Entrepreneurial Intentions for Engineering Students: Do Entrepreneurship Education and Family Environment Matter?
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Abstract: This research aims to analyze the influence of entrepreneurship education and family environment on engineering students’ entrepreneurial intentions within higher education. This examination method used was associative causal research. The research methodology is based on statistics using multiple regression analysis. This research was conducted on undergraduate students (S1) in the 2020 entry year at the Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang, which consists of 10 different undergraduate study programs. The total population for this research was 654 students. The total sample of this research was 200 students using the purposive sampling technique with the Slovin formula. This study’s conclusions revealed that entrepreneurship education and family environment have a practical and remarkable impact on engineering students’ entrepreneurial intentions. Partially, the variables of entrepreneurship education and family environment have a positive and significant impact on engineering students’ entrepreneurial intentions. In conclusion, the results of the hypothesis testing show that entrepreneurship education and family environments have a significant positive effect on engineering students’ entrepreneurial intentions.
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INTRODUCTION

Indonesia provides fewer occupation vacancies compared to the number of people searching for a job, influencing the number of unemployed people (Utari & Sukidjo, 2020). Unemployment is typically caused by a greater number of job applicants than available positions or is not proportional (Bian et al., 2020; Shah et al., 2020). This fact is reinforced during the Community Activities Restrictions Enforcement (CARE), also known as Pemberlakuan Pembatasan Kegiatan Masyarakat (PPKM) in Indonesian in this period, the number of job vacancies experienced a decrease. There were 4,574 job advertisements in August 2021 (Kristianti et al., 2021). This number decreased by 17.1% from 5,520 advertisements in July 2021 (Widarni et al., 2021). Compared to 5,909 advertisements in February 2021, this is a 22.6% decrease, but the number of job advertisements in August 2021 still higher than in August 2020 (Figure 1).

The trend of people looking for work is increasing. According to Google Trends, the job search trend was 7.25 points in August 2021, up from 7.2 points in February 2021 (Figure 2). The statistics show that because of Indonesia enduring the Covid-19 pandemic for the last two years (Pitoyo et al., 2020).
Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) shows the details concerning total employment in August 2021 was 140.15 million, which approximately increases by 1.93 million more than in August 2020. The employment rate increased by 0.03%. The open unemployment rate in August 2021 was 6.49% (Figure 3), down 0.58% compared to August 2020 (OECD, 2021). At that time, 10.32% (around 21.32 million people) of the productive ages were infected by a coronavirus, consisting of unemployment due to the pandemic of around 1.82 million people, unemployment due to COVID-19 (700,000), temporary disability due to COVID-19 (1.39 million), and workers who experienced shortened working hours due to COVID-19 (17.41 million). In August 2020, 77.91 million (59.45%) were in informal work, down 1.02% from the previous month (Naryono, 2020; Prawoto et al., 2020).

The economic impact of pandemics raises concerns about the outlook of young people, especially those who are quitting education earlier than others. In Indonesia, the unemployment rate the joblessness statistics for 25-34 year-olds under higher education in 2020 was 3.8%, an increase of 1.0 points from the previous year (Muhyiddin & Nugroho, 2021; Susilawati et al., 2020). Data from the BPS shows that the Open Unemployment Rate (Indonesian: Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka, commonly referred to as the TPT) for Vocational High Schools or widely known as Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan (SMK) in Indonesia is still the highest (Purwanto, 2022). The figure reaches 11.13% as of August 2021. Meanwhile, TPT for high school (SMA) was recorded at 9.09% in second place. Following that, the TPT for Junior High School (SMP) was 6.45%, University 5.98%,

![Figure 2. The Job search trends](image)

![Figure 3. Open Unemployment Rate by Province](image)
Diploma I/II/III 5.87%, and Elementary School (SD) 3.61% (Andriansyah & Kamalia, 2021; Tajuddien & Faroh, 2021).

Figure 4. Open Unemployment Rate by Education Level

The increase in the unemployment rate among students in higher education in Indonesia is caused by the shortage of desire to start their own entrepreneurship (Ramadani et al., 2022). The unemployment rate for higher education in Indonesia is still high because the desire of students to open new businesses is very low (Ganefri et al., 2021). The burden of unemployment, including educated unemployment, is a big challenge for Indonesia (Yulastri et al., 2020). Concrete efforts are needed so that the number of unemployed can be reduced by increasing the number of entrepreneurs in Indonesia (Handayati et al., 2020). Based on data in 2019, the ranking of entrepreneurs in Indonesia ranks 94th out of 137 countries, reaching 3.5% of the total population ratio (Nalurani et al., 2021; Widodo et al., 2022). Although Indonesia has exceeded the worldwide rate of business people by around 2%, Indonesia needs to be boosted again to catch up with the achievements of neighboring countries. For example, Singapore is currently at 7%, while Malaysia is at 5% (GEI Report, 2019). When calculated with a population of Indonesia's population at around 273 million people, the number of national business people barely held out at 9.55 million people, and it can be concluded that it is still very low (Irawati & Wantara, n.d.; Rohaeni et al., 2021). Looking at these facts, entrepreneurs are going to have an impact on economic advancement and the enhancement of Indonesia's economic position (Yusriadi et al., 2020).

To want to be a businessman, it is necessary to identify and understand possibilities, assemble necessary resources, and then act to capitalize on those opportunities (Ahmad & Hoffmann, 2011; Cooney, 2012; Kerr et al., 2018).

According to the Ministerial Decree of the Ministry of Cooperatives and Small-Scale Business Development Number 961/KEP/M/XI/1995, the world of business depends on how a person manages their business or entrepreneurship with their spirit, personality on their best behaviors, and capabilities to craft and develop their products' efficiency for the sake of their customers' benefits (Utami, 2017). Entrepreneurs, like innovators, are natural-born risk-takers (Olugbola, 2017). Entrepreneurs may read or create possibilities at any place and any time (Vamvaka et al., 2020). The main traits contributing to thriving and competitive business endeavors are learning to be more creative and innovative (Indarta et al., 2021). A product has more value than others when creative functions are available. Brand new machinery and spin-offs are created over time (Samala et al., 2022). Entrepreneurship is also a viable option for lowering the number of unemployed, meaning that business people are required to be more imaginative, incentive, and cutthroat (Wiklund et al., 2019). Looking at the current condition of Indonesia, where the unemployment rate is still high, especially for educated graduates, entrepreneurship classes for students intend to improve their passion for entrepreneurship, causing them to consider starting new businesses, not just relying on existing jobs.

The world of entrepreneurship is often viewed as diminishing desires and bravery necessary to open new commerce. Researchers worldwide are trying to examine why a person's intention to become an entrepreneur tends to be low. Many research workers are figuring out why people’s low desire to become a businessman. A particular case they research is the role of Entrepreneurship education and Family environment (Cardella et al., 2020; Fadillah & Thamrin, 2019; Hutasuhut, 2018; Kristianti et al., 2021). Entrepreneurship education prepares the generations for an entrepreneurial spirit (Lindner, 2018). Entrepreneurial spirits such as
The entrepreneurial intention positively influenced the entrepreneurial actions. This intention is what pushes and motivates an entrepreneur (Agolla et al., 2019). Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) explained that external factors, such as the family environment, influence entrepreneurial intention. With the existence of these family factors, students' interest in entrepreneurship will be high because of the encouragement of the family (Joensuu-Salo et al., 2021).

Entrepreneurial intention is explained as awareness and behaviors that push a person towards entrepreneurship behaviors. One of them is opening new entrepreneurship and starting as a businessman (Krieger et al., 2021). The entrepreneurial intention positively influenced the entrepreneurial actions. This intention is what pushes and motivates an entrepreneur (Agolla et al., 2019). TPB is the fundamental presumption for explaining Entrepreneurship motivation (Martínez-González et al., 2019). Entrepreneurial intention is a psychological state that guides our attention toward specific business goals to achieve entrepreneurial results. It also recognizes that individuals take action to develop new businesses or create new values in existing entrepreneurship. According to Thompson (2009), entrepreneurship motivation is the conviction concerning business people who want to open their own business. Not limited to that, it is also understood as the primary motivation for business people to develop and bring more meanings into available businesses.

![Conceptual Framework](image.png)

**Figure 5. Conceptual Framework**
METHODS

This research applies a quantitative approach using the causal associative research method. The research methodology uses multiple regression analysis based on statistics (Lewis-Beck & Lewis-Beck, 2015). Associative research investigates the correlation of two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2015). It was conducted in the form of causal relationships. Ex post facto comparative causal research means that the result is acquired after the events have occurred (Apuke, 2017). This research is set up to figure out the strong relationships of variables, namely entrepreneurship education ($X_1$), family environment ($X_2$), and entrepreneurial intentions ($Y$). The researcher studies the research by examining the data to the root of the causes, relationships, and purposes.

The hypothesis in this study consists of 3: $H_1$: At the same time, a significant impact is found between Entrepreneurship education and family environment on students’ entrepreneurial intentions at the Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang; $H_2$: There is a significant impact on the Entrepreneurship education on students’ entrepreneurial intention of Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang; $H_3$: There is a significant and impact on the Family environment on students’ entrepreneurial intention of Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang.

According to Gould (2001), research variables are a concept containing value variations. Meanwhile, Sugiyono (2015) defines a study subject as a person's trait, meaning, object, or activity that has a substantial variation that the researcher decided to analyze to get information and achieve a conclusion. The analyzed variables are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Entrepreneurship Education ($X_1$) | Series of formal education that intends to train anyone set on developing society's economy by introducing small businesses' creation and entrepreneurship knowledge. (Raposo & do Paço, 2011) | 1. Curriculum  
2. Quality of Teachers  
3. Education Facilities | Likert   |
| Family Environment ($X_2$)      | A family environment where a person gets their first education that significantly influences his behavior and plays a role in determining his life goals. (Leseman, 2002) | 1. Family Condition  
2. Family Support  
3. Parents' Guidance  
4. Family Relationship | Likert   |
| Entrepreneurial Intention ($Y$) | The disposition to become one's own boss and engage in business activities (Newman et al., 2019). | 1. Hopes  
2. Confidence  
3. Profit  
4. Freedom | Likert   |

According to Sugiyono (2017) and Casteel and Bridier (2021), the population is a general wide area, including objects with specific quirks and personalities, which the examiners lay the ground, study, and figure out conclusions. According to Krieger (2012), the population is the entire research materials, especially biological objects and inanimate objects such as events and symptoms fitting the criteria provided in the research. This research was conducted on undergraduate students (S1) in the 2020 entry year at the Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang, which consists of 10 different undergraduate study programs. The total population for this research was 654 students.

Sugiyono (2017) mentioned that the sample matches data from a broad population. The sample is a small portion extracted from the population following a step-by-step process (Taherdoost, 2016). The method utilized for this research was purposive sampling, which is a technique for gathering data that takes into account or considers particular characteristics. For this research, the used subjects are undergraduate students of the Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang, 2020. This study allocates some amount of sample which was determined with Slovin's principles.

This research uses multiple linear analyses to determine the rigidity of the relationship between the profit system and the factors that influence it (Keith, 2019). It is also used because this method can determine the significant link between many factors. After collecting data for quantitative research, the next step is to analyze the data (Ali, 2021). This study analyzes data using statistics. This data is later directed so the data can be appropriately categorized after looking at the variables analyzed and tabulating data based on variables gathered from all respondents. Generally, the techniques to analyze the data for quantitative study can be divided into descriptive and inferential statistics. On the other hand, the data analysis procedure can be done through another method. Descriptive data solely depend on the showcase of numerical figures to present the data. In contrast, deductive data, including descriptive statistics, can draw the line between the population and the sample (Fauzi & Pradipta, 2018).

Following the passing of the validity and reliability tests, the research instrument is tested using a one-
shot approach, literally meaning the test is done once where the results are compared to the other questions or whether there are relations between one reply to the next. Furthermore, the linear regression assumption test aims to prevent inevitable mistakes in retrogress figures (Keith, 2014). The linear regression assumption test is often known as classical assumption testing (Poole & O’Farrell, 1971). Valuables are later determined whether they can coexist and have a mutual effect or not using the F statistic test, and the t statistic test is applied to show how an independent variable can explain the dependent variable.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of the respondents

Characteristics of respondents in this study are based on gender, age, parent condition, and being an entrepreneur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents by Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Percentage of Respondents by Gender

Table 2 shows that from 200 subjects in this study, about 127 men students have a rate of 63.5%, whereas 73 women are at 36.5%. As a result, with 127 students, it can be inferred that males are the most dominant respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Characteristics of Respondents by Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 provides the information regarding the 200 respondents, with 97 of them being at 20 years old, representing the most dominant age of 48.5%, followed by 63 respondents at age 21 with 31.5% of the sample, and 40 people at 22 years old as the least dominant age at around 20.0% of the sample. As a result, with a percentage of 48.5 percent, it can be stated that the age of the most dominating responses is 20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Characteristics of Respondents Based on Parents’ Condition (Work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 provides the information regarding the 200 respondents, with 47 of them being civil servants, representing the most dominant condition of 23.5%, followed by 53 respondents as farmers accounting for 26.5%, 64 respondents as employed accounting for 32.0%, and respondents whose parents are entrepreneurs accounting for 18.0%.

Respondents are also studied based on their parents' occupations within Table 4, which shows those whose parents are public servants account for 23.5%, respondents whose parents are farmers account for 26.5%, respondents whose parents are employed account for 32.0%, and respondents whose parents are
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entrepreneurs account for 18.5%. As a result, the most common occupation among respondents’ parents is an employee.

**Classic Assumption Test**

**Normality Test**

The sample data is tested if drawn from a normally distributed population (with error tolerations) using a normality test (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). The normal graph plot shows dots dispersed around a slanted line, and the administering of the population is in sync with the line that matches the assumption of normality (Figure 7).

![Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual](image)

**Figure 7.** Plot Normality

The following table 5 shows the results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>8.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.200^c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Test distribution is Normal.

It can be concluded from the value of Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) at .200 at Table 5, indicating the value exceeds 5%, which means the variable is appropriately administered.

**Multicollinearity Test**

This study's multicollinearity test aims to test whether the regression model found a correlation (strong relationship) between independent or independent variables (Shrestha, 2020). A good regression model should not correlate with the independent variables, or there should be no multicollinearity symptoms (Daoud, 2018). The following example demonstrates ways to discover the multi correlations by examining the independent variables' correlation matrix and calculating the tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF).
The table proves that the tolerance value of all independent variables exceeds the determination value of 0.1, and the VIF value is less than 10. It can be concluded from this study that there are no issues with multicollinearity within the regression model.

**Heteroscedasticity Test**

One of the most common ways of checking for heteroskedasticity is by plotting a residuals graph using SPSS. Homoscedasticity helps determine the difference in the residual substance of one period compared to another (Williams, 2020). The case heteroscedasticity problem is not a good regression model. Several statistical approaches may be used to determine if a model is free of heteroscedasticity or not, including the White Test, Park Test, and Glejser Test. In this research, we used one heteroscedasticity test that can be applied in SPSS, namely Glejser Test. For this research, we employed the Glejser Examination, a heteroscedasticity test that can be run in SPSS (Figure 8).

![Figure 8. Heteroscedasticity Test Results](image)

This signifies that the regression model has no heteroscedasticity. As a result, it is possible to conclude that the model used in this research can be used to estimate entrepreneurial intention after understanding factors that significantly affect it, such as entrepreneurship education and family environment.

**Table 6. Tolerance and VIF Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>42.168</td>
<td>6.485</td>
<td>.6502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Y (Entrepreneurial Intention)
b. X₁ (Entrepreneurship Education)
c. X₂ (Family Environment)

**Table 7. Glejser Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>3.926</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: AbsUt (Residual)
b. X₁ (Entrepreneurship Education)
c. X₂ (Family Environment)

Based on Glejser test results proving that the value of both variables sig X₁ and X₂ count for a total of
more than 0.05, meaning there is no heteroscedasticity problem.

**Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

Multiple linear regression, referred to as multiple regression analysis, refers to a technique used to estimate the results based on the value of the variables (Grégoire, 2015; Slinker & Glantz, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Variables Entered/Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All requested variables entered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second column, part B within Table 8 concerning the value β₁ of entrepreneurship education variable of 0.210, family environment variable (β₂) at the value of 0.255, and the constant value (a) at 42.168, the multiple linear regression is obtained, with the equation as follows:

\[ Y = 42.168 + 0.210X₁ + 0.255X₂ + e \]

The Constanta value = 42.168 indicates that if entrepreneurship education \((X₁)\) and family environment \((X₂)\) are held constant, the entrepreneurial intention \((Y)\) is 42.168. Coefficient \(β₁ (X₁) = 0.210\), showing variable about entrepreneurship education \((X₁)\) positively influences the entrepreneurship intentions \((Y)\), or that improving entrepreneurship education \((X₁)\) increases entrepreneurial intention \((Y)\) by 0.210. Coefficient \(β₂ (X₂) = 0.255\) proves that Family environment \((X₂)\) variable positively influences the outcome of the entrepreneurial intention \((Y)\) or that improving family environment \((X₂)\) enhances entrepreneurial intention \((Y)\) by 0.255.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Simultaneous Test, commonly referred to as the F test and Anova Test, is a test used to figure out the influences of the independent variables on dependent variables (Larson, 2008; Zhang & Liang, 2014), with the entrepreneurship education and family environment factors as the dependent variables of students’ entrepreneurial intentions. The model is significant as long as the significance column (%) < Alpha (Blackwell, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Multiple Linear Regression Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: AbsUt (Residual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. X₁ (Entrepreneurship Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. X₂ (Family Environment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 9, it can be seen that the results of the F Test simultaneously obtained the value of F count= 15.988 with a significance level of 0.000. In comparison, the value of F table = 3.04 F count> F table (15.988 > 3.04) and significance level (0.000 < 0.05) with the hypothesis H₀ rejected and Ha accepted so that it can be concluded that independent variables, entrepreneurship education \((X₁)\) and family environment \((X₂)\) simultaneously positive and significant influence on the dependent variable that is entrepreneurial intention \((Y)\).

T Test Also known as a partial test, this process is conducted to determine the effects of each independent variable on dependent variables (Potochnik et al., 2018). This is performed by comparing t counts with t tables or inspecting the total amount column for each variable; the t-test procedure is equivalent to the F test procedure. This test is conducted partly to examine if entrepreneurship education \((X₁)\) and family
environment ($X_2$) have some or major impact on entrepreneurial intention ($Y$). $H_0$ starts to decline where $H_1$ is beginning to be received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. T Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Dependent Variable: Y (Entrepreneurial Motivation)

The variable of entrepreneurship education at 3.439, the level of significance at .001, and the approximate T table’s value at $\alpha = 5\%$ and $df1 = 197$ are 1.652. There is a valuable and significant impact of the teaching on entrepreneurs for the entrepreneurial intention in students of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang. When looking at the significance value, it can be concluded that the value of 0.001 < 0.05 and the T count’s value (3.439) > Table 1.65. Therefore, this study proves that $H_0$ has been denied where $H_1$ starts to be accepted.

Family environment variable is 4.398 with significance level 0.000 and Table value at $\alpha = 5\%$ and $df1 = 197$ is 1.652. It was found that there is a significant and beneficial effect on how the Family environment reacts towards the intention of starting a business among students of the Faculty of Engineering in Universitas Negeri Padang. The significance value showcases the statistic of 0.000 < 0.05 and the value of Tcount (4.398) > Table 1.652. Hence the result is that $H_0$ is denied, and $H_3$ is accepted.

**Coefficient of Determination Test ($R^2$)**

The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) test is carried out to determine and predict how significant or important the contribution of the influence given by the independent variables to the dependent variable is. The value of the coefficient of determination is between 0 and 1 (Chicco et al., 2021).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12. Coefficient of Determination Testing ($R^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Predictors: (Constant), Entrepreneurship Education, Family Environment
(b) Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

Table 12 provides the information regarding the Adjusted R Square's value of 0.431, consisting of around 43.1% of the entrepreneurship intention, which is further explained by the entrepreneurship education and the family environment. In contrast, the remaining percentage (56.9%) is defined through other factors not included in this paper.

**The Role of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Intentions**

Boldureau (2020), Cooney (2012), and Kerr et al. (2018) provide a similar opinion related to this research's conclusions. Entrepreneurs who are likely to thrive have the abilities, attitudes, capabilities, motivations, and knowledge to perform business operations. An entrepreneur will not succeed if he or she lacks information, skills, and determination (Ahmad & Hoffmann, 2011; Atsan, 2016). Entrepreneurship education is achieved not just via formal education but also through various things other than educational factors that can improve entrepreneurial knowledge (Saptono et al., 2020). This study is reinforced by previously conducted studies by Shahzad (2021), Jiatong (2021), Kusumojanto (2021), Lopes (2021), Tan (2021), and Yeh (2021). These studies' conclusions show that family background, entrepreneurship education, and online markets have useful impacts on the students' desires to be entrepreneurs after they graduate.

**The Role of Family Environment on Entrepreneurial Intention**

Family Environment is the first and main media that affect the behavior in child development (Arimbawa & Widhiyani, 2021; Cardella et al., 2020; Nurmalasari & Kristiani, 2019). Main family members (father, mother, and children) are the smallest group in society (Song et al., 2021). Family is the key place where an individual's life revolves and where they grow to be a better person (Suharto et al., 2022). The t-partial test's result shows
how the family’s environment has different influences. This simply means that good conversation between family members may also lead to proper motivations for becoming an entrepreneur. Family Background embodies Family environment, support, communication with other members, and proper parental guidance. The results of this research are supported by previous research by Subagia (2022), Gunarso and Selamat (2020), and Pratikto and Winarno (2019). Therefore, this research results show a practical and beneficial outcome between a family environment and an individual’s desire to become an entrepreneur.

Entrepreneurship education will be increasingly encouraged in higher education so university graduates can be independent. Entrepreneurship education is a priority program for higher education in Indonesia. The purpose of entrepreneurship Education in higher education is to prepare prospective graduates who have entrepreneurial skills so that they can create jobs (job creators) (Schwartz & Malach-Pines, 2009). Entrepreneurship education will be increasingly encouraged in higher education so that university graduates can be independent. Entrepreneurship education is a priority program for higher education in Indonesia, the purpose of entrepreneurship Education in higher education is to prepare prospective graduates who have entrepreneurial skills so that they can create jobs (job creators) (Pujiriyanto, 2013).

The government has also offered a program packaged as a student creativity program (PKM) that facilitates students to be on all fronts, namely application of technology, community service, creative initiatives, scientific ideas, and articles (Pratiwi & Januardi, 2021). Dikti has provided a program ever since 2009 for aspiring young students who dream of opening more employment opportunities via the Student Entrepreneurship Program (PMW). The implemented policies are done to improve the capabilities and personalities of the students who have just graduated and are ready to work and show their abilities, attitudes, and skills responsibly, as well as growing independence and developing businesses through creative projects on their respective major at college. The Government Regulation No. 17 of 2010 also regulates that the goal of further studies also involves preparing autonomous, creative, critical, confident, and entrepreneurial students as future entrepreneurs. However, the problem that arises is that the entrepreneurship education movement in higher education has not yielded the expected results.

The implementation of education regarding entrepreneurship within higher education still has room for further development, especially in teaching methods and learning organizations (Amalia & von Korflesh, 2021). Teaching methods in universities about business people pedagogy must be developed within the framework of developing knowledge and directed at project-based learning that allows students to explore their business environment (Radianto & Wijaya, 2017). When trying to improve the learning and training system for entrepreneurs, universities must carefully construct business content for the students, starting with creating a syllabus, teachers, theory module, practice module, and so on (Lv et al., 2022). Of course, the formulation must be done by a team that is truly knowledgeable and experienced in numerous domains of research. Little attention is paid by universities to developing this curriculum due to a lack of involvement of non-economic academic people and practitioners, as well as entrepreneurial motivators, in the drafting committee, resulting in less suitable materials (Lackéus et al., 2020). This is crucial because cooperation among academics, practitioners, and motivational lecturers will result in entrepreneurial theories and suggestions suited to students from many scientific fields (Miller et al., 2018; Shepherd & Gruber, 2021). Develop an entrepreneurial curriculum; it does not have to be a specific course, but entrepreneurship information might be integrated into all courses. Therefore, the main focus of entrepreneurship education in universities will undoubtedly persist and needs to be developed professionally to compete competitively to make the university an Entrepreneurial University (EU).

CONCLUSION

Entrepreneurship education and family environment have led to a proficient outcome in students' entrepreneurial intention to become entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship education and family environment have partly had a significant effect on the student's entrepreneurial intention to become an entrepreneur. However, the Family environment is the most significant variable. According to the researcher's empirical findings, although many of the respondents' parents work as workers, they always push them towards being entrepreneurs. This study can still be utilized as a reference source for future examinations on a similar subject. Students can also learn from the outcomes of this research when they consider their job prospects after they graduate from the Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang. It is also in the best interest of future entrepreneurship foundations where this research can provide information and increase students' interest in becoming entrepreneurs.
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