Evaluation of Faculty of Readiness in Achieving the Entrepreneurial University Study Agenda in the Faculty of Economics and Business, Institute of Business Dili Timor Leste

Domingas de Fatima Xavier[1], Astri Ghina[2]
[1,2]Faculty of Economic and Business, Telkom University, Bandung, Indonesia
Email: melxavier07@gmail.com

Abstract

Entrepreneurial University is a phenomenon that is considered important today by universities to increase university competitiveness in increasing excellence in aspects of teaching, research, and community service. If the university does not become an entrepreneurial university, it will hinder national development and international competitiveness. teaching universities need to create entrepreneurial universities and that is very important to achieve sustainable economic growth in a country and also being an Entrepreneurial University (EU) does not belong to any country, thus any University has the right to become an EU wherever the university is located. This study uses a mixed method and sequential explanatory desing which conducts quantitative research first by obtaining data from questionnaires distributed to respondents in the economics and business faculties and followed by qualitative methods by conducting interviews with resource persons. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the readiness of the faculty in realizing the entrepreneurial university agenda. The measuring instrument used by the OECD 2019 researchers is the measure and there are eight aspects that must be evaluated and the results of the evaluation there are 3 aspects that need focus and improvement by the faculty because they are considered to have low respondent scores in realizing the EU agenda, namely Entrepreneurship Teaching and Learning, Digital Transformation and Capability and Measuring Impact.

***Keywords**: Entrepreneurial University. Higer Education, Evaluation Faculty Readiness.*

– – – – – – – – – – ◆ – – – – – – – – – –

A. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship (Entrepreneurial) is an important issue in the economy of a country, the progress or decline of a country's economy is determined also supported by the existence and role of groups of entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurial growth brings extraordinary economic growth for a country, so that the more entrepreneurs there are, the more the economy will improve. Lately entrepreneurship has attracted the attention of scholars and policy makers to the point of causing concern. The main reason for this concern is the increasing need for entrepreneurs who accelerate economic development by generating new ideas and turning them into profitable ventures. Hannon et al. (2006) entrepreneurship in higher education is now recognized as very important and becomes the main driver to support innovation as well as to change the mindset of the university environment and create entrepreneurial behavior.

Entrepreneurial University is a current phenomenon, and the number of such transformations is increasing due to reduced university funding from government sources and the emergence of competitive markets for education and research. If universities do not become agents of innovation, namely entrepreneurial universities, they will hinder regional and national development and international competitiveness. IOB University is still a teaching university, but creating an entrepreneurial university is very important to achieve sustainable economic growth in Timor Leste. Therefore, being an Entrepreneurial University (EU) does not belong to any country, thus any University has the right to become an EU wherever the university is located.

The creation of an entrepreneurial university is the result of the internal development influence of the university itself. Entrepreneurial university functions as socio-economic development through various teaching missions, research activities and entrepreneurship. The results of this mission are related to the determinants of the production function, including human, knowledge, social, and entrepreneurial capital (Guerrero et al., 2016) and According to Mascarenhas et al (2017) the most important aspect of the entrepreneurial university model is the creation and implementation of new knowledge and transferable behavior. Likewise it contains aspects of invention and patent funding but patents alone are not evidence of the university's business-related behavior, but it is the first step towards applying new knowledge created to meet real business needs.

According to Gianiodis et al (2019) Entrepreneurial universities have become increasingly famous worldwide and are now engines for regional economic development. While a few, elite universities are successful in developing and leveraging entrepreneurial capital, most universities achieve only modest results, even after changing organizational structures, incentive systems and strategic priorities. With this division, it is time for universities to examine how entrepreneurship education can play a bigger role in shaping university model entrepreneurship to take advantage of its benefits.

Universities are becoming more involved in providing entrepreneurial education, encouraging entrepreneurship and contributing to economic and social well-being (Ahmed et al., 2016) which is a diversion from the traditional university mission of conducting research and offering education to a new approach that connects universities with their environment with an active role in promoting local development Guerrero et al (2016).

According to research conducted at universities in Austria, (Sperrer et al. 2016), it has been noted that entrepreneurial universities are the next step of development in higher education, and the motivation of students to get the best results so that various types of educational institutions are given entrepreneurial education and have worked hard to more entrepreneurial and have incorporated the university concept of entrepreneurship in their strategy. However, entrepreneurship in Austria is still in the development stage and the entrepreneurial university concept used in Austria is the OECD.

According to the findings of Ruiz et al. (2020), at universities in Brazil that the universities analyzed are still in the process of transforming into entrepreneurial universities, however, they only need to formulate strategies to set them up to become entrepreneurial universities in addition to giving new meaning to the concept of entrepreneurial universities.

After studying two Hong Kong entrepreneurial universities, Sharif and Baark (2008) concluded that Universities should better manage teach transfer offices (TTOs), through better understanding the capacity of TTOs to create spin-offs, should develop policies that are measured taking into account site facilities in progress.

In a university, of course it has a tridharma and the Institute of Business also has it because the tridharma is a university agenda which is one of the obligations to carry it out, however, it has various challenges in terms of how to integrate the tridharma activities, teaching, research, and community service. IOB is one of the Business Universities that has many entrepreneurial activities related to OECD aspects, and these related aspects are contained in the IOB 2020 Vice Chancellor's strategic planning module (2021) so that IOB also targets itself to become an entrepreneurial university but does not specify an estimate the time. (IOB module offline 2020). According to the IOB Foundation (2021) people said that for now there is no entrepreneurship in the Vision and Mission of the IOB University, but activities related to OECD aspects of the university are doing it.

Thus, in order to create an entrepreneurial university, it is necessary to conduct an evaluation because there is still time to correct the shortcomings of the efforts that have been made. The background to FEB IOB's mission contains the development of an entrepreneurial culture in general, which aims to foster an entrepreneurial culture within the university environment to encourage the creation of new entrepreneurs. So this research is very important to do in order to achieve the expectations of the faculty. Research questions, research objectives and methods used to obtain answers to research questions are formulated.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship has an important role in the creation and growth of businesses, as well as in the growth and prosperity of the nation. Entrepreneurial action begins at the confluence of profitable opportunities and enterprising individuals. An entrepreneurial opportunity is a situation in which new goods, services, raw materials, and methods of organizing can be introduced and sold at a price higher than the cost of producing them. For example entrepreneurial opportunities can come from introducing existing technology products that are used in one market to create new markets. Alternatively, entrepreneurial opportunities can be in the form of creating new technological products for existing markets or creating new products/services and new markets (Hisrich at al 2017).

The concept of entrepreneurship can be seen from 3 different perspectives for an economist, an entrepreneur is someone who combines resources, labor, raw

materials, and other assets to produce greater value than before, also someone who introduces change, innovation, and order. new. The definition of entrepreneurship is expanded to include innovation. Through innovation comes novelty that can take the form of new products to new distribution systems. Another concept from Alain Fayolle (2007) there are three concepts where the first is the failure to fully integrate the perspectives of different social and traditional scientific disciplines, economic, sociological, and anthropological explanations, which compete for clarity. The second is that business schools have captured the phenomenon and have attempted to deal with it in their conventional dictating ways in which they have organized explicit knowledge. And the third most fundamental possibility is for progress in developing existing concepts in the way academics put them together.

Entrepreneurial competence in Middleto et al (2019) can be described as the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to initiate and engage in entrepreneurial practice (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). Developing entrepreneurial competencies includes understanding changes in individual behavior as well as considering the performative outcomes of that behavior relative to standard expectations such as the creation of new companies (Mitchelmore and Rowley, 2010).

Entrepreneurial intention in universities according to Wegner et al (2019) is a state of thinking that leads to attention, experience, and behavior towards certain goals, objects or methods of behaving (Bird, 1988). Intention captures the motivational factors that influence behavior, indicating how much effort people plan to put into behavior. Shapero and Sokol (1982) in Wegner at al (2019) proposed that initiating entrepreneurial behavior depends on personally credible opportunities, which are the result of perceived desirability and feasibility. Desirability refers to the personal and social attractiveness of starting a business, while feasibility refers to the degree to which a person feels capable of starting a new business (Shapero, 1975). The following are entrepreneurs according to several experts from year to year.

Hisrich et al (2017) provide a definition that has accommodated all types of entrepreneurial behavior as a process of creating something new, of value, by utilizing the necessary effort and time, taking into account social, physical, and financial risks, and receiving rewards in the form of money and personal satisfaction and independence.

According to Martin Lukeus (2015) Entrepreneurship is when you act on opportunities and ideas and turn them into value for others. The value created can be financial, cultural, or social. Various studies show that not all aspects of entrepreneurship can be taught, such as Miler (1987) that aspects of self-confidence, persistence and high energy levels which are characteristics of entrepreneurs cannot be taught using conventional methods in the classroom. According to him, teachers cannot create entrepreneurs but can produce formulas regarding steps for successful entrepreneurship.

Miller's opinion is reinforced by Jack and Anderson (1998) who say that the entrepreneurial process is an art and a science. The science section involves business management functions which can be taught using conventional approaches. The arts

section concerning the creative and innovative aspects cannot be invited in the same way. The entrepreneurship program in order to create entrepreneurs teaches the skills needed to build new business ventures. Hisric, Peter, and Shepherd (2017) divide these skills into 3 categories, namely technical skills, business management skills, and entrepreneur personal skills.

2. Entrepreneurial University Concept

University is a new quality of international competition that is changing the role and function of universities and research systems dramatically. If these do not become agents of innovation, entrepreneurial universities, they hinder regional and national development as well as international competitiveness (Ropke 1998). So, in this study the focus is on the constraints or possibilities of universities, to become entrepreneurs, to mutate into agents of innovation and regional development in the sense of Schumpeter (1934). In Ropke (1998) An entrepreneurial university can mean three things: 1. The university itself, as an organization, becomes an entrepreneur. 2. University members - faculty, students, employees - somehow turn themselves into entrepreneurs. 3. The interaction of the university with the environment, the "structural merger" between the university and the region, follows the pattern of entrepreneurship.

Universities as a labor market, have become global, technological, innovative and competitive, which means the transformation from institutions that have traditionally focused on institutions of two main goals, teaching and research, to the so-called third mission or collaboration between universities and external stakeholders, Nogueira et al (2018) Universities need to respond to the need for a knowledge-based economy to prepare students with the necessary skills to be competitive, not just locally but globally (Sam & Van der Sijde, 2014).

According to Noguira et al (2018) considers that the University, as a labor market, and has become global, technological, innovative and competitive, which means the transformation from an institution that has traditionally focused on its two main goals, teaching and research, to what is called third mission or collaboration between universities and external stakeholders as part of student training; the so-called entrepreneurial university. And according to Sam & Van der Sijde, (2014) in Noguira et al (2018) said that universities need to respond to the needs of a knowledge-based economy to prepare students with the necessary skills to be competitive, not only locally but globally.

Sam & Van der Sijde (2014) in Nogueira et al (2018) summarize three revolutions carried out by universities. First, the incorporation of research to prepare students for work in other fields is not academic (Etzkowitz, 2001; 2008; & 2011). Second, university teaching and research aims at socio-economic development to create new local knowledge-based enterprises and sell technology (Etzkowitz, 2001). Third, technology transfer or university-business cooperation where universities are in socio-economic development or "service to society" Sam & Van der Sijde, (2014)

Thorp and Goldstein (2010) suggest that entrepreneurial universities are universities that embrace an entrepreneurial culture and instill an entrepreneurial mindset in every graduate, "regardless of their interests, dreams, and values. Business activities with public and private companies and governments to find collaborations and interactions with the aim of linking education, research and activities with technological, social and economic development (Guerrero & Urbano, 2012) and propose an entrepreneurial university model with features such as formal factors of organizational structure and entrepreneurial governance, support measures for entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship education Informal factors university community attitudes towards entrepreneurship, teaching entrepreneurship methodologies, role models and reward systems Human, financial, physical and commercial capital resources Status and prestige capabilities, networks and alliances, localization.

According to the findings of Guerrero et al (2020) showing the important role of the entrepreneurial university ecosystem in facilitating the choice of employment as academic entrepreneurship for their university ITESM graduates. This study provides some insight into how risk aversion and graduate employability are positively affected by university business incubators and entrepreneurship education programs, respectively. In the university context, the university ecosystem of entrepreneurial innovation is integrated by program education, infrastructure (incubator, research park, technology transfer office, business creation office, employment office), university regulations (normative business creation, property rights), university culture (exemplary, attitude towards entrepreneurship) as well as relations with government, investors, industry and others.

While according to the findings of Ghina (2013) still little attention has been dedicated to how to measure the overall effectiveness of entrepreneurship education, there is no well defined, no standardized means of measuring generally accepted outcomes (Alberti, 2004). Lack of comprehensive internal evaluation regarding program planning and monitoring, and also lack of external evaluation from alumni regarding new start-ups (composition of successful and failed entrepreneurs, time factor, cause and effect, company quality, business focus).

According to Ruiz at al (2020) the theoretical concept of an entrepreneurial university has been exemplified from the transformation of a traditional university into an entrepreneurial university model that takes several years due to cultural changes from the infrastructure needed by Jacob at al (2003), including changes in the culture of government, industry and other ecosystems, particularly education managers, teachers and students.

C. METHOD

In this study, there is a connection that uses two research methods, namely quantitative and qualitative or called the mixed method with the sequential explanatory design method, namely research that is carried out with quantitative methods first and then completed as confirmation with qualitative methods, thus This quanti-

tative nature may be able to answer the formulation of the problem that was formulated from the start, or answer the results of the problem being studied, but it may also not, because as has been stated, that the formulation of the problem in quantitative research is still temporary and will develop after the researcher be in the field. This qualitative research was conducted to confirm the results of previous quantitative research that was still tentative, thus using this qualitative research to examine the problem until it became clear, which could be a causal or interactive relationship, descriptive or theoretical. Conclusion drawing is an analytical activity at the end of the study, which is carried out in the process of qualitative data analysis.

Thus, in relation to the analysis used by researchers in scientific research, it is known that there are two kinds of data analysis, namely quantitative descriptive analysis and qualitative descriptive analysis. Quantitative descriptive is carried out by researchers by looking for the number of frequencies and looking for percentages, and statistical analysis/tests in the form of data distribution or calculation or grouping of data from research results. Meanwhile, in qualitative descriptive analysis, it is usually an assessment, non-numerical verbal analysis, to explain further meaning from the results found from quantitative research.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the processing were analyzed descriptively and further confirmed to the informants about the implementation of the entrepreneurial university and its challenges. Data from interviews in the form of audio are presented in verbatim form and then reduced to perform reduction and analysis. Confirmation of this qualitative data is obtained directly from trusted sources. Thus, the descriptive results of quantitative data research show that of the eight variables, with score of 10 meaning totally agree, and 1 is totally disagree, each of them has a perception score as shown in the following tables:

Table 1. Leadership And Governance

Score	Response Distribution					Total	Percentage
	X1.1	X1.2	X1.3	X1.4	X1.5		
10	16	14	17	19	18	84	35.7%
9	9	14	9	9	9	50	21.3%
8	16	14	15	11	15	71	30.2%
7	1	3	2	5	1	12	5.1%
6	2	0	2	1	1	6	2.6%
5	0	1	1	1	0	3	1.3%
4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.4%
3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.4%
2	1	0	1	0	1	3	1.3%
1	1	1	0	1	1	4	1.6%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**235**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage of perceptions of leadership and governance variables is 87.2%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty has

prepared very well regarding the aspects studied. Entrepreneurship has become a major part of the faculty's strategy. The faculty has a commitment at the top management level to implement entrepreneurial strategies. The faculty has a model for integrating entrepreneurial activities with other faculties. Faculty have the autonomy to act on the entrepreneurial agenda at IOB. The faculty becomes the driving force for the development of entrepreneurship in the wider community.

Table 2. Organizational Capacity, Human Resources, And Incentives

Score	Response Distribution							Total	Percentage
	X3.1	X3.2	X3.3	X3.4	X3.5	X3.6	X3.7		
10	10	12	16	16	18	12	18	102	31.0%
9	10	17	11	15	18	20	18	109	33.1%
8	12	10	12	11	6	8	4	63	19.1%
7	5	2	4	3	1	1	3	19	5.8%
6	4	1	1	0	1	2	2	11	3.3%
5	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	4	1.2%
4	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	6	1.8%
3	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	5	1.5%
2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	1.2%
1	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	1.8%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**329**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage of perceptions of organizational capacity, human resources, and incentives variables is 83.2%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty has prepared very well regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university, namely the entrepreneurial target in the faculty is supported by various sources of funding, both internal and external. The faculty has a sustainable financial strategy to support entrepreneurial development. The faculty has a mechanism to bring internal stakeholders such as lecturers, academic support staff, students to synergize with each other. The faculty is open to collaborating with individuals from internal and external who have an entrepreneurial spirit. The faculty invests in lecturer development to support the entrepreneurial agenda. The faculty has clear rewards such as for lecturers, students who actively support the entrepreneurial agenda. The faculty provides recognition for stakeholders who contribute to the entrepreneurial agenda.

Table 3. The Development of Entrepreneurship in Learning and Teaching

Score	Response Distribution							Total	Percentage
	X4.1	X4.2	X4.3	X4.4	X4.5	X4.6	X4.7		
10	11	7	17	13	12	8	13	81	24.6%
9	16	16	16	17	11	13	12	101	30.7%
8	5	8	6	9	8	8	9	53	16.1%
7	6	3	4	5	5	4	6	33	10.0%
6	3	5	1	1	5	3	3	21	6.4%
5	2	1	2	0	2	4	0	11	3.3%
4	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	0.9%
3	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	1.2%

2	1	2	0	1	2	1	1	8	2.4%
1	2	3	0	1	2	3	3	14	4.3%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**329**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage of perceptions of development variables in teaching and learning is 71.4%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty prepares less well regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university, namely. The faculty provides a variety of informal learning opportunities to support the development of mindsets to entrepreneurial skills for lecturers and students. The faculty encourages all lecturers to innovate in the teaching and learning process. Entrepreneurial behavior is supported throughout the educational curriculum; from creating awareness, stimulating ideas to their implementation. The faculty checks the achievement of formal and informal entrepreneurship learning consistently every semester. The design and delivery of learning in the faculty has involved collaboration with external stakeholders. The research results are integrated into the entrepreneurship education of the faculty.

Table 4. Preparation and Support for Entrepreneurs

Score	Response Distribution							Total	Percentage
	X5.1	X5.2	X5.3	X5.4	X5.5	X5.6	X5.7		
10	18	12	17	15	12	11	7	92	28.0%
9	12	19	18	15	15	18	14	111	33.7%
8	8	5	6	6	5	4	9	43	13.1%
7	3	3	3	6	6	3	3	27	8.2%
6	3	2	0	1	2	1	1	10	3.0%
5	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	14	4.3%
4	1	2	0	2	3	2	2	12	3.6%
3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0.6%
2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	0.9%
1	1	3	2	1	2	2	4	15	4.6%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**329**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage perception of the variable preparation and support for entrepreneurship is 74.8%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty has prepared very well regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university, namely the faculty provides a variety of formal learning opportunities to support development mindset to entrepreneurial skills for lecturers, students. The faculty provides a variety of informal learning opportunities to support the development of mindsets to entrepreneurial skills for lecturers and students. The faculty encourages all lecturers to innovate in the teaching and learning process. Entrepreneurial behavior is supported throughout the educational curriculum; from creating awareness, stimulating ideas to their implementation. The faculty checks the achievement of formal and informal entrepreneurship learning consistently every semester. The design and delivery of learning in the faculty has involved collaboration with external stakeholders. The research results are integrated into the entrepreneurship education of the faculty.

Table 5. Digital Transformation and Capabilities

Score	Response Distribution					Total	Percentage
	X2.1	X2.2	X2.3	X2.4	X2.5		
10	11	13	12	11	10	57	24.3%
9	10	9	11	8	8	46	19.6%
8	10	16	14	17	12	69	29.4%
7	2	5	4	5	8	24	10.2%
6	4	2	1	1	2	10	4.3%
5	7	0	1	2	3	13	5.5%
4	0	1	2	3	1	7	3.0%
3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0.9%
2	1	1	0	0	2	4	1.7%
1	2	0	0	0	1	3	1.3%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**235**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage of perceptions of the variable digital capability transformation is 73.3%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty is still poorly prepared and not well prepared regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university, namely the faculty fostering digital culture as a means to create an innovation that provide real solutions in society. Transparent knowledge and innovative practices are widespread throughout the faculty's activities. The digital infrastructure is managed to align with the faculty's innovative vision, mission and strategy. The faculty is committed to digital-based teaching, learning and assessment practices. The faculty has a dynamic digital infrastructure that supports all its activities.

Table 6. Knowledge Exchange and Collaboration

Score	Response Distribution									Total	Percentage
	X6.1	X6.2	X6.3	X6.4	X6.5	X6.6	X6.7	X6.8	X6.9		
10	17	17	11	11	16	17	16	19	16	140	33.1%
9	15	13	11	16	13	13	14	12	16	123	29.1%
8	7	7	12	9	12	10	11	11	10	89	21.0%
7	4	6	3	3	1	2	2	1	3	25	5.9%
6	0	1	3	3	2	1	1	1	0	12	2.8%
5	1	0	2	2	1	3	1	0	1	11	2.6%
4	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	1.2%
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0.7%
2	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	7	1.7%
1	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	8	1.9%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**423**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage of perceptions of knowledge exchange and collaboration variables is 83.1%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty has prepared very well regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university, namely the faculty is committed to exchanging knowledge and collaborating with industry, society, and the government sector. The faculty demonstrates active participation in collaborating with industry, society, and the

government sector. The faculty has strong relationships such as with incubators, science parks, other external parties in order to create opportunities for dynamic knowledge exchange. The faculty provides opportunities for lecturers, academic support staff to be involved in innovation activities with internal and external business actors. The faculty provides opportunities for students to engage in entrepreneurial activities with internal and external business actors. The faculty supports lecturers to have teaching experience in other study programs or faculties. The faculty supports academic support staff to have experience working in other study programs or faculties. The faculty supports students to form business teams with students from other study programs or faculties. The faculty links education, research and industry activities together to exploit new knowledge.

Table 7. Internationalization Strategy

Score	Response Distribution							Total	Percentage
	X7.1	X7.2	X7.3	X7.4	X7.5	X7.6	X7.7		
10	12	14	15	14	16	13	8	92	28.0%
9	14	15	12	17	16	17	22	113	34.3%
8	11	8	7	6	7	7	6	52	15.8%
7	4	3	4	5	6	4	5	31	9.4%
6	1	2	4	0	0	3	2	12	3.6%
5	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1.2%
4	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	1.8%
3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.3%
2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0.9%
1	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	15	4.6%
Total	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**47**	**329**	**100.0%**

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage of perceptions of the internationalization strategy variable is 78.1%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty has prepared very well regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university, namely the faculty adapting globally oriented strategies, structures, and resources as entrepreneurial strategy in the faculty. The faculty supports lecturers to have teaching experience at overseas universities. The faculty supports academic support staff to have experience working at foreign universities. The faculty supports students to have a study experience at a foreign university. The faculty seeks to recruit international lecturers who have an entrepreneurial spirit (including in terms of teaching, research, community service). The international perspective is reflected in the approach to teaching. The international perspective is reflected in the approach in the field of research.

Table 8. Measuring Impact

Score	Response Distribution						Total	Percentage
	X8.1	X8.2	X8.3	X8.4	X8.5	X8.6		
10	11	13	14	10	10	16	74	26.2%
9	18	18	12	16	16	14	94	33.3%
8	6	6	10	7	7	6	42	14.9%

7	5	6	4	5	2	3	25	8.9%
6	3	1	2	2	5	3	16	5.7%
5	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	1.8%
4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	1.4%
3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.4%
2	0	1	1	1	2	0	5	1.8%
1	3	2	4	3	2	2	16	5.7%
Total	47	47	47	47	47	47	282	100.0%

Based on the table, it can be seen that the percentage perception of the Measuring Impact variable is 74.4%, indicating that the FEB-IOB faculty is not well prepared and not well prepared regarding the following aspects in realizing an entrepreneurial university. The faculty routinely evaluates the involvement of all human resources in supporting the formal and informal entrepreneurship agenda. The faculty regularly evaluates the teaching and learning of entrepreneurship, both formally and informally. The faculty regularly evaluates knowledge exchange to collaborations that are carried out internally and externally. The faculty regularly evaluates international activities carried out related to the entrepreneurship agenda. The faculty regularly evaluates the impact of the entrepreneurship agenda that is carried out formally and informally. The faculty regularly evaluates the economic, social impact of its support for the process of creating new businesses.

After the stages of the results of the descriptive data obtained above, the next stage is the qualitative research stage. Based on the results of the research from the eight aspects studied, there are three aspects whose results are lower than the other five aspects such as Entrepreneurship Development in Teaching and Learning. which consists of stimulating and supporting the entrepreneurial agenda, collaboration with external stakeholders and research integration.

1. Entrepreneuship development in teaching and learning

a. Stimulate and support the entrepreneurial agenda

Faculties need a formal training program for lecturers and students for the development of entrepreneurial skills marked by the acquisition of certain certifications. Faculties also need informal activities such as knowledge sharing discussions, monitoring, coaching, by practitioners for lecturers and students as a means of developing entrepreneurial skills, this program has been carried out by the faculty but is not yet optimal in its implementation. This is as quoted from the interview with the interviewees that N1 "…there are trainings and workshops which are usually carried out from the beginning of the school year and at the end of the year at the ministry of trade and industry and to organize entrepreneurship training. N3 "… Faculties have faculty activities or study programs outside of campus activities that combine students from the three faculties to gather together and provide a kind of information briefing or provide briefings so that they can foster educating and motivate students"…."As well as for courses that support entrepreneurial strategies according to respondents for

Business Management Strategy, Micro Finance, Entrepreneurship courses (p. 190, line 234).

Based on the findings of the researchers, the faculty conducted training workshops and informal activities gathered together to share information but were not accompanied by experienced practitioners so that this was still not optimal in realizing the EU, the EU needed training activities and workshops and other informal activities that were carried out regularly.

b. Collaboration with external stakeholders

Faculties need to collaborate in the preparation of RPS (Semester Learning Plans) and innovations to deliver lecture material, RPS in this case is like involving practitioners in industry so that RPS is made relevant to current needs, if necessary, the faculty also prepares a budget for these activities. This condition, as quoted in the results of interviews with interviewees, said that N1 "…there was coordination with the foundation, the foundation and the rectorate often suggesting how to improve the quality of students and improve the curriculum". (p. 174, line 159)

Based on the findings of collaborative researchers conducted by the faculty in the preparation of the RPS, it is still in the internal context of the university, namely between the Faculties, the Rectorate and the Foundation, has not involved industry practitioners, and the budget for the faculty so far there is no budget from the faculty for entrepreneurial activities, the budget is still centered on the rectorate. Actually, cooperation with external parties is very good and a relevant thing when a faculty builds or improves a faculty so that it is more advanced and can improve the condition of the faculty so that it can achieve its goals. Collaborating can also be between universities means merging business processes in collaboration between universities. The direction of collaboration between universities is to create internal integration which will improve the quality of the university, of course the faculty in this case such as sharing knowledge, this is because according to (Jensen & Thursby, 1998) in A. Martinelli at al (2007) faculty collaboration is important to prepare the right incentive package and reduce the problem.

c. Research Integration

Research centers and universities should become centers of creativity and innovation for industry as well as give birth to innovative entrepreneurs. Basically, all research products at universities must be in products that have economic value. However, in reality, research results are often only used for publication and research itself. In general, a university must initially be a teaching-based university and then transform into a research university. The Faculty of Economics and Business has research results that are patented and which are used as student learning materials such as examples of cases or textbooks, this is as quoted in interviews conducted with resource persons N3 "… yes, there are courses that can integrate research results, and the results can be used as teaching materials and utilized by the community. (p. 192, line 350) N1 "…there are several lecturers who conduct research on entrepreneurship which has produced several books on entrepreneurship and it also involves students in conducting research" (p. 174, line 175).

However, based on the findings of faculty researchers in general, research results are still only used for publications and research itself and not enough patents are available and only a few are used as teaching materials at universities. Based on the findings of FEB IOB researchers, entrepreneurship has not become a part of entrepreneurship development in learning and teaching in realizing the entrepreneurial university agenda and has not been maximized in achievement so that teaching and learning entrepreneurship development is not ready to create an entrepreneurial university. This is because the program in the Stimulate and support section of the the en-trepreneurial agenda that has not been maximally carried out by the faculty.

2. Digital Transformation and Capability

Based on the results of interviews conducted by researchers to informants regarding Digital Transformation and Capability, it shows that there are two sub-variables consisting of Digital Culture and Digital Infrastructure.

a. Digital Culture

Digital culture as a concept that describes the idea that technology and the internet significantly shape humans when interacting, as well as thinking in a community or university environment. Based on the results of interviews with all respondents that fertilizing digital culture in carrying out tridharma activities at FEB IOB there needs to be a policy to be required to carry out activities that are closely supported by technology support, in terms of making technology-based businesses or administrative interests supported by technology, as well as the need for innovation in teaching, research and community service. The FEB IOB learning system needs to be integrated with major research tasks, and the results of these tasks can be realized into patents or business ideas that can be implemented and can be useful for the wider community. This is as quoted in the interview. The resource person said that N1 "…there is the use of technology-based facilities", but for innovation "…Not yet" (p. 172, line 94).

This is different from the results of interviews conducted with resource person 3 who said that N3 "…the existence of technology such as a graphic design lap facility can facilitate students on how to do digital marketing and e-commerce" (p. 189, line 113). As for the innovations carried out by FEB IOB according to N3 that "... innovation efforts about e-commerce are like students doing a kind of market in the classroom and outside the classroom after that they record the activity and transfer it to social media in order to encourage the public how to do business" (p. 187, line137).

Berdasarkan temuan peneliti FEB IOB menjadikan *entrepreneuship* menjadi bagian dari *digital culture* akan tetapi according to the findings, they are still not ready to realize the entrepreneurial university agenda. This is like the use of technology-based facilities but innovation is still very low, such as entrepreneurial activities that are carried out only normally recorded and published through social media such as Facebook and Instagram. Administrative interests such as payment of tuition fees are still not optimal, the management of scientific journals at the University is still not fully using the Open Journal System (OJS) and online academic services are still fairly

standard and need a lot of improvement in various parties. Digitization is important to be improved by the faculty to make it easier and faster to work as well as create innovation and creativity, flexibility, expand networks and expand business, meaning that the existence of this digital culture needs to have a significant impact on changes in a university or faculty. This is in accordance with research conducted by Martinel et al (2019) that digital items are used to consider and improve faculty practices in solving accurate needs in certain academic fields.

b. Digital Infrastructure

Based on the results of interviews with respondents that the faculty is committed that all lecturers carry out digital-based learning, the faculty needs a task in managing or updating information in technology-based infrastructure according to their respective sections in terms of the teaching system managed by study programs and research and community service systems. managed by the expertise group. Then faculties also need to have a dynamic infrastructure in order to support all faculty activities such as routine methods used by the faculty so that lecturers can implement digital-based learning such as sharing lecture material through google class rooms, zoom, or other online platforms. can be seen by students and can be edited by lecturers anytime and anywhere. This means that there is a digital infrastructure in the faculty. Thus, this is quoted in an interview with resource person N3 "… For digital-based learning now, the learning process is carried out through zoom meetings, google class rooms and transferring material via email, conducting workshops or seminars from zoom meetings… conducting online training". "... The faculty has digital infrastructure such as email, prepaid Zoom and google class rooms" (p. 188, line 169).

Based on the findings of FEB IOB researchers, entrepreneurship has not yet become part of digital transformation and capability because according to the findings, it is still not ready to realize the en-trepreneurial university agenda. This is due to the lack of digital culture within the faculty, and the existing digital infrastructure in the faculty is still not optimal. An institution that wants to become an entrepreneurial university of course digital culture and digital infrastructure is the most important part to innovate, this is according to research conducted by Alves et al (2020) which revealed that "It is increasingly important for institutions to take advantage of the opportunities provided by digital technology, which is a key drivers of innovation and entrepreneurship. So digital infrastructure needs to be up to date to develop digital competition between students and staff who are fully digital."

Based on the findings of the researchers, the faculty has an intrastructure that is still lacking in the faculty, this is like a platform for inputting student scores and those that can be accessed by lecturers are still simple, thus making the academic community and prospective new students to register have to queue this is due to several reasons. there has been no innovation made by the faculty. On the other hand, the speed of internet access at the faculty is still not adequate. Meanwhile, the readiness of infrastructure in the faculties to support the implementation of education in the digital era is also quite good, but still needs various improvements. Meanwhile, digitalization in a university should have been running better so that it can realize the EU

because to realize the EU, digital capabilities and also faculty infrastructure is one of the determinants. This is in accordance with research conducted by Kryukov et al (2020) which revealed that digital technology is one of the main priorities in higher education development plans and using technology in the classroom serves as an attractive factor for universities to attract prospective students (Kling). 1996). As quoted in (Hitt 1998) that "Technology is bringing about promising change and is so significant and pervasive that it becomes impossible for universities to separate their plans and strategies, activities and initiatives, resources and administrative data".

3. Measuring Impact

Faculties need to evaluate entrepreneurship programs that have been carried out, for example by looking at the number of businesses that are still continuing after passing certain courses, seeing the number of patents produced, seeing the number of startups formed. As well as evaluating collaboration programs, for example by making questionnaires to measure the level of satisfaction after collaborating together, evaluating study learning plans made with practitioners so that they can find out whether courses have a positive impact on increasing the entrepreneurial spirit for students or not, as well as how to evaluate international activities. For example, if you do collaborative research, you will see the quality of the publication, the number of citations to the article, and so on. If you send a business team to take part in the competition, you will see how many times they have won the competition, how much was funded by investors, and so on. So, this condition is as quoted in interviews with resource persons and as explained by N3 "… yes, evaluations are carried out every three months, six months, nine months and one year, evaluations carried out such as material evaluations, performance evaluation processes, achievement evaluations that have been carried out faculty and evaluation and teaching staff" (p. 195, line 375).

"… From the Faculty sent a kind of questionnaire to other universities abroad such as in Indonesia or Malaysia with the aim of research so that they can find out about how the work process and learning process are successful that have been carried out by research together to achieve goals so that they can do better business in the future. So, the questionnaire every six months is addressed to universities abroad so that they can provide input or contribute more information about the achievements of joint research or activities between the two institutions" (p. 194, line 398).

In this section the program evaluation has been carried out by the faculty, however, based on the findings of the researchers, the faculty is still not optimal in conducting program evaluations and is not gradual and incomplete so it is considered not ready, this is like interviews conducted with informants saying that N1 "…to evaluate the impact This, which is not gradual, but incomplete, is usually carried out a little by little evaluation" (p. 176, line 248).

Thus, this evaluation program is still considered not optimal in the faculty, therefore the faculty needs to do a better evaluation program in this case the evaluation of entrepreneurial activities carried out by the faculty from the beginning to the end of the program. The Faculty of Economics and Business, the lecturers think that

the evaluation for entrepreneurial activities is still not perfect by the IOB Faculty. In order for a university to become a producer of entrepreneurs, changes are needed, these changes are the results of the evaluation of entrepreneurial activities and other programs carried out at the faculty so that an entrepreneurial university can be achieved. And from the results of the evaluation, it can change the mission and continue to monitor and review how to apply the results of a good evaluation program to achieve an entrepreneurial university. This is in accordance with research conducted by (Teresa Paiva at al 2020) that Measuring the impact of certain practices on entrepreneurial and innovative HEIs is neither easy nor direct. To measure the impact of entrepreneurship, it is important to start by monitoring and reviewing entrepreneurship within the university leadership environment.

Faculties need to evaluate the impact of the entire entrepreneurial agenda that has been carried out, for example how much workforce is absorbed by startups produced by the faculty, how much financial contribution the startup makes to the country or society. This condition is similar to the interview with N1 "…to evaluate the impact, which is not gradual but incomplete, it is usual to conduct a piecemeal evaluation" (p. 176, line 248).

Based on the findings of the researchers, FEB IOB has conducted an assessment, but according to the findings, it is not optimal, meaning that it is not ready to realize the entrepreneurial university agenda. In this case, the impact of the assessment carried out has not had an impact on the activities carried out by the faculty, there is no manpower absorbed by the startup produced by the faculty, there is no contribution from the startup for the State or the community. Thus, because the study of this impact is one of the things that is of concern to the foundation which has concern for all university activities, even the FEB faculty itself. This is closely related if the foundation has started its operational activities, it will cause a conflict which will eventually result in the foundation incurring higher costs for the faculty.

E. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion that have been described previously, the conclusions in this study are. From the results of the descriptive analysis of the questionnaire data, it can be concluded that there are several things according to the research variables that are still not ready to realize the Entrepreneurial University agenda which has a low perceived value, which means that the achievement is not optimal. in the faculty so that it is considered not ready for this, such as Entrepreneurial Teaching and Learning, Digital Transformation and Capability, and Measuriang, which means that the things contained in the three aspects are still not optimally carried out by the faculty so that these three aspects are seen from the descriptive results of the perceptions of each respondent. has a lower percentage, and confirmation has been made to those who know more about entrepreneurial activities at the faculty, from the results of the confirmation and the observations of the researchers indicate that these three aspects are still not optimal. in the faculty. However, the other five aspects have good presentation perceptions so

they are considered ready, but even though the perception results from the respondents are high and considered ready, the researcher hopes that in the future there will be other researchers who can do better research on the match so that it will be dug deeper so that it will be more useful later.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, T., Chandran, V. G. R., & Klobas, J. (2017). Specialized entrepreneurship education: does it really matter? Fresh evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 23*(1), 4-19.
2. Alves, C., & Paiva, T. F. T. HEIs' digital capacity in supporting innovation and entrepreneurship: self-assessment by Heinnovate. *Advances in Higher Education*, 17.
3. Amaratunga, D., Baldry, D., Sarshar, M., & Newton, R. (2002). Quantitative and qualitative research in the built environment: application of "mixed" research approach. *Work study*.
4. Bramwell, A., & Wolfe, D. A. (2008). Universities and regional economic development: The entrepreneurial University of Waterloo. *Research policy*, *37*(8), 1175-1187.
5. Casillas Alvarado, M. Á., & Ramírez Martinell, A. (2019). Digital culture and institutional change in universities. *Revista de la educación superior*, *48*(191), 97-111.
6. Casson, M. (2012). *Entrepreneurship: Teori, Jejaringdan Sejarah*. Depok: Rajawali Press.
7. Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: organizational pathways of transformation. Issues in Higher Education*. New York: Elsevier Science Regional Sales.
8. Creswell, J. W., & Cresswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
9. Dabic, M., Svarc, J., & González-Loureiro, M. (2018). *Entrepreneurial universities in innovation-seeking countries: challenges and opportunities*. Springer.
10. Dana, L. P., & Dana, T. E. (2005). Expanding the scope of methodologies used in entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *2*(1), 79-88.
11. D'Este, P., & Patel, P. (2007). University–industry linkages in the UK: What are the factors underlying the variety of interactions with industry?. *Research policy*, *36*(9), 1295-1313.
12. Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research policy*, *29*(2), 109-123.
13. Etzkowitz, H. (2004). The evolution of the entrepreneurial university. *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation*, *1*(1), 64-77.
14. Fairweather, J. S. (1990). The university's role in economic development: Lessons for. *SRA Journal*, *22*(3).

15. Farsi, Y. J., Imanipour, N., & Salamzadeh, A. (2012). Entrepreneurial University Conceptualization: Case of Developing Countries. *Global Business & Management Research*, *4*(2).
16. Fayolle, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education: A general perspective* (Vol. 1). Edward Elgar Publishing.
17. Fayolle, A., & Lyon, E. M. (2010). *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education* (Volume 1). CERAG Laboratory, France and Visiting Professor, Solvay Business School, Belgium, A General Perspective.
18. Fernández-Nogueira, D., Arruti, A., Markuerkiaga, L., & Saenz, N. (2018). The entrepreneurial university: A selection of good practices. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, *21*(3), 1-17.
19. Ferreira, M., Reis, N., & Pinto, C. (2017). Schumpeter's (1934) Influence on Entrepreneurship (and Management) Research. *REGEPE-Revista de Empreendedorismo e Gestão de Pequenas Empresas*, *6*(1), 04-39.
20. Ghina, A. (2014). Effectiveness of entrepreneurship education in higher education institutions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *115*, 332-345.
21. Ghina, A., Simatupang, T. M., & Gustomo, A. (2015). Building a Systematic Framework for Entrepreneurship Education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 18(2), 73-97.
22. Gianiodis, P. T., & Meek, W. R. (2020). Entrepreneurial education for the entrepreneurial university: a stakeholder perspective. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *45*(4), 1167-1195.
23. Gibb, A. A. & Hannon, P. D. (2006). Towards the Entrepreneurial University. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 4, 73-110.
24. Gibb, A. (2012). Exploring the synergistic potential in entrepreneurial university development: towards the building of a strategic framework. *Annals of Innovation & Entrepreneurship*, *3*(1), 16742.
25. Gibb, A., Haskins, G., & Robertson, I. (2013). Leading the entrepreneurial university: Meeting the entrepreneurial development needs of higher education institutions. In *Universities in change* (pp. 9-45). New York: Springer.
26. Grecu, V., & Denes, C. (2017). Benefits of entrepreneurship education and training for engineering students. In *MATEC web of conferences* (Vol. 121, p. 12007). EDP Sciences.
27. Guenther, J., & Wagner, K. (2008). Getting out of the ivory tower – new perspectives on the entrepreneurial university. *European Journal of International Management*, *2*(4), 400-417.
28. Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2017). The impact of Triple Helix agents on entrepreneurial innovations' performance: An inside look at enterprises located in an emerging economy. *Technological forecasting and social change*, *119*, 294-309.
29. Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2012). The development of an entrepreneurial university. *The journal of technology transfer*, *37*(1), 43-74.
30. Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., & Gajón, E. (2020). Entrepreneurial university ecosystems and graduates' career patterns: do entrepreneurship education

programmes and university business incubators matter?. *Journal of Management Development*, *39*(5), 753-775.
31. Gustomo, A. & Ghina, A. (2017). Building a systematic framework for an entrepreneurial university. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, *4*(7), 116-123.
32. Hisrich, R. D., Peters, M. P., & Shepherd, D. A. (2017) *Entrepreneuship*.
33. Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. (2010). Question and questionnaire design. Handbook of Survey Research. *London*: *Education Emerald.*
34. Kryukov, V., & Gorin, A. (2016). Digital technologies as education innovation at universities. *The Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, *21*(3).
35. Kweick, M. (2012). Knowledge Production in European Universities. *Higher Education Research and Policy-3. Peter Lang Edition.-2012*, *6*.
36. Mann Jr, G. R. (2018). *Intrapreneurship in public education: an exploration of the antecedents and dimensions* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania).
37. Martinelli, A., Meyer, M., & Von Tunzelmann, N. (2008). Becoming an entrepreneurial university? A case study of knowledge exchange relationships and faculty attitudes in a medium-sized, research-oriented university. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *33*(3), 259-283.
38. Mascarenhas, C., Marques, C. S., Galvão, A. R., & Santos, G. (2017). Entrepreneurial university: towards a better understanding of past trends and future directions. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 11(03), 316-338.
39. Meyers, A. D., & Pruthi, S. (2011). Academic entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial universities and biotechnology. *Journal of Commercial Biotechnology*, *17*(4), 349-357.
40. Middleton, W. K., Padilla-Melendez, A., Lockett, N., Quesada-Pallarè, C., & Jack, S. (2020). The university as an entrepreneurial learning space: The role of socialized learning in developing entrepreneurial competence. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, *26*(5), 887-909.
41. Mudde, H., Widhiani, A. P., & Fauzi, A. M. (2017). Entrepreneurial university transformation in Indonesia: a comprehensive assessment of IPB. *GSTF Journal on Business Review (GBR)*, *5*(1).
42. Neergaard, H., & Ulhøi, J. P. (2007). *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*. USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
43. OECD. (2019). *OECD Skills Studies Supporting Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Higher Education in Austria*.
44. OECD. (2012). *A Guiding Framework for Entrepreneurial Universities final version 18th December 2012.*
45. Ruiz, S. M. d. A., Martens, C. D. P. & da Costa, P. R. (2020). Entrepreneurial university: an exploratory model for higher education. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(5), 705-722.
46. Sharif, N. & Baark, E. (2008*).* Mobilizing technology transfer from university to industry, the experience of Hong Kong universities. *Journal of Technology Managementin China*, *3*(1).

47. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934) *The Theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Hardwar University Press.
48. Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Method for Business, A Skill Building Approach*. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.
49. Sesen, H. (2013). Personality or environment? A comprehensive study on the entrepreneurial intentions of university students. *Educationþ Training*, *55*(7), 624-640.
50. Sperrer, M., Muller, C., & Soos, J. (2016). The concept of the entrepreneurial university applied to universities of technology in Austria: already reality or a vision of the future?. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, *6*(10), 37-44.
51. Thorp, H. H., & Goldstein, B. (2010). *Engines of Innovation: The Entrepreneurial University in the 21th Century*. University of North Carolina Press.
52. Turker, D., & Selcuk, S. S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students?. *Journal of European industrial training*, 33(2), 142-159.
53. Villareal, E., & García Aracil, A. (2004). Una propuesta de indicadores para la caracterización de las universidades emprendedoras.
54. Wegner, D., Thomas, E., Teixeira, E. K., & Maehler, A. E. (2019). University entrepreneurial push strategy and students' entrepreneurial intention. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *26*(2), 307-325.