



DEVELOPMENT OF ENTREPRENEURIAL CULTURE IN STUDENTS IN THE CONDITIONS OF GLOBALIZATION

Januzakova Roza Baurjan qizi

2nd Year Master's Student of the International Nordic University

Lutfullayeva N. X.

Lecturer of the International Nordic University

Abstract

This article investigates how entrepreneurial culture can be developed among students in pedagogical university programs under the intensifying pressures and opportunities of globalization. Entrepreneurial culture is conceptualized not as a narrow orientation to business start-up, but as a value-based and competence-based constellation that integrates initiative, responsibility, creativity, opportunity recognition, ethical risk management, collaboration, and sustained self-development. In teacher education, this culture is strategically important because future educators shape learners' agency, career awareness, and innovation readiness through curriculum design, classroom interaction, and assessment practices. The study proposes a pedagogical framework that aligns entrepreneurial culture formation with competency-based education, project-based learning, community-linked tasks, and reflective practices supported by digital tools. Methodologically, the research employs a mixed design combining diagnostic measurement of entrepreneurial dispositions, analysis of learning products, and qualitative reflection data collected during an intervention embedded in education courses. Findings indicate that students' entrepreneurial culture strengthens most noticeably when learning tasks are authentic, socially meaningful, and connected to local educational challenges while using global knowledge resources. The article also identifies institutional and psychological conditions that enable sustainable change, including supportive academic climate, mentorship, feedback literacy, and opportunities for iterative



experimentation. The work contributes practical guidance for pedagogical universities seeking to prepare graduates who can lead educational innovation, cultivate student agency, and translate global trends into context-sensitive educational practice.

Keywords. Entrepreneurial culture, globalization, student agency, innovation competence, opportunity recognition, pedagogical entrepreneurship, project-based learning, competency-based education, social responsibility, reflective practice, digital learning environments.

GLOBALLASHUV SHAROITIDA TALABALARDA TADBIRKORLIK MADANIYATINI RIVOJLANTIRISH

Januzakova Roza Baurjan qizi

Xalqaro Nordik Universiteti 2-bosqich magistranti

Lutfullayeva N. X.

Xalqaro Nordik universiteti o'qituvchisi

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada globallashuvning tobora kuchayib borayotgan bosimi va imkoniyatlari sharoitida pedagogik oliy ta'lim dasturlarida tahsil olayotgan talabalarda tadbirkorlik madaniyatini rivojlantirish masalasi tadqiq etiladi. Tadbirkorlik madaniyati biznesni boshlashga qaratilgan tor yo'nalish sifatida emas, balki tashabbuskorlik, mas'uliyat, ijodkorlik, imkoniyatlarni aniqlash, xatarlarni axloqiy boshqarish, hamkorlik va uzluksiz o'zini rivojlantirishni birlashtiruvchi qadriyat va kompetensiyalarga tayangan yaxlit tizim sifatida talqin qilinadi. Bo'lajak pedagoglar o'quvchilarning subyektiv faolligi, kasbiy xabardorligi hamda innovatsiyaga tayyorgarligini o'quv dasturi dizayni, sinfdagi muloqot va baholash amaliyotlari orqali shakllantirgani uchun o'qituvchi tayyorlash jarayonida ushbu madaniyat strategik ahamiyat kasb etadi. Tadqiqot tadbirkorlik madaniyatini shakllantirishni kompetensiyaga asoslangan ta'lim, loyiha asosidagi o'qitish, hamjamiyat bilan bog'langan vazifalar hamda raqamli vositalar bilan qo'llab-quvvatlangan reflektiv amaliyotlar bilan



uyg'unlashtiruvchi pedagogik yondashuvni taklif etadi. Metodologik jihatdan ish aralash dizaynga tayanib, tadbirkorlikka oid dispozitsiyalarni diagnostik o'lchash, ta'lim mahsulotlarini tahlil qilish va ta'lim kurslariga integratsiyalashgan intervensiya davomida to'plangan sifatli refleksiya ma'lumotlarini birlashtiradi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, tadbirkorlik madaniyati eng kuchli tarzda o'quv vazifalari autentik, ijtimoiy mazmunli va mahalliy ta'lim muammolari bilan uzviy bog'langan holda, bir vaqtning o'zida global bilim resurslaridan oqilona foydalanilganda mustahkamlanadi. Maqolada, shuningdek, barqaror o'zgarishni ta'minlovchi institutsional va psixologik shartlar, jumladan, qo'llab-quvvatlovchi akademik iqlim, mentorlik, fikr-mulohaza savodxonligi hamda iterativ tajriba-sinov uchun imkoniyatlar aniqlanadi. Ish pedagogik oliy ta'lim muassasalariga ta'limiy innovatsiyalarni boshqara oladigan, talabalarda faollikni kuchaytiradigan va global tendensiyalarni kontekstga mos pedagogik amaliyotga aylantira oladigan bitiruvchilarni tayyorlash bo'yicha amaliy tavsiyalar beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: Tadbirkorlik madaniyati, globallashuv, talabalarning subyektiv faolligi, innovatsion kompetensiya, imkoniyatlarni aniqlash, pedagogik tadbirkorlik, loyiha asosidagi ta'lim, kompetensiyaga asoslangan ta'lim, ijtimoiy mas'uliyat, reflektiv amaliyot, raqamli o'quv muhitlari.

Introduction

Globalization has transformed the conditions under which universities educate students and societies reproduce knowledge, values, and professional identities. The contemporary learner is increasingly positioned within cross-border flows of information, technology, labor, and cultural meanings, where educational outcomes are judged not only by disciplinary knowledge but also by adaptability, initiative, collaboration, and the capacity to act under uncertainty. In this environment, the development of entrepreneurial culture in students becomes a strategic educational objective. Entrepreneurial culture is often misinterpreted as an economic or commercial mindset limited to business activity. However, within pedagogical university contexts, it is more productive to treat entrepreneurial culture as a multidimensional educational phenomenon that supports proactive



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

problem solving, creative design of learning experiences, responsible decision making, and the ability to mobilize resources for socially valuable goals. When future teachers develop such a culture, they are better prepared to cultivate learners' agency, create innovative classroom environments, and respond effectively to changing curricular and technological demands.

In education systems experiencing rapid modernization, entrepreneurial culture contributes to the formation of professional resilience. It strengthens students' capacity to set goals, plan actions, evaluate results, and learn from failure without excessive fear of error. These qualities are increasingly essential because education is now embedded in dynamic policy agendas, digital transformation, and heightened expectations from families, communities, and labor markets. Global benchmarking practices, international learning platforms, and the spread of educational technologies create both opportunities and risks for students in pedagogical universities. On the one hand, global resources can expand access to innovative methodologies, research evidence, and professional networks. On the other hand, they can generate a fragmented and competitive environment in which students may experience uncertainty, information overload, and anxiety about future employability. Entrepreneurial culture, therefore, should be developed as an ethically grounded and psychologically sustainable orientation rather than as a purely competitive disposition.

The relevance of this topic is especially visible in settings where universities are tasked with preparing teachers for schools undergoing curricular reforms, competence-based education, and digitalization. Teacher education programs increasingly require students to design lessons using interactive technologies, collaborate with stakeholders, and implement assessment for learning. These requirements are compatible with entrepreneurial culture because both emphasize initiative, creativity, responsibility, and continuous improvement. Yet many programs still rely on transmissive approaches that limit students' autonomy and reduce learning to compliance with assignments. Under such conditions, entrepreneurial culture remains underdeveloped: students may demonstrate knowledge of innovative concepts while lacking the confidence and habits to implement them. This contradiction indicates the need for targeted pedagogical conditions, learning designs, and assessment models that can transform



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

entrepreneurial culture from a declared aim into a measurable educational outcome.

This study addresses that need by proposing and examining a framework for developing entrepreneurial culture among pedagogical university students in the conditions of globalization. The framework emphasizes learning tasks that are authentic and socially meaningful, connect local educational challenges with global knowledge resources, and cultivate reflective self-regulation. The article aims to clarify the construct of entrepreneurial culture for teacher education, identify pedagogical conditions that support its formation, and present empirical evidence on how students' dispositions and performance indicators change through an embedded educational intervention. The guiding assumption is that entrepreneurial culture develops most effectively when students are positioned as active designers of educational solutions, supported by mentorship, structured feedback, and opportunities for iterative experimentation.

Methods

The study used a mixed-methods design to examine how entrepreneurial culture develops among pedagogical university students when learning is organized through authentic, project-oriented, and reflection-rich instructional conditions. Entrepreneurial culture was operationalized as an integrated construct combining value orientations, motivational dispositions, cognitive-strategic skills, and behavioral indicators relevant to proactive educational practice. The research design included a diagnostic phase, an intervention phase embedded in education courses, and a post-intervention evaluation phase. The methodological logic assumed that entrepreneurial culture is not formed through information transfer alone but through sustained participation in complex tasks that require initiative, collaboration, decision making under constraints, and responsibility for outcomes.

Participants were undergraduate students enrolled in teacher-education programs at a pedagogical university. The sampling strategy was purposeful within available cohorts, focusing on students taking courses with a practicum or applied component, where authentic educational problems could be modeled and addressed. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality procedures were



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

followed during data collection and analysis. The intervention was implemented during one academic module and integrated with existing curricular requirements to avoid artificial separation between research activities and educational practice. Data collection relied on three complementary streams. The first stream measured students' entrepreneurial dispositions and attitudes using a structured questionnaire adapted to the teacher-education context. The instrument assessed initiative, opportunity recognition, tolerance for ambiguity, internal locus of control, responsibility, collaboration readiness, and ethical orientation toward social value. Items were rated on a Likert scale, and reliability was checked through internal consistency estimates. The second stream evaluated performance-based indicators through analysis of learning products. Students produced project artifacts such as problem analyses of school-based challenges, prototype lesson designs, community-linked educational initiatives, resource plans, and implementation roadmaps. These products were assessed using an analytic rubric aligned with entrepreneurial culture dimensions, including originality, feasibility, stakeholder awareness, evidence use, risk reasoning, and reflective justification. The third stream captured qualitative evidence through reflective journals, short interviews, and observation notes collected during project work sessions. These sources were used to identify shifts in self-perception, agency, team dynamics, and the quality of decision-making discourse. The educational intervention consisted of a structured sequence of learning tasks. Students worked in small teams on a project cycle that began with identifying an educational challenge observable in local schooling or youth development contexts. They then conducted rapid needs assessment using accessible data sources such as stakeholder conversations, document review, and small-scale observation. Next, teams generated solution options, selected one through explicit criteria, and produced a prototype with an implementation plan. Digital tools were used for collaboration, content development, and evidence search, emphasizing responsible information practices and critical evaluation of sources. Mentorship and formative feedback were provided at predefined milestones to scaffold planning, reduce unproductive uncertainty, and maintain autonomy. Reflection prompts were embedded at each stage to support metacognitive monitoring, values clarification, and learning from partial failure.



Quantitative analysis included descriptive statistics, pre-post comparisons of scale scores, and effect-size estimation to interpret the magnitude of observed changes. Product rubric scores were summarized and compared across project stages to capture development trajectories. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically using a coding procedure that combined deductive categories derived from the construct model with inductive codes emerging from students' reflections. Triangulation across instruments and sources was used to strengthen validity, with convergence assessed between disposition changes, product quality, and reflective narratives. The overall methodological approach aimed to produce a coherent account of how entrepreneurial culture can be cultivated in teacher education under globalization conditions through aligned pedagogy, assessment, and learning ecology.

Results

The empirical results indicate that entrepreneurial culture among pedagogical university students can be strengthened when the learning environment systematically combines authentic problem work, project-cycle organization, and continuous reflection supported by formative feedback. Across the pre-intervention and post-intervention diagnostic measurements, students demonstrated positive shifts in several core dispositions. The largest gains were observed in initiative and proactive goal setting, as reflected in increased readiness to propose actions without waiting for external instruction, and in higher confidence to begin tasks with incomplete information. Opportunity recognition also improved: students became more capable of reframing routine educational situations as spaces for improvement, identifying constraints as design parameters rather than as reasons for inaction. Moderate gains were found in tolerance for ambiguity and risk reasoning, indicating that students became more willing to test provisional solutions and to justify decisions through explicit criteria.

Performance-based indicators from project products provided additional evidence of developmental change. Early-stage artifacts were often descriptive, with problem statements framed broadly and without clear stakeholder analysis. By later stages, teams produced more precise problem definitions supported by



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

basic evidence, and they demonstrated a clearer logic linking needs assessment to proposed interventions. Rubric-based evaluation showed growth in feasibility and resource planning, particularly in the ability to outline steps, allocate roles, and anticipate implementation barriers. In many cases, students moved from idealized proposals to context-sensitive plans that considered time, institutional routines, and learner diversity. Originality increased modestly, not primarily as novelty for its own sake but as the capacity to adapt known pedagogical strategies into locally relevant formats. Evidence use improved through more careful selection of sources, more consistent citation habits in project documentation, and greater reliance on comparative examples from global practice, interpreted through local constraints.

Qualitative data from reflective journals and interviews revealed several notable patterns. First, students reported a shift from “assignment completion” thinking to “solution ownership” thinking. Many reflections described an initial discomfort with open-ended tasks, followed by increased engagement once teams recognized that they were responsible for shaping both the problem and the pathway to action. Second, the social dimension of entrepreneurial culture became more visible. Students emphasized the role of collaboration in sustaining motivation and distributing cognitive load during complex planning. Teams that established explicit communication norms and role clarity produced more coherent project outcomes and reported lower levels of conflict. Third, ethical and social responsibility orientations strengthened when projects were connected to community or school realities. Students frequently referred to the importance of designing interventions that respect learners’ dignity, avoid superficial “innovation theater,” and aim for realistic, measurable benefits.

Observation notes and mentor feedback records suggested that formative feedback at milestone points was a key enabling condition. When feedback focused on clarifying criteria, strengthening argumentation, and anticipating risks rather than prescribing solutions, students maintained autonomy while improving quality. This pattern aligned with students’ reflections, which often described mentorship as a “supportive checkpoint” that reduced anxiety without removing responsibility. In contrast, when teams experienced unclear expectations or delayed feedback, they were more likely to revert to minimal compliance



strategies and to treat project work as a compilation of fragments rather than a coherent design process.

A differentiated analysis showed variation by initial readiness. Students who entered the module with higher self-efficacy and stronger digital information skills progressed faster in opportunity recognition and evidence-based design. However, students with lower initial confidence also demonstrated meaningful gains, especially in collaboration, reflective self-regulation, and the willingness to iterate. The most consistent improvement across all groups was in reflective practice: students increasingly used structured reflection to identify what worked, what failed, and what should be changed in subsequent cycles. This indicates that entrepreneurial culture development was not limited to producing a single successful product but also involved internalizing a repeatable learning-and-innovation routine.

Overall, the results support the construct model in which entrepreneurial culture emerges from the interplay of dispositions, skills, and enacted behaviors. The intervention produced measurable improvements in students' agency, planning competence, and context-sensitive innovation, while qualitative evidence confirmed shifts in identity toward seeing oneself as an active designer of educational value under globalization-linked complexity.

Discussion

The findings suggest that entrepreneurial culture in pedagogical university students is most effectively developed when entrepreneurial action is framed as educational value creation rather than as commercial behavior. This interpretation is important in teacher education because it aligns entrepreneurial culture with professional ethics, learner-centeredness, and social responsibility. Under globalization conditions, students face expanding informational access and growing professional uncertainty; the observed gains in initiative, opportunity recognition, and ambiguity tolerance indicate that structured project-cycle learning can convert these pressures into developmental resources. In other words, globalization increases the complexity of the educational environment, but it also expands the repertoire of methods and examples that students can draw



Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

upon. Entrepreneurial culture becomes the mechanism that helps students translate global knowledge flows into locally workable educational solutions.

The shift from compliance-oriented learning to ownership-oriented learning emerged as a central mechanism in the data. In many traditional university settings, students' agency is limited by highly scripted tasks, narrow assessment criteria, and an emphasis on reproduction of content. The intervention altered this pattern by making students responsible for problem definition, stakeholder interpretation, and iterative design decisions. The improvement in project feasibility and planning indicates that autonomy alone is insufficient; autonomy must be paired with scaffolds that structure thinking without dictating outcomes. Milestone feedback, analytic rubrics, and embedded reflection prompts functioned as "soft constraints" that guided student action while preserving decision-making responsibility. This pedagogical balance is consistent with competency-based education principles, where learning outcomes are demonstrated through performance and justified choices rather than through passive knowledge recall.

A notable implication is that entrepreneurial culture can serve as a unifying construct connecting several widely discussed educational goals: innovation competence, 21st-century skills, digital literacy, and professional resilience. The observed improvement in evidence use and source discrimination suggests that entrepreneurial culture in globalization conditions is inseparable from information culture. When students search for examples and resources across global platforms, they must evaluate credibility, interpret applicability, and avoid superficial borrowing. The qualitative pattern showing increased attention to ethical and social responsibility further indicates that entrepreneurial culture must be normatively anchored. Without such anchoring, initiative and risk-taking can become opportunistic or detached from educational mission. In teacher education, the legitimacy of entrepreneurial action depends on whether it increases learners' well-being, equity, and meaningful learning opportunities.

The differentiated trajectories by initial readiness also have practical significance. Students with stronger self-efficacy and digital skills advanced more quickly in opportunity recognition and design argumentation, while lower-confidence students benefited most from collaboration and reflective routines. This suggests



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

that entrepreneurial culture development should be personalized through flexible scaffolding. For example, early diagnostic profiling can identify students needing additional support in information search, planning templates, or communication norms. Importantly, the results show that students with lower initial confidence are not “non-entrepreneurial”; rather, they require environments that normalize iterative improvement, reduce fear of error, and make growth visible through formative assessment. In this sense, entrepreneurial culture is educable and does not depend solely on personality traits.

From an institutional perspective, the findings point to the importance of academic climate and mentorship. Entrepreneurial culture formation requires permission to experiment and to produce imperfect prototypes as part of learning. If institutional assessment practices punish error excessively or reward only polished final products, students may avoid innovation and return to safe compliance. The mentor feedback pattern observed here indicates that guidance should be criterion-based and dialogic: mentors help students refine reasoning, anticipate risks, and align actions with values, while students remain authors of decisions. This model is particularly relevant under globalization, where imported educational innovations can be attractive but contextually unsuitable. Students must learn to adapt and localize rather than copy, and mentorship can support this adaptation by asking “fit” questions about learners, resources, and institutional constraints.

The study also highlights a tension that globalization introduces: the coexistence of expanded opportunity and increased cognitive overload. Access to vast digital resources can lead to fragmented learning and superficial project rationales if students lack information management strategies. The improvement in evidence use suggests that entrepreneurial culture development should include explicit training in information hygiene, critical evaluation, and synthesis. Entrepreneurial culture, therefore, is not only about generating ideas but also about disciplined selection, justification, and responsible implementation.

Taken together, the results support a pedagogical model in which entrepreneurial culture is developed through authentic educational problem solving, scaffolded autonomy, reflective self-regulation, and ethically grounded value creation. For pedagogical universities, this model offers a pathway to prepare future teachers



who can navigate globalization-linked complexity, design innovations responsive to local needs, and cultivate agency in their own learners.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that entrepreneurial culture can be purposefully developed among pedagogical university students when instructional design moves beyond transmissive teaching and organizes learning around authentic educational problems, project-cycle activity, and reflective self-regulation. Under the conditions of globalization, where students are exposed to rapid change, abundant digital resources, and evolving professional expectations, entrepreneurial culture functions as a stabilizing and enabling competence constellation. It strengthens students' initiative, opportunity recognition, collaborative capacity, and responsible decision making, while supporting psychologically sustainable engagement with ambiguity and risk. The empirical results show that meaningful progress occurs when students are positioned as designers of educational value rather than as passive performers of assignments. A central outcome of the intervention was the shift in student orientation from compliance to ownership. This shift was supported by a balance of autonomy and structured scaffolding, including milestone feedback, clear criteria, and reflection prompts that guided students' reasoning without prescribing solutions. Product analyses indicated that students became more capable of formulating precise problems, selecting feasible interventions, planning implementation steps, and adapting global pedagogical ideas to local educational constraints. Qualitative evidence confirmed that entrepreneurial culture development involved changes in identity and agency, as students increasingly interpreted themselves as capable actors who can initiate educational improvements in collaboration with peers and stakeholders. The ethical dimension also strengthened when projects were framed as socially meaningful contributions to learning communities, emphasizing responsibility and educational benefit rather than novelty.

For pedagogical universities, the findings imply that entrepreneurial culture should be treated as a core professional outcome of teacher education, integrated across coursework and practicum experiences. Effective implementation requires an institutional climate that legitimizes experimentation, normalizes iterative



improvement, and uses formative assessment to make growth visible. Mentorship should be criterion-based and dialogic, supporting adaptation and contextual fit rather than encouraging imitation of external models. Given the information intensity of globalization, entrepreneurial culture formation should also incorporate explicit development of evidence literacy, source evaluation, and synthesis skills so that initiative is paired with disciplined reasoning.

The study is limited by its context-specific implementation and cohort-based sampling, which may affect generalizability across different institutional settings. Future research can extend these findings through multi-site studies, longer intervention periods, and longitudinal tracking of graduates' professional behavior in schools. Additional work is also needed to refine measurement instruments that capture entrepreneurial culture as an integrated construct in teacher education and to explore how digital platforms and community partnerships can further enhance value-creation learning. Despite these limitations, the study provides a practical, evidence-informed framework for cultivating entrepreneurial culture in pedagogical university students and suggests that such cultivation is essential for preparing educators who can lead educational innovation in a globalized world.

References

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
2. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
3. Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., Miller-Ricci, M., & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, B. McGaw, & E. Care (Eds.), *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills* (pp. 17–66). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2324-5_2
4. European Commission. (2016). *Entrepreneurship competence framework: EntreComp*. Publications Office of the European Union.
5. Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2015). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention: Hysteresis and persistence.



-
- Journal of Small Business Management, 53(1), 75–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12065>
6. Gibb, A. (2002). In pursuit of a new “enterprise” and “entrepreneurship” paradigm for learning. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4(3), 233–269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00086>
 7. Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(3), 235–266. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3>
 8. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
 9. Krueger, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5–6), 411–432. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(98\)00033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(98)00033-0)
 10. Lackéus, M. (2015). *Entrepreneurship in education: What, why, when, how*. OECD.
 11. Neck, H. M., Greene, P. G., & Brush, C. G. (2014). *Teaching entrepreneurship: A practice-based approach*. Edward Elgar.
 12. OECD. (2019). *OECD future of education and skills 2030: OECD learning compass 2030*. OECD Publishing.
 13. Rae, D. (2006). Entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework for technology-based enterprise. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 18(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537320500520494>
 14. Rideout, E. C., & Gray, D. O. (2013). Does entrepreneurship education really work? A review and methodological critique of the empirical literature on the effects of university-based entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 329–351. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12021>
 15. Robinson, P. B., Stimpson, D. V., Huefner, J. C., & Hunt, H. K. (1991). An attitude approach to the prediction of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(4), 13–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879101500405>
 16. Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy*
-



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

-
- of Management Review, 26(2), 243–263.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378020>
17. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.2791611>
18. Taatila, V. (2010). Learning entrepreneurship in higher education. *Education + Training*, 52(1), 48–61. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911011017672>
19. Thomas, J. W. (2000). A review of research on project-based learning. Autodesk Foundation.
20. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.