneurial ideas;

+ Strengthening links between schools and cooperatives, small businesses, and local production facilities to provide students with opportunities to access real-world experience and test their ideas;

+ Integrating entrepreneurship content into related subjects such as economics, technology, geography, and career education, thereby enhancing the interdisciplinary nature and applicability of entrepreneurship education.

5.3. Enhance the supportive role of local authorities and relevant organizations

The research results also show that support from local authorities and related organizations has a positive influence, although not to a very strong degree. This suggests that current startup support policies need to be adjusted to be more accessible to schools and teachers. Specifically, local authorities can:

+ Coordinate with educational institutions in developing support, training, and startup consulting programs suitable to regional conditions;

+ Facilitate the participation of student startup projects in local trade fairs, exhibitions, and trade promotion events;

+ Connect support resources from socio-economic development programs, the OCOP program, and youth startup support funds.

5.4. Shift the focus from individual intervention to building a supportive environment

A notable finding of the study is that individual factors such as teacher competence, years of service, or participation in training do not show a sustainable impact when considered within the overall model. This suggests that entrepreneurship education policies need to shift their focus from individual training to building a comprehensive support environment, where schools play a central role and local communities serve as the implementation space.

Therefore, instead of focusing solely on short-term training courses, support programs should aim for:

+ Building a core network of teachers in entrepreneurship education;

+ Establishing a long-term coordination mechanism between schools, businesses, and local authorities;

+ Ensuring the continuity and sustainability of entrepreneurship education activities, especially in mountainous and disadvantaged areas.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

6.1. Conclusion

This study analyzes the factors influencing the level of entrepreneurship education implementation based on project survey (PKS) data collected in the mountainous region of Northern Vietnam. By constructing a composite index reflecting the level of entrepreneurship education implementation and simultaneously using OLS and Ordered Logit regression models, the study provides empirical evidence on the role of institutional, environmental, and local resource factors in entrepreneurship education within schools.

The research results show that school support is the most powerful and consistent factor influencing the level of entrepreneurship education implementation. This finding affirms the central role of schools in organizing, coordinating, and creating a favorable environment for entrepreneurship education activities, especially in mountainous areas with limited resources.

Furthermore, integrating local resources and products (OCOP) into entrepreneurship education has also had a positive and statistically significant impact. This shows that entrepreneurship education linked to local practices not only enhances the feasibility of implementation activities but also contributes to forming an entrepreneurial mindset suitable to the local socio-economic development conditions.

Furthermore, support from local authorities and relevant organizations was identified as an important supplementary factor contributing to the enhancement of entrepreneurship education implementation, although its impact was not particularly strong. Conversely, individual factors such as teacher competence, years of service, or participation in training did not show a sustainable impact when considered within the overall model, thus emphasizing the dominant role of the institutional and organizational environment.

Academically, the research contributes to supplementing quantitative evidence on entrepreneurship education in mountainous areas – a context that is still understudied in existing literature. Practically, the research results provide a scientific basis for designing and adjusting policies and programs to support entrepreneurship education in a way that is relevant to local conditions and strengthens the role of schools.

6.2. Limitations of the study and directions for further research

Despite achieving its stated objectives, the study still has certain limitations:

Firstly, the research data was collected using a cross-sectional survey at a single point in time, thus failing to reflect changes in the level of entrepreneurship education implementation over time. Further studies could use panel data or a time-series research design to analyze the long-term impact of institutional and environmental factors.

Secondly, the research variables are primarily measured based on teachers' self-assessment scales, thus they may be susceptible to cognitive bias and social bias. Combining survey data with objective evaluation criteria, such as the number of implemented startup projects or student participation levels, would enhance the reliability of the research results.

Third, the study focuses on a specific geographical area, thus limiting the ability to generalize the results to other regions. Future studies could expand the scope to rural, lowland, or urban areas to compare differences in factors influencing entrepreneurship education.

Finally, the research model did not consider the mediating or moderating role of several factors such as individual motivation, organizational culture, or social networks. This is a potential area for further research, especially when using advanced analytical methods such as structural equation modeling (SEM).

Acknowledgments: This study was supported by Tan Trao University, Vietnam.

REFERENCES

1. Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2015). *The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(1), 75–93.
2. Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). *Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 55–70.
3. Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). *Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211–224.
4. Rauch, A., & Hulsink, W. (2015). *Putting entrepreneurship education where the intention to act lies*. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2), 187–204.
5. Gibb, A. (2011). *Concepts into practice: Meeting the challenge of development of entrepreneurship educators*. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 17(2), 146–165.
6. Hannon, P. D. (2007). *Enterprise for all? The fragility of enterprise provision across England's HEIs*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(2), 183–210.
7. Audretsch, D. B. (2015). *Entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth*. Oxford University Press.
8. OECD (2019). *SME and Entrepreneurship Policy in Rural Areas*. OECD Publishing.
9. Ratten, V. (2017). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and local contexts. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 29(2), 99–113.
10. Greene, W. H. (2018). *Econometric analysis* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
11. Long, J. S., & Ervin, L. H. (2000). Using heteroscedasticity consistent standard errors in the linear regression model. *The American Statistician*, 54(3), 217–224.
12. Wooldridge, J. M. (2016). *Introductory econometrics: A modern approach* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.