

The Connection Between Family Economic Education and Entrepreneurial Interest in University Students

Fitri Maulidya¹, Riza Yonisa Kurniawan¹

¹Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia



DOI : <https://doi.org/10.63230/jopacbis.1.3.13>

Sections Info

Article history:

Submitted: March 13, 2025

Final Revised: October 20, 2025

Accepted: October 20, 2025

Published: October 22, 2025

Keywords:

Economic Behavior

Teacher Competence

ABSTRACT

Objective: This research seeks to examine the relationship between family economic education and the entrepreneurial interest of prospective economics teacher students. **Method:** This study employs a quantitative regression method with a survey to obtain primary data processed in SPSS. The results of this study found a negative and significant connection in relation to family economic education and the entrepreneurial interest of prospective teacher students at Surabaya State University. **Results:** The results of this study found a negative and massive relationship between family economic education and the entrepreneurial interest of prospective teacher students at Surabaya State University. This occurs due to the internalisation process and the conservative views of parents regarding the teaching profession that students will pursue. The indication lies in the preparation of all economic aspects for career purposes, rather than focusing on entrepreneurship. **Novelty:** This study uses a population of prospective economics teachers, which is rarely studied, with a research model related to the latest data. This can broaden the understanding of the broader contextual entrepreneurial interest.

INTRODUCTION

The decline in unemployment rates in various countries including Indonesia is a concern of the government, with a very large population, entrepreneurship is a solution to overcome this problem (Cahayani, 2018; Wijaya & Saudi, 2019). A report from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) shows that in August 2023, 9.9 million young people-also known as Gen Z-were neither employed nor trained or NEET. This is a decrease of 0.97% from August 2022, and is equivalent to 22.25% of the total population aged 15-24 in Indonesia. By age group, NEETs consist of 6.46 million people aged 20 to 24, and 3.44 million people aged 15 to 19. Most of the NEET youth have a senior high school diploma, or 3.57 million people. They also have a junior high school diploma, or 2.29 million people. These numbers reflect serious employment problems across educational levels and show that not only low-education graduates but also university graduates face them (Huang et al., 2021).

Unemployment is a significant issue in many countries, especially in Indonesia (Feriyanto et al., 2020; Pratama & Purmiyati, 2020; Sasongko & Huruta, 2019). Any economic development plan that aims to lower the unemployment rate often addresses this issue. The highest unemployment rate likely occurs among young people, especially those who have completed university (Daud et al., 2024; Ryu & Jeong, 2021). Compared to other educational levels, the number of unemployed people with senior high school to university education was 3.57 million in 2023. This shows that more university graduates are not followed by more jobs, lack of training, and entrepreneurial skills, leading to high unemployment (Fajaryati et al., 2020; Wahab et al., 2025).

The large number of unemployed people at universities is due to the fact that the productive age of the population is 15 to 24 years old, which is a fairly wide range. It is expected that a larger number of university graduates will be employable and entrepreneurial, thereby reducing unemployment. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the desire for entrepreneurship in university students.

Therefore, various efforts have been made to foster entrepreneurial intentions from an early age. Entrepreneurship is an important sector in a country's economy through job creation (Crecente-Romero et al., 2016; Zulpatli et al., 2025). Increasing entrepreneurship will affect workforce participation in the productive sector, which can reduce unemployment and alleviate poverty. The government in Indonesia can continue entrepreneurship programs for students such as sponsorship, business simulation, industry cooperation, training and strengthening social assistance (Andriany & Heldy Ramadhan Putra, 2022; Muhammad Amsal et al., 2014)

In addition, entrepreneurial activities are important for national economic development, given the high level of poverty and the challenges faced by developing countries (Amorós et al., 2021; Amorós & Cristi, 2011; Musara et al., 2020), therefore it is very important to study the factors that influence entrepreneurial intentions, especially among students who are determining their future careers (Borozan et al., 2025; Rodrigues et al., 2023).

Education is one of the important roles in improving quality human resources which will lead to change (Fahmi & Oktavia, 2015; Natkhov, 2010). Apart from educational practices, there are massive factors, such as family education, which is still not given enough attention by academics. Parent also has a substantial influence in shaping education for a person's life (Ginanjar & Prakoso, 2024; Suratno et al., 2021). Family education occurs in the family environment through daily experiences. The family is the main place for children to form character and get education (Sugiarti & Erlangga, 2025). Therefore, family education plays a very important role in child development, both in personality formation and in knowledge development.

Economic education needs to be instilled by parents to children from an early age. Economic education in children cannot be felt directly, but the benefits will be felt when the child grows up which will be seen from the child's behavior (Prima & Andisa, 2021). Research conducted by Segal et al., (2023) shows that support from families for children's initiatives in understanding money management and economic concepts from an early age affects their ability and ability to start a business in the future.

The role of family economic education in fostering entrepreneurial interest can be a solution (Cerecedo Lopez, 2025; Hasan et al., 2020). The relationship between the two can be examined from the perspective of social learning theory (Woszidlo & Kunkel, 2017). Family economic education includes habits and concrete examples from parents in managing finances, working, or engaging in entrepreneurship (LeBaron et al., 2019;

Michiels & Binz Astrachan, 2024). Students who often see their parents trading, saving, or taking economic risks will imitate these behaviours and internalise them.

Several previous studies have highlighted the relationship between family economic education and entrepreneurial interest. Research by Suratno et al., (2021) analysing this indicates a positive relationship between family economic education and entrepreneurial interest among university students. More specifically, the family relationship is considered to have a positive influence on the entrepreneurial interest of vocational school students. Furthermore, research by Bahri & Trisnawati, (2021) also suggests that the family environment significantly impacts students' entrepreneurial interest. According to research by Zellweger et al. (2011), in general, entrepreneurial intentions are most influenced by parents' entrepreneurial experience, rather than by more specific economic education at home (Hopp et al., 2019).

Based on previous research studies, a research gap was identified in the form of limited studies examining the connection in relation to family economic education comprehensively and students' entrepreneurial interest, particularly in the East Java Province. This is important to study because East Java's significant economic and demographic potential needs to be maximised through students' entrepreneurial interests. Furthermore, studies on this relationship rarely focus on students training to become teachers. Therefore, this paper seeks to analyse the relationship between family economic education and the entrepreneurial interest of students in economic education at the State University of Surabaya.

The novelty of this research lies in the population that has never been studied: students of economic education as prospective teachers. This is rarely addressed in previous research, even though the study could be broader if it included perspectives from those who are strong in economic education and the role of parents in developing it. The latest data in 2025 provides a new basis for assessing the consistency of past research results.

This research contributes to expanding understanding of how economic education within the family shapes students' entrepreneurial orientation. Practically, this study can serve as a source for policy-making to optimise programmes related to entrepreneurship among students.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a survey method with a quantitative approach. Data were founded through questionnaires designed for the objective of this research, which comprises of undergraduate students in the Economic Education programme at Universitas Negeri Surabaya, class of 2023. The respondents were chosen through a proportionate stratified random sampling technique, because students are divided into several classes or academic groups with different numbers of members. The collected data were analysed

using simple linear regression with the help of SPSS software. To support the results, this study will also analyze relevant education policy documents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Table 1. Validity Tests Results

Statements items	r-count	r-table	Sig	Conclusion
X1	0.640	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
X2	0.384	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
X3	0.678	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
X4	0.538	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
X5	0.618	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
Y1	0.554	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
Y2	0.431	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
Y3	0.669	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
Y4	0.570	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid
Y5	0.482	0.282	0.00 < 0.05	Valid

The validity results table which utilizes a significant level of 0.05 shows meaningful results. This can be seen from the relationship between each indicator and the total construct score for each variable, where the calculated r value is greater than the r table. The conclusion is that all statements are valid.

Table 2. Reliability Test

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Description
Family Economic Education	0.669	Reliable
Student Entrepreneurial Intention	0.778	Reliable

The reliability analysis indicates that all variables have satisfactory alpha coefficients, ranging from 0.600 to 0.700. Thus, all concepts used to measure each variable in the questionnaire can be considered credible. Therefore, the items related to each variable can be used as research instruments in the future.

The Kormogolov-Smirnov test results show that the residuals are normally distributed because the Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) = 0.175 is greater than 0.05. Thus the normality assumption is met, so the regression model can be considered valid for use in further analysis.

Table 3. Linierity Test

ANOVA Table			Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
		(Combined)	Squares		Square		
student	Between	Linearity	443.738	10	44.374	1.625	.159
entrepreneurial	Groups	Deviation	.255	1	.255	.009	.924
intention *		from	443.483	9	49.276	1.805	.120
Family		Linearity					
economic	Within		655.233	24	27.301		
education	Groups						
	Total		1098.971	34			

Rely on the linearity test outcomes in the ANOVA table, the sig. Deviation from linearity is 0.120, which is more than 0.05. This indicates that there is a linear relationship between variables X (family economic education) and Y (student entrepreneurial intention).

Test Hypothesis Results

Table 4. Simple Linear Regression Test

		Coefficients ^a				
		Unstandardized		Standardized		
		Coefficients		Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	44.972	3.363		13.374	.000
	X1	-1.319	.168	-.807	-7.845	.000

The p-value (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05 indicates that this constant is statistically significant at the 5% significance level; the constant value of 44.972 indicates that when x1 is zero, the predicted value of the dependent variable is 44.972. X1 has a coefficient of -1.319. This indicates that, assuming other variables remain constant, each one-unit increase in X1 will reduce the predicted value of the dependent variable by 1.319 units. We can reject the non hypothesis (H0) which says that X1 does not affect Y, and accept the alternative hypothesis (Ha) which says that X1 affects Y significantly. The result is that the p-value of 0.000 is less than the significance level of 0.05.

Reflecting on the outcomes of this regression analysis, it can be seen that the independent variable X1 has a significant influence on the dependent variable Y. This conclusion provides a strong basis for using the regression model in further analysis or data-based decision-making.

Table 6. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.807 ^a	.651	.640	3.36568

The correlation coefficient (R) is 0.807, reflecting a massive connection between X1 and the dependent variable Y. This value is close to 1, meaning that changes in X1 are associated with significant changes in Y. R² of 0.651 reflects about 65.1% of the variability in the dependent variable is elaborated by this regression model. This is a good indication that this model has a strong enough ability to explain the data. The Adjusted R Square of 0.640 reflects that after taking into account the number of predictors in the model, about 64%. The variation in the dependent variable can still be explained by X1. This means that the model remains relevant despite using only one predictor. The standard error of the estimate of 3.36568 gives an idea of how accurate the model prediction is so the smaller this value, the better the model in predicting the value of the dependent variable.

Discussion

Research results show a negative and massive relation between family economic education and the entrepreneurial interest of family economics students at the State University of Surabaya. This finding may arise from the role of non-ideal family dynamics. The majority of respondents have parents who are still overly protective and conservative. This indicates that students were raised in families with inconsistent financial security and job stability pressures (Dias, 2013), leading them to avoid the risk of entrepreneurship. They believe that family economic stability can be achieved through formal employment (Chinsinga & Kayuni, 2016; Hassel, 2020; Wu & Wan, 2023), which their parents strongly believed in.

The potential indicated above points to how economic education is delivered. If families emphasise theoretical economic education only without practice, internalisation will certainly not occur. The aspect of economic education in conservative families tends to lead to careers with clear and conventional career paths such as government employees (Aslan & Koçak, 2025; Vautero et al., 2021). As a result, the encouragement for students to avoid entrepreneurship as a future occupation disappears. This condition is also relevant for respondents who are prospective teachers. The high professionalism of teachers causes families and students to focus on studying rather than developing the entrepreneurial potential they possess (Amurdawati, 2019; Pambudi et al., 2022).

The results of this research are contradictory to the majority of previous studies, which showed that family economic education has a positive influence on entrepreneurial interest (Shofwan et al., 2023). This may occur due to the orientation and contextual background of respondents as prospective economics teachers and their families' still conservative mindset. Moreover, the more aware students are of economic risks, the more reluctant they are to engage in entrepreneurship (Ayu & Fatoni, 2021; Eremina & Kulakova, 2023; Herranz et al., 2015).

The existing findings emphasise that family economic education should be directed not only at financial management aspects but also at developing an adaptive entrepreneurial mindset suitable for the times. In addition, social environmental factors and direct experience in entrepreneurial activities (Liu et al., 2019), also have the potential to be important determinants that could strengthen the relation to family economic education and entrepreneurial interest among students.

CONCLUSION

Fundamental Finding: This research found that family economic education has a negative and massive effect on the entrepreneurial interest of economics education students. **Implication:** Family economic education does not always strengthen entrepreneurial intentions, but it can have the opposite effect if the values taught are conservative and oriented towards financial stability. This can serve as a basis for more contextual entrepreneurship programme policies for Economics Education student. **Limitation:** This study only focuses on 2023 undergraduate Economics Education students at Universitas Negeri Surabaya, so the results cannot yet be generalised to all students in East Java or Indonesia. **Future Research:** Further studies could compare students from other study programmes or different universities to determine whether this negative relationship pattern is specific to prospective teacher students or applies more broadly.

REFERENCES

- Amorós, J. E., & Cristi, O. (2011). Poverty and Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries. In *The Dynamics of Entrepreneurship: Evidence from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Data*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199580866.003.0010>
- Amorós, J. E., Ramírez, L. M., Rodríguez-Aceves, L., & Ruiz, L. E. (2021). REVISITING POVERTY and ENTREPRENEURSHIP in DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1084946721500084>
- Amurdawati, G. (2019). The influence of values and achievement motivation on teacher professionalism at Muhammadiyah 2 high school Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Pedagogika*, 133(1), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2019.133.6>
- Andriany, D., & Hedy Ramadhan Putra, P. (2022). Implementing Entrepreneurship Education in Extracurricular Activity (ECA) for Students. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology*, 10(4), 955–970. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijemst.2621>
- Aslan, Y., & Koçak, O. (2025). How do family influence on career choices and perceived social support affect students' life satisfaction in Turkey? The role of vocational outcome expectations as mediator. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 25(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-023-09602-1>
- Ayu, S. F., & Fatoni, R. B. M. I. (2021). Factors affecting risk perceptions of young entrepreneurs in agricultural startup business. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 782(2). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/782/2/022055>
- Bahri, S., & Trisnawati, N. (2021). Pengaruh Lingkungan Keluarga dan Lingkungan Sosial terhadap Minat Berwirausaha melalui Pendidikan Kewirausahaan pada Siswa

- SMKN 10 Surabaya. *Journal of Office Administration : Education and Practice*, 1, 269–281. <https://doi.org/10.26740/joaep.v1n2.p269-281>
- Borozan, T., Rakićević, Z., Stanimirović, P., & Backović, N. (2025). Key Drivers of Entrepreneurial Intentions: Evidence from Engineering Students. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 41(4), 1005–1017. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-105011837946&partnerID=40&md5=8c3add89813eae6cac56a2a8f4f0d25>
- Cahayani, A. (2018). The Role of Entrepreneurial Spirit in Indonesian Youths and Housewives to Reduce Unemployment and Poverty Rate. In *Socio-Economic Development: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 991–1008). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7311-1.ch052>
- Cerecedo Lopez, J. A. (2025). Social foundations of entrepreneurship education: a family-centric exploration. In *Annals of Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy - 2025* (pp. 143–164). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035325795.00016>
- Chinsinga, B., & Kayuni, H. (2016). The Complexities and Paradoxes of Governing the Informal Sector in Malawi: The Case of Street Vending in Zomba and Blantyre. In *The Legal Empowerment Agenda: Poverty, Labour and the Informal Economy in Africa* (pp. 107–129). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315238739-14>
- Crecente-Romero, F., Giménez-Baldazo, M., & Rivera-Galicia, L. F. (2016). Subjective perception of entrepreneurship. Differences among countries. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5158–5162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.097>
- Daud, N., Possumah, B. T., Nugraha, R. A., Sukri Mustofa, S., & Amin, C. (2024). Investigating the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and macroeconomic variables on unemployment among university graduates in Indonesia: Regression and Fs-QCA approaches. *Cogent Economics and Finance*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2024.2382350>
- Dias, D. (2013). Students' choices in Portuguese higher education: Influences and motivations. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(2), 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-012-0122-9>
- Eremina, I., & Kulakova, L. (2023). Managing financial risks in industrial entrepreneurship. In *Digital Challenges: What Is the Response of the Economy?* (pp. 481–496). Nova Science Publishers, Inc. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85181264832&partnerID=40&md5=c2fee95917cd2f46047a3384814c67a7>
- Fahmi, M., & Oktavia, Y. (2015). Pendidikan, Human Capital atukah Signaling? Studi Kasus Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan Indonesia*, 15, 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.21002/jepi.v15i2.01>
- Fajaryati, N., Budiyo, B., Akhyar, M., & Wiranto, W. (2020). The employability skills needed to face the demands of work in the future: Systematic literature reviews. *Open Engineering*, 10(1), 595–603. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eng-2020-0072>
- Feriyanto, N., El Aiyubbi, D., & Nurdany, A. (2020). THE IMPACT of UNEMPLOYMENT, MINIMUM WAGE, and REAL GROSS REGIONAL DOMESTIC PRODUCT on POVERTY REDUCTION in PROVINCES of INDONESIA. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 10(10), 1088–1099. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.aefr.2020.1010.1088.1099>
- Ginjar, A. E., & Prakoso, A. F. (2024). Tren Penelitian Pendidikan Ekonomi Keluarga di Indonesia: Sebuah Analisis Bibliometrik. *Belantika Pendidikan*, 7(1).

- <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47213/bp.v7i1.358>
- Hasan, M., Hatidja, S., Abd. Rasyid, R., Walenta, A. S., Tahir, J., & Haeruddin, M. I. M. (2020). Entrepreneurship education, intention, and self efficacy: An examination of knowledge transfer within family businesses. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 8(1), 526–538. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.8.1\(37\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.8.1(37))
- Hassel, A. (2020). Employment relations, welfare and politics. In *Comparative Employment Relations in the Global Economy* (pp. 169–187). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315544793-9>
- Herranz, N., Krasa, S., & Villamil, A. P. (2015). Entrepreneurs, risk aversion, and dynamic firms. *Journal of Political Economy*, 123(5), 1133–1176. <https://doi.org/10.1086/682678>
- Hopp, C., Minarikova, D., & Speil, A. (2019). A chip off the old block? How parent-child interactions affect the intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2019.e00130>
- Huang, J., Wu, Y., Yang, X., & Jiang, H. (2021). Analysis and countermeasure of the contradiction between the graduation thesis (design) and employment. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 538–541. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3456887.3457008>
- LeBaron, A. B., Runyan, S. D., Jorgensen, B. L., Marks, L. D., Li, X., & Hill, E. J. (2019). Practice Makes Perfect: Experiential Learning as a Method for Financial Socialization. *Journal of Family Issues*, 40(4), 435–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X18812917>
- Liu, Q., Chen, X., Song, X., & Niu, B. (2019). The effects of characteristics, attitudes and perceived environment conditions on youths' entrepreneurial intent. *2019 16th International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management (ICSSSM)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icsssm.2019.8887675>
- Michiels, A., & Binz Astrachan, C. (2024). Money education in the business family: a perspective article. *Journal of Family Business Management*, 14(5), 1026–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFBM-01-2024-0006>
- Muhammad Amsal, S., Dileep Kumar, M., & Ramalu, S. S. (2014). Categorizing and fixing variables on entrepreneurial intention through qualitative research. *Asian Social Science*, 10(19), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n19p45>
- Musara, M., Mabila, T., Gwaindepi, C., & Dhoro, N. L. (2020). Entrepreneurial activity for economic growth and unemployment reduction in South Africa. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 24(2), 1–8. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85090728855&partnerID=40&md5=ad60a30f05da266606196225888c1545>
- Natkhov, T. (2010). Education, social capital, and economic development (Review of basic studies). *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 2010(8), 112–122. <https://doi.org/10.32609/0042-8736-2010-8-112-122>
- Pambudi, D. I., Hamami, T., Rachmawati, Y., & Nofiaturrehman, F. (2022). The Influence of Meaning in Life and Teacher Leadership on Teacher Professionalism through Structural Equation Model. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(3), 561–580. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15331a>
- Pratama, R. A., & Purmiyati, A. (2020). Increasing number of young unemployment due to inflation, education, and economic growth. *Opcion*, 36(91), 296–309. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85084985870&partnerID=40&md5=8f0049540ff14179c0d67b49c1c74897>
- Prima, A. F., & Andisa, W. R. (2021). Pentingnya pendidikan ekonomi keluarga dalam

- membentuk perilaku ekonomi anak. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan Pendidikan ...*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.17977/um066v1i22021p105-110>
- Rodrigues, M., Silva, R., & Franco, M. (2023). Entrepreneurial Attitude and Intention in Higher Education Students: What Factors Matter? *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 13(2), 251–280. <https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2020-0107>
- Ryu, J.-E., & Jeong, J. (2021). Career Compromise Types Among University Graduates During the School-to-Work Transition. *Career Development Quarterly*, 69(1), 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12246>
- Sasongko, G., & Huruta, A. D. (2019). The causality between inflation and unemployment: The Indonesian evidence. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 20, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2019.01>
- Segal, S., Mikulincer, M., Hershkovitz, L., Meir, Y., Nagar, T., & Maaravi, Y. (2023). A Secure Base for Entrepreneurship: Attachment Orientations and Entrepreneurial Tendencies. In *Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 13, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13010061>
- Shofwan, I., Sunardi, S., Gunarhadi, G., & Rahman, A. (2023). Entrepreneurship Education: Encouraging Entrepreneurial Intentions for Equality Education Students in Semarang. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(6), 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.6.10>
- Sugiarti, R., & Erlangga, E. (2025). Parental care for developing character of children. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(3), 1284–1298. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i3.5485>
- Suratno, Narmaditya, B. S., & Wibowo, A. (2021). Family economic education, peer groups and students' entrepreneurial intention: the mediating role of economic literacy. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06692–e06692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06692>
- Vautero, J., Silva, A. D., & do Céu Taveira, M. (2021). Family influence on undergraduates' career choice implementation. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 21(3), 551–570. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-020-09453-0>
- Wahab, M. H. S., Hosen, M., Islam, M. A., Chowdhury, M. A. M., Jantan, A. H., & Wahab, S. A. (2025). Graduate employability: A bibliometric analysis. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 44(2), 38–57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22267>
- Wijaya, N. P. N. P., & Saudi, M. H. M. (2019). Role of techno park for create technopreneurship in education industry case study: Bandung techno park. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 11(3 Special Issue), 580–584. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85069544284&partnerID=40&md5=bd84be81f07a891b2033125da84be226>
- Woszidlo, A., & Kunkel, A. (2017). Social learning theory: An emphasis on modeling in parent-child relationships. In *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 290–299). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315204321>
- Wu, K., & Wan, S. (2023). Job stability and household financial vulnerability: Evidence from field surveys in China. *Finance Research Letters*, 58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104554>
- Zellweger, T., Sieger, P., & Halter, F. (2011). Should I stay or should I go? Career choice intentions of students with family business background. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(5), 521–536.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.04.001>

Zulpatli, R., Lubis, A. B., & Hasibuan, B. (2025). Peran Kewirausahaan dalam Mendorong Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Era Digital. *Factory Jurnal Industri, Manajemen Dan Rekayasa Sistem Industri*, 3(2 SE-Articles), 51-54.
<https://doi.org/10.56211/factory.v3i2.737>

***Fitri Maulidya (Corresponding Author)**

Affiliation: Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Address: Jl. Ketintang, Ketintang, Gayungan, Surabaya

Email: fitri.23079@unesa.ac.id

Riza Yonisa Kurniawan

Affiliation: Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Address: Jl. Ketintang, Ketintang, Kec. Gayungan, Surabaya

Email: rizakurniawan@unesa.ac.id
