WWW.IJRPR.COM

**International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews**

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

# Factors Influencing Students' Readiness for Innovative Entrepreneurship

***Vo Thi Minh Nho***

*University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Danang*
*DOI : https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1124.3239*

**A B S T R A C T**

This study examines the factors that influence the readiness for innovative entrepreneurship among university students in central Vietnam. Data were collected from 574 students, and analyzed using SPSS to explore the relationships between variables. The results show that practical experience, educational support, opportunity recognition, innovative ability, and digital skills all significantly impact students' readiness for entrepreneurship, with practical experience and opportunity recognition having the strongest effects. Based on these findings, the study offers recommendations to enhance these factors, aiming to improve students' entrepreneurial intentions and better prepare them for launching innovative ventures.

*Keywords: Motivation, Scientific research, Students, Extrinsic motivators, Intrinsic motivator*

## Introduction

Innovative entrepreneurship (IE) is a highly relevant topic today, particularly among students. Education, scientific research, and IE are recognized as three essential missions of universities. In recent years, universities have increasingly prioritized fostering entrepreneurship among students, helping them develop soft skills and connect with employers to secure appropriate jobs post-graduation (Vuong, La, Vuong, Ho, & Ho, 2020).

Academically, the intention to pursue IE is a significant area of interest for scholars, policymakers, and business leaders. In Vietnam, the startup movement has garnered attention from the government, society, and the community (Nguyen & Mort, 2016). Over the last few decades, entrepreneurship has experienced robust growth globally and has become a focal point for various nations, supported by extensive research (Schmitz, Urbano, Dandolini, de Souza, & Guerrero, 2017).

Higher education institutions play a vital role in driving innovation and development at both national and regional levels. By emphasizing research, nurturing creative thinking, and partnering with organizations within the startup ecosystem, universities prepare a workforce equipped with essential skills and mindsets. Furthermore, they assist faculty in improving their expertise to guide and cultivate students' entrepreneurial ideas, enhancing the scientific and technological aspects of their projects. Universities also serve as key connectors among businesses, research entities, and local authorities, fostering an environment of innovation and development while providing leadership skills to young people (Hassan, Saleem, Anwar, & Hussain, 2020).

To boost the IE movement among students, universities have created opportunities for scientific research and supported the conversion of projects into viable products. Additionally, the entrepreneurial potential of students highlights the importance of factors such as innovative ability, digital competence, and opportunity recognition, which collectively enable the transition from entrepreneurial intention to action. IE further relies on skillsets that include creative problem-solving, digital proficiency, and the capacity to identify emerging market needs. Entrepreneurship education and practical experiences provide essential training that enhances entrepreneurial intentions by building confidence and perceived control over entrepreneurial. Moreover, readiness for innovative entrepreneurship requires agility and a strategic mindset, allowing entrepreneurs to iterate on their business models and meet investor criteria. External support, such as government policies and access to mentorship, reinforces this readiness, creating a conducive environment for launching and sustaining new ventures (Blank & Dorf, 2020). However, there are still significant challenges in increasing students' intentions to engage in IE. This study aims to deepen understanding of the factors influencing IE, particularly among students, by examining how individual attributes, educational support, practical experience, and systemic readiness collectively foster the development and sustainability of innovative ventures. By exploring these interlinked factors, this research contributes valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and entrepreneurial support organizations aiming to build environments conducive to fostering innovative entrepreneurship.

## Literature reviews

Innovative entrepreneurship (IE) is becoming increasingly important for economic development and innovation in today's world (Krueger, 2017). According to Block, Fisch, and Van Praag (2017), IE, like other forms of entrepreneurship, arises from the connection between individuals and opportunities. This type of entrepreneurship tends to thrive in specific environments, particularly those driven by knowledge, technology, or research, which are key factors for the emergence of innovative startups (Acs, Braunerhjelm, Audretsch, & Carlsson, 2009). Additionally, the potential for IE increases when entrepreneurs possess socioeconomic characteristics and personal traits such as educational attainment and technical expertise (Koellinger, 2008).. Beyond individual attributes and opportunities, the environmental context and available resources from stakeholders, alliances, and networks are crucial for developing creative entrepreneurship (Elfring & Hulsink, 2003). IE plays a vital role in driving economic growth, positively impacting job creation, fostering innovation, and enhancing market competitiveness. It embodies the pursuit of successful opportunities through personal initiatives, even within uncertain conditions and limited resources (Prince, Chapman, & Cassey, 2021).

Research indicates that students have high entrepreneurial potential, and their intentions to start businesses can be predicted by specific factors (Nowiński, Haddoud, Lančarič, Egerová, & Czeglédi, 2019). Jocic, Morris, and Kuratko (2023) emphasize that the intention for IE is more than just an idea; it is a concrete action plan that reflects readiness to take necessary steps to bring that idea to fruition. Scholars agree that the intention for IE is a critical factor for starting new ventures, representing not only personal determination but also a deep understanding of the market and the ability to formulate business strategies, thus aligning personal goals with market demands (Krueger, 2017).

**Innovative ability**

Innovative ability is a core competency in entrepreneurship, encompassing the skills and mindset required to conceive, develop, and implement novel ideas that create value in the marketplace. This ability is influenced by an entrepreneur's creativity, knowledge, and problem-solving skills, all of which contribute to their capacity to recognize and exploit unique opportunities (Amabile, 1997). Entrepreneurs with high innovative ability are adept at using creative thinking to develop solutions that meet emerging customer needs, often leading to disruptive innovations that redefine market dynamics (Schumpeter, 2013). Furthermore, the innovative ability is enhanced by an entrepreneurial environment that fosters experimentation and tolerance for risk, allowing entrepreneurs to prototype, test, and refine ideas iteratively (Fagerberg, 2005). As Zahra, Sapienza, and Davidsson (2006) argue, innovative ability is also a dynamic capability, meaning it enables entrepreneurs not only to innovate in response to current conditions but also to adapt proactively to future market changes. This skill set is essential for maintaining competitiveness in fast-evolving sectors, where continuous innovation can become a key driver of sustained growth.

**Digital ability**

Digital ability, or digital literacy, is increasingly vital in innovative entrepreneurship, as it enables entrepreneurs to leverage digital tools and technologies for ideation, product development, and market reach. In the digital age, entrepreneurs with high digital ability can utilize platforms like social media, data analytics, and e-commerce to gain customer insights, enhance marketing strategies, and streamline operations (Nambisan, 2017). Furthermore, digital competence allows entrepreneurs to build and scale digital business models, often with lower costs and broader reach than traditional models, which can lead to disruptive innovations (Kraus, Palmer, Kailer, Kallinger, & Spitzer, 2019). High digital ability also supports agility, as it enables quick adaptation to technology-driven market changes, helping entrepreneurs respond to evolving customer needs with innovative solutions. This capability is essential in the context of "born-digital" startups, which rely entirely on digital infrastructure and the ability to exploit online channels for competitive advantage. Thus, fostering digital ability is crucial for entrepreneurs to remain competitive and responsive in fast-paced digital markets.

**Opportunity recognition**

In the context of innovative entrepreneurship, opportunity recognition is the critical skill of identifying new market gaps or novel ways to create value through unique products, services, or processes. Opportunity recognition is not only about perceiving unmet needs but also involves analyzing resources and trends to predict how these needs could evolve (Shane, 2000). Successful entrepreneurs leverage cognitive frameworks and prior knowledge to identify opportunities more effectively than others, which often distinguishes them in competitive markets (Baron, 2006). Additionally, personal networks and social capital play crucial roles in recognizing and validating opportunities, as entrepreneurs often depend on feedback and insights from their networks to refine their ideas (Ardichvili, Cardozo, & Ray, 2003). By merging creativity with market insight, innovative entrepreneurs can turn fleeting opportunities into viable ventures, positioning themselves at the forefront of industry shifts. As Schumpeter (2013) noted, the ability to innovate through opportunity recognition is a driving force of economic development, fostering "creative destruction" that redefines industries and creates new market standards.

**Support for entrepreneurship education**

Entrepreneurship education helps students acquire essential business knowledge and skills. It promotes a more positive attitude toward entrepreneurship by providing in-depth insights into business processes and successful models. When students understand the advantages of entrepreneurship—such as job independence, innovation potential, and economic opportunities—their attitudes become more favorable (Fayolle & Degeorge, 2006). According to Hassan et al. (2020) students gain entrepreneurial skills, knowledge, and even business opportunities through higher education. In environments enriched with entrepreneurship education, students often connect with like-minded communities, reinforcing their belief that entrepreneurship is a viable and socially accepted choice (Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Al-Laham, 2007). Support from faculty, mentors, and peers also helps shape positive social

norms regarding entrepreneurial behavior. When the surrounding environment encourages entrepreneurship, students feel more confident in pursuing their entrepreneurial intentions.

Moreover, entrepreneurship education plays a vital role in increasing students' awareness of their capabilities to take action, including managing challenges and obstacles in entrepreneurship. Courses on entrepreneurship cover business planning, financial management, and product development while also helping students develop soft skills like leadership, negotiation, and problem-solving (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014). When students feel well-equipped with the necessary tools and knowledge, their confidence in executing and managing entrepreneurial processes increases. This enhances their perceived behavioral control, thereby promoting their entrepreneurial intentions.

***Practical experience in entrepreneurship***

Practical experience in entrepreneurship refers to students' work experiences related to business. Arranz et al. further include activities such as attending entrepreneurship workshops and conferences, visiting businesses, engaging in simulations, or participating in startup projects (Arranz, Ubierna, Arroyabe, Perez, & Fdez. de Arroyabe, 2017). Devonish, Alleyne, Charles‐Soverall, Young Marshall, and Pounder (2010) assert that personal experiences related to business positively influence future entrepreneurial intentions. Such practical experiences help students develop a more positive attitude toward entrepreneurship by providing deeper insights into its benefits and real-world challenges. Additionally, involvement in social networks related to entrepreneurship fosters support from the surrounding environment, enhancing subjective norms regarding entrepreneurship. Finally, through projects and competitions, students can build confidence in their perceived control over entrepreneurial actions, improving their awareness of behavioral control in the creative entrepreneurship process.

**Readiness of innovative entrepreneurship**

The readiness of innovative entrepreneurship is essential for the successful development and implementation of new ideas in the market. Readiness involves multiple aspects, including an entrepreneur's knowledge, skills, and ability to access resources, which influence their capability to launch and sustain new ventures. As highlighted by Blank and Dorf (2020), a startup's readiness depends on its ability to iterate on its business model and adapt quickly to market feedback, a process that demands both agility and resilience. Additionally, the concept of "investment readiness" emphasizes the importance of financial preparedness, where entrepreneurs must demonstrate that they understand and can meet the criteria of potential investors (Mason & Harrison, 2001). Successful innovative entrepreneurship, therefore, requires both a mindset geared toward adaptability and the financial acumen to secure and manage funds effectively. Furthermore, government policies and institutional support can significantly impact an entrepreneur's readiness by providing necessary infrastructure, mentoring, and financial incentives (Isenberg, 2010). The alignment of these factors fosters an environment where innovative ideas can mature into sustainable businesses.

***Research methodology***

The participants in this study were university students from a central region of Vietnam, with a total of 574 students providing responses. Data was collected through a structured survey questionnaire, with questions adapted from relevant studies and refined with the assistance of two entrepreneurship experts to ensure that the measurement scale suited the context of this study. The research variables included five independent factors: support from education, practical experience in entrepreneurship, personal attitude, perceived behavioral control, and subjective norms, along with a scale to measure students' intentions toward creative entrepreneurship.

The collected data from the 574 participants was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were calculated to summarize the data and provide a clear overview of the results. In addition, a linear regression analysis was conducted to examine how each factor influences students' intentions for innovative entrepreneurship.

Ethical considerations were strictly followed throughout the study. All participants gave informed consent before participating and were fully informed about the study's purpose. They were also assured that their responses would be kept confidential, ensuring that their privacy was respected and maintained.

## 3. Results

***Demographic characteristics of respondents***

Table 1 below displays the characteristics of the respondents based on gender, year of study, and the sources of information they received about student scientific research. Out of 574 participants, 517 (90.07%) were women, while 57 (9.93%) were men. In terms of academic year, the largest percentage of respondents were fourth-year students (29,27%), followed by third-year students (27.18%), followed by second-year students (19.86%) and first-year students (23.69%).

Regarding their career plans after graduation: The largest group (60.45%) expressed a desire to work while remaining open to entrepreneurial opportunities, indicating a strong interest in flexible career pathways. Private company employment is the next most popular choice, while direct entrepreneurship or working in state-owned companies are less preferred.

**Table 1** – Summary of characteristics of respondents

| ***Variable*** | ***Characteristics*** | ***Number*** | ***Percent (%)*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Gender* | *Female* | 517 | 90.07 |
| | *Male* | 57 | 9.93 |
| *Class year* | *1* | 136 | 23.69 |
| | *2* | 114 | 19.86 |
| | *3* | 156 | 27.18 |
| | *4* | 168 | 29.27 |
| *Your career plans after graduation* | *Start up* | 25 | 4.36 |
| | *Work in private company* | 166 | 28.92 |
| | *Work in a state-owned company* | 36 | 6.27 |
| | *Employed but open to starting a business if the opportunity arises.* | 347 | 60.45 |

***Descriptive Statisics and reliability analysis of independent variables and dependent variables***

**Table 2 - Descriptive Statistics and reliability analysis of Support for entrepreneurship education**

| **Support for entrepreneurship education – GDKN** (AVE = 0.665, Cronbach's Alpha = 0.874 ) | Outer loadings | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GDKN1 | 0.799 | 1 | 5 | 3.103 | 0.969 |
| GDKN2 | 0.839 | 1 | 5 | 2.981 | 0.988 |
| GDKN3 | 0.823 | 1 | 5 | 3.307 | 0.951 |
| GDKN4 | 0.795 | 1 | 5 | 3.049 | 0.987 |
| GDKN5 | 0.820 | 1 | 5 | 3.253 | 0.992 |

The results in table 2 indicate that the "Support for Entrepreneurship Education – GDKN" scale has good reliability and validity. With an AVE of 0.665, the construct meets the recommended threshold of 0.5, indicating strong convergent validity and demonstrating that the items collectively capture the concept well. Additionally, the Cronbach's Alpha of 0.874 shows high internal consistency, suggesting that the items are reliable and consistently measure the same construct. The outer loadings for each item (ranging from 0.795 to 0.839) also support the individual items' contribution to the overall construct, while the mean responses (ranging from 2.981 to 3.307) and standard deviations (around 0.951 to 0.992) show moderate agreement among respondents, with some variation. Overall, these metrics confirm that the GDKN scale is a dependable measure for assessing support for entrepreneurship education.

**Table 3 - Descriptive Statistics and reliability analysis of Practical experience in entrepreneurship**

| **Practical experience in entrepreneurship – TNTT** (AVE = 0.589, Cronbach's Alpha = 0.824 ) | **Outer loadings** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TNTT1 | 0.657 | 1 | 5 | 2.721 | 1.223 |
| TNTT2 | 0.792 | 1 | 5 | 2.519 | 1.055 |
| TNTT3 | 0.732 | 1 | 5 | 2.650 | 1.047 |
| TNTT4 | 0.810 | 1 | 5 | 2.368 | 1.043 |
| TNTT5 | 0.833 | 1 | 5 | 2.138 | 1.039 |

As shown in table 3, the "Practical Experience in Entrepreneurship – TNTT" scale demonstrates adequate reliability and validity for measuring practical experience in entrepreneurship. An AVE of 0.589 meets the acceptable threshold of 0.5, suggesting that the items in this scale capture the concept with sufficient convergent validity. The Cronbach's Alpha of 0.824 indicates good internal consistency, meaning the items reliably assess the same construct. Outer loadings range from 0.657 to 0.833, supporting the contribution of each item to the overall construct. The mean scores (ranging from 2.138 to 2.721) suggest a relatively low but varied level of practical experience, and the standard deviations (from 1.039 to 1.223) imply moderate variability among respondents' experiences. Altogether, these results indicate that the TNTT scale is a sound measure of practical entrepreneurial experience, though responses suggest a generally lower experience level among participants.

**Table 4 -** Descriptive Statistics of Innovative Ability- **NLDM**

| Innovative Ability- **NLDM** (AVE = 0.600, Cronbach's alpha = 0.777) | Outer loadings | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NLDM1 | 0.737 | 1 | 5 | 3.502 | 0.888 |
| NLDM2 | 0.703 | 1 | 5 | 2.730 | 1.076 |
| NLDM3 | 0.834 | 1 | 5 | 3.408 | 0.861 |
| NLDM4 | 0.817 | 1 | 5 | 3.331 | 0.903 |

The "Innovative Ability – NLDM" scale shows acceptable reliability and validity for measuring individuals' innovative abilities. With an AVE of 0.600, the construct meets the minimum requirement for convergent validity, indicating that it effectively captures the intended concept. A Cronbach's Alpha of 0.777 suggests a satisfactory level of internal consistency, meaning the items are reasonably reliable in measuring the same construct. Outer loadings ranging from 0.703 to 0.834 further support the contributions of each item to the overall construct. Mean scores (from 2.730 to 3.502) suggest that respondents generally rate their innovative abilities moderately, with some variation, while standard deviations (from 0.861 to 1.076) indicate a moderate spread in responses. Overall, the NLDM scale is a reliable and valid tool for assessing innovative ability, with a generally positive perception of innovation skills among respondents.

**Table 5 -** Descriptive Statistics of Digital Ability

| **Digital Ability - NLCN** (AVE =0.536, Cronbach's Alpha= 0.723) | Outer loadings | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NLCN1 | 0.547 | 1 | 5 | 3.937 | 0.911 |
| NLCN2 | 0.806 | 1 | 5 | 3.167 | 0.942 |
| NLCN3 | 0.820 | 1 | 5 | 3.502 | 0.989 |
| NLCN4 | 0.722 | 1 | 5 | 3.387 | 1.062 |

The "Digital Ability – NLCN" scale shows adequate reliability and validity for assessing digital skills. With an AVE of 0.536, the scale meets the recommended threshold for convergent validity, indicating that the items collectively represent the concept of digital ability. A Cronbach's Alpha of 0.723 reflects acceptable internal consistency, suggesting that the items are reasonably reliable in measuring the same construct. The outer loadings (ranging from 0.547 to 0.820) show that, while all items contribute to the construct. Mean scores (ranging from 3.167 to 3.937) imply that respondents generally rate their digital abilities positively, and the standard deviations (from 0.911 to 1.062) indicate a moderate variation in responses. Overall, the NLCN scale provides a satisfactory measure of digital ability, with respondents generally perceiving themselves as moderately skilled in digital competencies.

**Table 6** - Descriptive Statistics of Opportunity recognition

| **Opportunity recognition- NDCH** (AVE = 0.727, Cronbach's Alpha = 0.875) | Outer loadings | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NDCH1 | 0.825 | 1 | 5 | 3.103 | 0.941 |
| NDCH2 | 0.860 | 1 | 5 | 3.122 | 0.972 |
| NDCH3 | 0.866 | 1 | 5 | 3.066 | 0.976 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NDCH4 | 0.858 | 1 | 5 | 2.848 | 1.018 |

The "Opportunity Recognition – NDCH" scale exhibits strong reliability and validity for evaluating the ability to recognize opportunities. An AVE of 0.727 exceeds the typical threshold of 0.5, indicating high convergent validity and suggesting that the scale effectively captures the intended concept. With a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.875, the scale also demonstrates excellent internal consistency, showing that the items consistently measure the same construct. Outer loadings range from 0.825 to 0.866, further supporting the strength and relevance of each item to the overall construct. Mean scores (from 2.848 to 3.122) reveal a moderate level of opportunity recognition among respondents, with standard deviations (from 0.941 to 1.018) indicating some variation in responses. Overall, the NDCH scale is a reliable and valid measure, reflecting a generally positive perception of opportunity recognition skills among participants.

**Table 7 -** Descriptive Statistics of Readiness of Innovative Entrepreneurship

| Readiness of Innovative Entrepreneurship - **SSKN** (AVE = 0.699, Cronbach's Alpha= 0.892) | Outer loadings | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SSKN1 | 0.783 | 1 | 5 | 3.035 | 1.029 |
| SSKN2 | 0.877 | 1 | 5 | 2.756 | 1.016 |
| SSKN3 | 0.878 | 1 | 5 | 2.685 | 1.028 |
| SSKN4 | 0.831 | 1 | 5 | 2.507 | 1.084 |
| SSKN5 | 0.809 | 1 | 5 | 2.735 | 1.159 |

The "Readiness of Innovative Entrepreneurship – SSKN" scale demonstrates strong reliability and validity for assessing individuals' readiness for innovative entrepreneurship. The AVE of 0.699 is above the recommended threshold of 0.5, indicating excellent convergent validity, meaning the scale effectively captures the concept of entrepreneurial readiness. A Cronbach's Alpha of 0.892 reflects high internal consistency, suggesting the items reliably measure the same construct. Outer loadings range from 0.783 to 0.878, all above the typical threshold of 0.7, indicating that each item significantly contributes to the construct. The mean scores (ranging from 2.507 to 3.035) suggest a moderate level of perceived readiness among respondents, with standard deviations (from 1.016 to 1.159) indicating moderate variation in responses. Overall, the SSKN scale is a reliable and valid measure of readiness for innovative entrepreneurship, with respondents showing moderate but varied perceptions of their entrepreneurial preparedness.

In general, all indicators in the measurement scales from Table 2 to Table 7 have outer loadings that are approximately or greater than 0.7, which is consistent with the reference values of previous studies (Götz, Liehr-Gobbers, & Krafft, 2009; Henseler, Ringle, & Sinkovics, 2009). The Cronbach's Alpha values of the measurement scales are all greater than 0.7, and the AVE values are all greater than 0.5, indicating that the measurement scales meet the requirements for reliability and convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

New variables were generated in the statistical software SPSS using the Transform function.

GDKN=mean(GDKN1, GDKN2, GDKN3, GDKN4, GDKN5).

TNTT=mean(TNTT1, TNTT2, TNTT3, TNTT4, TNTT5).

NLDM=mean(NLDM1,NLDM2,NLDM3,NLDM4).

NLCN=mean(NLCN1,NLCN2,NLCN3,NLCN4).

NDCH=mean(NDCH1,NDCH2,NDCH3,NDCH4).

SSKN=mean(SSKN1,SSKN2,SSKN3,SSKN4, SSKN5).

rrelation of research variables

The results of the correlation analysis in table 8 indicate that there is no issue of multicollinearity between the variables. Therefore, the conditions for conducting regression analysis are met.

Table 8 – Correlations

| **Correlations** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | GDKN | TNTT | NLDM | NLCN | NDCH | SSKN |
| GDKN | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.366** | 0.403** | 0.253** | 0.389** | 0.443** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | N | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 |
| TNTT | Pearson Correlation | 0.366** | 1 | 0.424** | 0.229** | 0.514** | 0.554** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 |
| NLDM | Pearson Correlation | 0.403** | 0.424** | 1 | 0.298** | 0.562** | 0.490** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | N | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 |
| NLCN | Pearson Correlation | 0.253** | 0.229** | 0.298** | 1 | 0.303** | 0.304** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | N | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 |
| NDCH | Pearson Correlation | 0.389** | 0.514** | 0.562** | 0.303** | 1 | 0.610** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | | 0.000 |
| | N | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 |
| SSKN | Pearson Correlation | 0.443** | 0.554** | 0.490** | 0.304** | 0.610** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| | N | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 | 574 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |

***Linear regression analysis***

Linear regression analysis examines the influence of independent variables on a dependent variable. In this case, the dependent variable is Readiness of Innovative Entrepreneurship, while the independent variables include Practical Experience in Entrepreneurship, Support for Entrepreneurship Education, Opportunity Recognition, Digital Ability, and Innovative Ability. The results of the analysis in table 8 reveal that all independent variables significantly impact Readiness of Innovative Entrepreneurship, with Opportunity Recognition having the greatest effect, followed by Practical Experience in Entrepreneurship.

The entrepreneurial potential of students underscores the importance of factors like innovative ability, digital competence, and opportunity recognition, which together facilitate the transition from entrepreneurial intention to action. The findings provide insights into the direction and strength of the relationships between the variables, helping to identify which factors most significantly affect innovative entrepreneurship. This information can guide interventions or strategies designed to foster and enhance innovative entrepreneurship within specific contexts.

**Table 8 -** Regression analysis investigates the impact of predictor variables on the outcome variable.

| **Coefficients[a]** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | -0.316 | 0.164 | | -1.928 | 0.054 |
| | GDKN | 0.173 | 0.038 | 0.155 | 4.544 | 0.000 |
| | TNTT | 0.285 | 0.039 | 0.265 | 7.339 | 0.000 |
| | NLDM | 0.133 | 0.047 | 0.107 | 2.829 | 0.005 |
| | NLCN | 0.089 | 0.039 | 0.072 | 2.255 | 0.025 |
| | NDCH | 0.353 | 0.042 | 0.331 | 8.350 | 0.000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: SSKN | | | | | | |

## 5. Discussions and conclusions

The coefficient for *Support for Entrepreneurship Education* (GDKN) is 0.173, with a standardized beta of 0.155, and it is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). This suggests that increased support for entrepreneurship education positively affects the readiness for innovative entrepreneurship. Specifically, for each unit increase in educational support, readiness for innovative entrepreneurship increases by 0.173 units. The relatively moderate impact highlights the importance of structured learning and support programs in preparing individuals to engage in innovative entrepreneurial ventures.

*Practical Experience in Entrepreneurship* (TNTT) has a significant impact on readiness for innovative entrepreneurship, with a coefficient of 0.285 and a standardized beta of 0.265 ($p < 0.001$). This is the strongest effect among the independent variables, suggesting that hands-on experience plays a crucial role in enhancing individuals' readiness to engage in innovative ventures. For each unit increase in practical experience, the readiness for innovative entrepreneurship increases by 0.285 units. The result emphasizes the value of real-world experience in developing the skills and confidence needed for entrepreneurial success.

*Innovative Ability* (NLDM) shows a positive impact on readiness for innovative entrepreneurship, with a coefficient of 0.133 and a standardized beta of 0.107 ($p = 0.005$). Although its impact is smaller compared to some other variables, it is still statistically significant. This result indicates that individuals with higher innovative ability are more likely to be ready to engage in innovative entrepreneurship. Enhancing creativity and problem-solving skills can, therefore, boost entrepreneurial readiness, albeit with a relatively moderate influence in this context.

The coefficient for *Digital Ability* (NLCN) is 0.089, with a standardized beta of 0.072 ($p = 0.025$), suggesting a statistically significant but modest effect on readiness for innovative entrepreneurship. This indicates that digital competence, while important, has a smaller impact compared to factors like practical experience and opportunity recognition. Nonetheless, increasing digital literacy remains a valuable component for supporting innovation and entrepreneurial readiness, especially in the context of digital transformation in entrepreneurship.

*Opportunity Recognition* (NDCH) has the largest impact among the independent variables, with a coefficient of 0.353 and a standardized beta of 0.331 ($p < 0.001$). This indicates that the ability to recognize entrepreneurial opportunities is the strongest predictor of readiness for innovative entrepreneurship. For each unit increase in opportunity recognition, readiness for innovative entrepreneurship increases by 0.353 units. This underscores the critical role of identifying and seizing opportunities in driving entrepreneurial action and innovation.

To foster innovative entrepreneurship, it is essential to enhance support for entrepreneurship education by offering comprehensive programs that include mentorship, networking opportunities, and experiential learning. Additionally, providing more practical experience through internships, startup incubators, and real-world projects will help individuals develop the necessary skills for entrepreneurial success. Encouraging innovative thinking through creative problem-solving workshops and idea-generation activities will further strengthen readiness for entrepreneurship. While digital ability has a more modest impact, integrating digital skills training into educational programs—such as e-commerce, digital marketing, and analytics—will equip entrepreneurs to navigate the digital landscape. Finally, developing opportunity recognition skills through case studies, innovation challenges, and exercises will enable aspiring entrepreneurs to identify and act on new business opportunities, ultimately enhancing their preparedness for launching innovative ventures.

In conclusion, this study highlights the critical factors that influence readiness for innovative entrepreneurship, particularly among students and early-career entrepreneurs. The findings underscore the significant roles of practical experience, educational support, opportunity recognition, innovative ability, and digital competence in shaping entrepreneurial readiness. Among these, practical experience and opportunity recognition were found to have the strongest impacts on preparing individuals for innovative entrepreneurial ventures. The insights derived from this analysis provide valuable implications for policymakers, educators, and entrepreneurial support organizations, emphasizing the need for targeted interventions that enhance practical exposure, foster innovation, and build digital and opportunity-recognition skills. By focusing on these factors, we can better equip the next generation of entrepreneurs to navigate the challenges of launching and sustaining innovative ventures, ultimately contributing to the growth and development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

**References**

Acs, Z. J., Braunerhjelm, P., Audretsch, D. B., & Carlsson, B. (2009). The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics, 32*, 15-30.

Amabile, T. M. (1997). Motivating creativity in organizations: On doing what you love and loving what you do. *California Management Review, 40*(1), 39-58.

Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., & Ray, S. (2003). A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity identification and development. *Journal of Business Venturing, 18*(1), 105-123.

Arranz, N., Ubierna, F., Arroyabe, M. F., Perez, C., & Fdez. de Arroyabe, J. (2017). The effect of curricular and extracurricular activities on university students' entrepreneurial intention and competences. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(11), 1979-2008.

Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. (2014). The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta–analytic review. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38*(2), 217-254.

Baron, R. A. (2006). Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: How entrepreneurs "connect the dots" to identify new business opportunities. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 20*(1), 104-119.

Blank, S., & Dorf, B. (2020). *The startup owner's manual: The step-by-step guide for building a great company*: John Wiley & Sons.

Block, J. H., Fisch, C. O., & Van Praag, M. (2017). The Schumpeterian entrepreneur: A review of the empirical evidence on the antecedents, behaviour and consequences of innovative entrepreneurship. *Industry and innovation, 24*(1), 61-95.

Devonish, D., Alleyne, P., Charles‐Soverall, W., Young Marshall, A., & Pounder, P. (2010). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions in the Caribbean. *International journal of entrepreneurial behavior research 16*(2), 149-171.

Elfring, T., & Hulsink, W. (2003). Networks in entrepreneurship: The case of high-technology firms. *Small Business Economics, 21*, 409-422.

Fagerberg, J. (2005). *The Oxford handbook of innovation*: Oxford University Press.

Fayolle, A., & Degeorge, J.-M. (2006). Attitudes, intentions, and behaviour: New approaches to evaluating entrepreneurship education. *International entrepreneurship education. Issues and newness*, 74-89.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research, 18*(1), 39-50.

Götz, O., Liehr-Gobbers, K., & Krafft, M. (2009). Evaluation of structural equation models using the partial least squares (PLS) approach. In *Handbook of partial least squares: Concepts, methods and applications* (pp. 691-711): Springer.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). Multivariate data analysis 6th Edition. *Pearson Prentice Hall. New Jersey. humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87*, 49-74.

Hassan, A., Saleem, I., Anwar, I., & Hussain, S. A. (2020). Entrepreneurial intention of Indian university students: the role of opportunity recognition and entrepreneurship education. *Education+ Training*.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. In *New challenges to international marketing*: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

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

Jocic, M. R., Morris, M. H., & Kuratko, D. F. (2023). Familiness and innovation outcomes in family firms: The mediating role of entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Small Business Management, 61*(4), 1345-1377.

Koellinger, P. (2008). Why are some entrepreneurs more innovative than others? *Small Business Economics, 31*, 21-37.

Kraus, S., Palmer, C., Kailer, N., Kallinger, F. L., & Spitzer, J. (2019). Digital entrepreneurship: A research agenda on new business models for the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 25*(2), 353-375.

Krueger, N. F. (2017). Entrepreneurial intentions are dead: Long live entrepreneurial intentions. In *Revisiting the entrepreneurial mind* (pp. 13-34): Springer.

Mason, C. M., & Harrison, R. T. (2001). 'Investment readiness': A critique of government proposals to increase the demand for venture capital. *Regional Studies, 35*(7), 663-668.

Nambisan, S. (2017). Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41*(6), 1029-1055.

Nowiński, W., Haddoud, M. Y., Lančarič, D., Egerová, D., & Czeglédi, C. (2019). The impact of entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and gender on entrepreneurial intentions of university students in the Visegrad countries. *Studies in Higher Education, 44*(2), 361-379.

Nguyen, Q. A., & Mort, G. S. (2016). Economic reform and entrepreneurship in Vietnam: A policy perspective. *Economic development and entrepreneurship in transition economies: Issues, obstacles and perspective*, 109-127.

Prince, S., Chapman, S., & Cassey, P. (2021). The definition of entrepreneurship: is it less complex than we think? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 27*(9), 26-47.

Schmitz, A., Urbano, D., Dandolini, G. A., de Souza, J. A., & Guerrero, M. (2017). Innovation and entrepreneurship in the academic setting: a systematic literature review. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 13*, 369-395.

Schumpeter, J. A. (2013). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*: routledge.

Shane, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship As a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review*.

Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. J. J. o. B. v. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *22*(4), 566-591.

Vuong, Q.-H., La, V.-P., Vuong, T.-T., Ho, M.-T., & Ho, M.-T. (2020). What have Vietnamese scholars learned from researching entrepreneurship? A Systematic review. *Heliyon*

*6*(4).

Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Davidsson, P. (2006). Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(4), 917-955.