

From Organization to Enterprise: The Institutional Factors Shaping Student Entrepreneurial Engagement in Higher Education

Anne Jere Bajarias^{1,2}, Christina Pacubas¹, Elisa Payod^{1,2}, Florenda Gabuya^{2,3}, Kafferine Yamagishi^{2,4*}, Adrian P. Ybañez^{5*}

¹Department of Business Administration and Entrepreneurship, Cebu Technological University, Corner M. J. Cuenco Ave. & R. Palma St., Cebu City, 6000 Philippines.

¹Department of Tourism Management, Cebu Technological University, Corner M. J. Cuenco Ave. & R. Palma St., Cebu City, 6000 Philippines

²Center for Advanced Tourism Innovation, Management, and Governance, Cebu Technological University, Corner M. J. Cuenco Ave. & R. Palma St., Cebu City, 6000 Philippines

³Department of Hospitality Management, Cebu Technological University, Corner M. J. Cuenco Ave. & R. Palma St., Cebu City, 6000 Philippines

⁴Department of Tourism Management, Cebu Technological University, Corner M. J. Cuenco Ave. & R. Palma St., Cebu City, 6000 Philippines

⁵College of Veterinary Medicine, Cebu Technological University, Corner M. J. Cuenco Ave. & R. Palma St., Cebu City, 6000 Philippines

*Corresponding Author: kafferineyamagishi@gmail.com, dr.adrianpybanez@gmail.com

Citation: Bajarias, A. J., Pacubas, C., Payod, E., Gabuya, F., Yamagishi, K. & Ybañez, A. P. (2025). From Organization to Enterprise: The Institutional Factors Shaping Student Entrepreneurial Engagement in Higher Education, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.3355>

Published: December 16, 2025

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurial engagement among students is increasingly recognized as a vital component of higher education's contribution to economic development, yet limited empirical research explores how organizational climates within student organizations foster such engagement, particularly in developing countries. This study examines the institutional and organizational factors associated with student entrepreneurial engagement in Philippine higher education institutions, focusing on organizational commitment, entrepreneurial leadership, organizational support, access to finance, location advantages, and innovative culture. Using a quantitative, cross-sectional design, data were collected from 916 student organization members and analyzed through descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, and Pearson correlation. Findings indicate high levels of perceived organizational support, innovative culture, organizational commitment, and entrepreneurial engagement, suggesting that student organizations operate within environments that encourage initiative, collaboration, and creativity. Correlation results reveal significant positive associations among all variables, with innovative culture ($r = .693$), organizational support ($r = .676$), and entrepreneurial leadership ($r = .618$) emerging as the strongest correlates of entrepreneurial engagement. These associations underscore the ecosystemic nature of student entrepreneurship, wherein structural support, leadership practices, and innovation-oriented cultures collectively shape student involvement in entrepreneurial activities. Access to finance showed only moderate perceptions yet remained significantly associated with entrepreneurial engagement, highlighting persistent resource constraints. The study contributes to entrepreneurship education literature by positioning student organizations as critical sites of entrepreneurial learning and by emphasizing institutionally embedded, association-based mechanisms rather than causal or predictive pathways. Implications for policy and practice include the need to strengthen support systems, expand financial access, enhance leadership capacity, and cultivate innovation-driven organizational cultures to promote student entrepreneurship.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Engagement, Student Organizations, Entrepreneurship Education, Innovative Culture, Organizational Support, Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship has become an essential pillar of national development in the twenty-first century, particularly in emerging economies where innovation, youth participation, and enterprise creation serve as engines for inclusive growth. Across Southeast Asia—and notably in the Philippines—higher education institutions (HEIs) are increasingly expected to cultivate entrepreneurial capacities among students to address employment challenges, stimulate local innovation, and build resilient communities. As labor markets evolve and the demand for adaptable, opportunity-seeking graduates rises, universities are tasked with creating environments that nurture entrepreneurial mindsets, skills, and engagement. Yet despite this growing institutional emphasis, student entrepreneurship remains insufficiently understood, particularly regarding the organizational contexts that shape students' entrepreneurial experiences.

Traditionally, entrepreneurship education research has centered on formal curricular approaches, such as entrepreneurship courses, training programs, business plan competitions, and university-based incubators. While these initiatives remain important, recent scholarship highlights that much entrepreneurial learning occurs informally through co-curricular and extra-curricular spaces—particularly within student organizations. These organizations serve as dynamic micro-ecosystems where students practice leadership, collaborate on projects, navigate challenges, mobilize resources, and engage in creative problem-solving. In this sense, student organizations act as early laboratories for entrepreneurial thinking and behavior, offering experiential learning opportunities that complement classroom-based instruction.

However, the capacity of student organizations to cultivate entrepreneurial engagement is shaped by multiple institutional and organizational factors. Supportive leadership, accessible resources, conducive physical spaces, and cultures that value innovation may enhance the likelihood that students participate in entrepreneurial activities. Conversely, limited access to finance, weak organizational support, and rigid institutional structures may hinder such participation. Understanding how these factors interact is essential for HEIs seeking to design effective entrepreneurship ecosystems that empower students to transition “from organization to enterprise.”

Despite the importance of these dynamics, research examining the institutional and organizational determinants of student entrepreneurial engagement is sparse, particularly in developing-country contexts. Most studies focus on entrepreneurial intentions using psychological models such as the Theory of Planned Behavior. While valuable, these models do not capture the organizational conditions that shape behavioral engagement within student groups. Furthermore, few studies in the Philippine setting examine student organizations as drivers of entrepreneurial learning, despite their prominent role in institutional life and student development.

The present study addresses this gap by investigating the associations between entrepreneurial engagement and six institutional variables—organizational commitment, entrepreneurial leadership, organizational support, access to finance, location advantages, and innovative culture—within Philippine HEIs. Rather than assuming causal or predictive relationships, the study adopts a correlation-based approach consistent with its methodological design. This perspective recognizes entrepreneurial engagement as emerging from interconnected organizational conditions rather than linear causal pathways.

Using data from 916 student organization members, the study explores how these institutional factors relate to students' participation in entrepreneurial activities. Organizational commitment reflects students' emotional attachment to their organizations, which may influence their willingness to contribute actively to entrepreneurial initiatives. Entrepreneurial leadership captures the extent to which leaders inspire innovation, encourage proactive behavior, and create psychologically safe environments conducive to creative exploration. Organizational support denotes perceived access to institutional resources, guidance, and recognition—factors known to motivate greater involvement in organizational activities.

Access to finance remains a critical enabler of entrepreneurship, especially among youth who often lack personal capital. Understanding how students perceive financial accessibility within their organizations provides insight into structural barriers or facilitators of entrepreneurial engagement. Location advantages refer to the accessibility and strategic positioning of organizational spaces that may promote collaboration, idea generation, and project implementation. Lastly, innovative culture reflects shared norms and values that prioritize creativity, experimentation, and open-mindedness—cultural qualities consistently associated with entrepreneurship.

By examining associations among these variables, the study advances a more holistic understanding of the student entrepreneurship ecosystem. Its contributions are three-fold. First, it extends entrepreneurship education research by focusing on organizational and institutional contexts rather than solely individual-level psychological constructs. Second, it positions student organizations as significant spaces of entrepreneurial learning, offering

evidence for their role in shaping entrepreneurial engagement. Third, it provides empirical insights relevant to Philippine higher education, informing institutional efforts to strengthen student innovation and enterprise development.

In doing so, the study responds to broader calls for ecosystem-based approaches to entrepreneurship education—approaches that recognize the interplay of leadership, culture, resources, and commitment in shaping entrepreneurial action. As HEIs continue to champion innovation and enterprise creation, understanding these organizational determinants becomes not only academically significant but also practically essential.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship has evolved from a narrow focus on business creation to a broader framework that includes opportunity recognition, innovation, value creation, and social transformation across diverse contexts. Contemporary definitions describe entrepreneurship not merely as starting a venture but as a process through which individuals pursue opportunities despite limited resources, uncertain outcomes, and dynamic environmental conditions (Giones & Brem, 2017). This shift reflects the expanded role of entrepreneurship in modern economies, where innovation capabilities and entrepreneurial mindsets are essential for national competitiveness and adaptability (Audretsch & Belitski, 2021).

In developing countries like the Philippines, entrepreneurship serves as a strategic mechanism for addressing employment challenges, empowering youth, and supporting inclusive economic growth. The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2023) highlights that entrepreneurial activity among Filipino youth is increasingly motivated by opportunity-driven ventures rather than necessity, reflecting a shift toward innovation-oriented enterprise creation. However, systemic challenges such as limited financial access, uneven institutional support, and varying cultural attitudes toward risk persist and influence entrepreneurial trajectories.

Entrepreneurial behavior is often conceptualized as a function of both individual attributes (e.g., creativity, risk tolerance, self-efficacy) and contextual enablers (e.g., institutional support, social networks, cultural norms). Ecosystem perspectives emphasize that entrepreneurship thrives when actors interact within supportive institutional, economic, and social environments that facilitate collaboration, knowledge exchange, and resource mobilization (Fetters et al., 2010). In higher education settings, these ecosystems include formal academic programs, student organizations, administrative support systems, and broader campus cultures that shape student engagement in entrepreneurial activities.

Recent developments in entrepreneurial research also highlight the importance of “everyday entrepreneurship,” where entrepreneurial behavior occurs within nontraditional contexts, including community engagement, student organizations, and project-based activities (Maritz et al., 2023). These contexts expand the conception of who engages in entrepreneurship and how entrepreneurial learning unfolds. As such, understanding entrepreneurship within student-led environments requires examining the organizational structures, leadership practices, cultural characteristics, and resource conditions that influence students’ lived experiences.

Given this broader conceptualization, entrepreneurship within higher education transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries and becomes a holistic developmental process shaped by institutional and organizational environments. This study builds on this multidimensional perspective by focusing on how specific organizational and contextual factors relate to student entrepreneurial engagement within higher education institutions.

Entrepreneurship Education

Evolution and Purpose of Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education has undergone significant transformation, shifting from business-focused instruction to experiential, competency-based, and ecosystem-oriented approaches. Early models emphasized business plan development and venture creation, assuming that entrepreneurship could be taught through structured business training. However, research now recognizes that entrepreneurial learning is more complex, involving iterative processes of experimentation, reflection, creativity, and action (Cope, 2021).

Contemporary entrepreneurship education seeks to cultivate entrepreneurial mindsets, opportunity recognition skills, and innovation competencies applicable across disciplines. Rather than focusing solely on preparing students to start businesses, it aims to equip them with adaptable and transferable skills—such as problem-solving, collaboration, resilience, and creativity—that support diverse career pathways (Sansone et al., 2021). These developments reflect an expanded understanding of entrepreneurship as a means of navigating uncertainty, addressing societal challenges, and contributing to economic development.

Meta-analytic evidence indicates that entrepreneurship education positively influences students' entrepreneurial attitudes, competencies, and intentions, although the magnitude of impact varies widely depending on institutional context, pedagogical design, and availability of experiential opportunities (Nabi et al., 2017). High-impact programs tend to integrate experiential learning, mentorship, competitions, simulations, and opportunities for students to engage directly with real-world problems.

Experiential and Action-Based Approaches

Experiential learning is now widely considered the core of effective entrepreneurship education. Rooted in Kolb's experiential learning theory, action-based approaches allow students to engage in cycles of experiencing, reflecting, conceptualizing, and experimenting. Through hands-on activities such as prototyping, pitching, team-based projects, and collaboration with external partners, students develop practical entrepreneurial capabilities that cannot be acquired solely through classroom instruction.

Experiential learning also strengthens entrepreneurial self-efficacy—the belief that one can successfully perform entrepreneurial tasks—which research has repeatedly identified as a major predictor of entrepreneurial behavior (Newman et al., 2019). As a result, HEIs increasingly integrate incubators, innovation labs, and cross-disciplinary programs that provide immersive entrepreneurial experiences.

2.2.3 The Role of Student Organizations in Entrepreneurship Education

Despite the prominence of formal entrepreneurship programs, scholars now recognize that entrepreneurial learning frequently occurs in informal settings—particularly within student organizations. These organizations provide opportunities for leadership, collaboration, project management, resource mobilization, and innovation. They offer psychologically safe environments where students can test ideas, learn from mistakes, and build social capital—the networks and relationships essential for entrepreneurial success (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003).

Student organizations foster peer learning, mutual encouragement, and identity development, which are critical for entrepreneurial growth. Because these organizations operate with relative autonomy, they also serve as microcosms of real entrepreneurial ecosystems, where leadership, culture, and resource conditions shape behavior. Members often engage in fundraising, event planning, community outreach, and problem-solving—activities that mirror entrepreneurial processes.

Shinnar et al. (2021) demonstrate that student organization involvement enhances entrepreneurial intentions by exposing students to leadership experiences, collaborative environments, and innovation-focused activities. However, the degree to which these organizations cultivate entrepreneurial engagement depends significantly on institutional support, resource availability, organizational culture, and leadership quality.

Theoretical and Empirical Gaps

Despite robust literature on entrepreneurship education, several gaps remain:

1. **Limited research on organizational contexts**—Most studies focus on individual intentions, ignoring how organizational environments shape entrepreneurial engagement.
2. **Underrepresentation of developing-country contexts**—Philippine HEIs remain understudied despite unique cultural, economic, and institutional conditions.
3. **Insufficient attention to student organizations**—Few studies conceptualize student organizations as embedded ecosystems where entrepreneurial learning occurs.
4. **Lack of association-based research**—Most studies attempt causal modeling without considering the value of association-focused designs in early-stage research.

This study addresses these gaps by exploring how organizational commitment, entrepreneurial leadership, organizational support, access to finance, location, and innovative culture are associated with entrepreneurial engagement among student organization members.

Student Organization

Student organizations play a pivotal role in higher education by providing platforms for leadership development, community participation, and experiential learning. Astin's (1999) theory of involvement emphasizes that student learning and development increase when students invest time and energy in meaningful activities—conditions often facilitated by active participation in organizations. These organizations function as dynamic learning environments where students acquire practical skills, deepen social networks, and engage in collaborative problem solving.

From an entrepreneurial perspective, student organizations represent natural incubators of innovation. They require members to initiate projects, manage resources, lead teams, respond to challenges, and adapt to change. Such responsibilities reflect core entrepreneurial competencies. Moreover, organizational experiences strengthen social capital, which is essential for opportunity recognition, resource mobilization, and resilience (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003).

Entrepreneurial engagement within student organizations may take multiple forms: launching small-scale ventures, fundraising, organizing innovation events, solving organizational problems creatively, or participating in entrepreneurial competitions. These activities align with the broader definition of entrepreneurship as value creation and opportunity pursuit.

The success of these activities depends on organizational climates. Leadership that empowers, supports innovation, encourages participation, and maintains open communication strengthens engagement. Similarly, cultures that tolerate failure, reward creativity, and promote experimentation foster entrepreneurial behavior (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Institutional factors such as financial access, strategic location, and administrative support further shape opportunities and constraints for organizational entrepreneurship.

Thus, student organizations are not merely social groups; they are informal learning ecosystems that significantly influence entrepreneurial engagement. Understanding how organizational conditions relate to engagement requires examining associations among climate variables, leadership traits, and environmental factors.

Conceptual Grounding for the Study Variables

This study focuses on six institutional and organizational variables associated with entrepreneurial engagement: **organizational commitment, entrepreneurial leadership, organizational support, access to finance, location advantages, and innovative culture**. These variables are grounded in established organizational behavior and entrepreneurship theories.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment reflects the emotional bonds individuals feel toward their organizations. High commitment increases motivation, involvement, and persistence—factors that may support entrepreneurial participation. Affective commitment theory (Meyer & Allen, 1997) suggests that committed members are more willing to exert discretionary effort and support organizational initiatives.

Entrepreneurial Leadership

Entrepreneurial leaders inspire innovation, empower members, articulate compelling visions, and encourage opportunity seeking. Entrepreneurial leadership theory posits that such leaders shape organizational climates that support creativity and initiative (Renko et al., 2015).

Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986) theory suggests that when members believe the organization values their contributions and provides resources, they reciprocate with engagement, initiative, and organizational citizenship behaviors—behaviors closely linked to entrepreneurial involvement.

Access to Finance

Access to financial resources is a known enabler of entrepreneurial action, particularly among youth who face resource constraints (Sutter, Bruton, & Chen, 2019). In student organizations, perceived financial access facilitates project implementation and reduces barriers to experimentation.

Location Advantages

Physical environments influence collaboration, creativity, and engagement. Strange and Banning (2015) highlight that accessible, well-positioned, and conducive spaces foster participation and innovation—conditions relevant to entrepreneurial engagement.

Innovative Culture

Innovative culture reflects shared norms that encourage creativity, experimentation, and learning from failure. Such cultures strongly support entrepreneurial behavior by shaping expectations and reducing fear of failure (Amabile & Pratt, 2016).

These theoretical foundations justify the exploration of associative relationships within the study's correlational design.

Hypothesis

Entrepreneurial engagement in higher education does not emerge in isolation; rather, it is shaped by organizational, cultural, and contextual variables that collectively form the institutional ecosystem within which students operate. Drawing from organizational behavior theory, innovation theory, leadership studies, and entrepreneurship education research, the following hypotheses propose how key organizational factors influence student entrepreneurial engagement. Each hypothesis is grounded in established theory and empirical evidence.

Organizational Commitment and Entrepreneurial Engagement

Organizational commitment reflects a member's emotional attachment, sense of belonging, and identification with their organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). High organizational commitment enhances intrinsic motivation and discretionary effort, which increases the likelihood that students will invest time, creativity, and energy in organizational initiatives—including entrepreneurial activities. Prior research demonstrates that strong organizational commitment predicts higher proactive behavior, innovation participation, and organizational citizenship behavior, which are foundational to entrepreneurial engagement (Jena, 2022; Meyer et al., 2019). In student organizations, where voluntary participation dominates, commitment becomes a pivotal mechanism driving engagement in value-creating projects.

H1: Organizational commitment is positively associated with student organizations' entrepreneurial engagement.

Entrepreneurial Leadership and Entrepreneurial Engagement

Entrepreneurial leadership is characterized by leaders who inspire opportunity-seeking, encourage innovation, promote shared vision, and empower team members (Renko et al., 2015). These leaders facilitate an organizational climate where experimentation and risk-taking are encouraged, which directly shapes entrepreneurial outcomes. Entrepreneurial leadership has been linked to higher innovation output, team creativity, and proactive behavior across multiple settings (Bagheri, 2017; Newey & Zahra, 2021). For student organizations, leaders often act as gatekeepers of opportunities and role models for entrepreneurial behavior, thereby influencing members' engagement in entrepreneurial initiatives.

H2: Entrepreneurial leadership is positively associated with student organizations' entrepreneurial engagement.

Organizational Support and Entrepreneurial Engagement

Perceived organizational support (POS) refers to members' belief that the organization values their contributions and provides resources necessary to succeed (Eisenberger et al., 1986). According to POS theory, supportive environments encourage individuals to reciprocate with increased motivation, initiative, and engagement. In academic settings, organizational support has been shown to enhance innovation behavior, opportunity recognition, and entrepreneurial intention (Abualrejal et al., 2022). Support may take the form of mentorship, access to facilities, administrative guidance, recognition systems, or assistance in project implementation,

H3: Organizational support is positively associated with student organizations' entrepreneurial engagement.

Access to Finance and Entrepreneurial Engagement

Access to financial resources is widely recognized as a fundamental enabler of entrepreneurial activity. Students with greater financial access are more likely to pursue entrepreneurial ideas because they face lower perceived risk and fewer structural barriers (Sutter, Bruton, & Chen, 2019). Financial empowerment also increases entrepreneurial self-efficacy, which predicts entrepreneurial behavior (Newman et al., 2019).

H4: Access to finance is positively associated with student organizations' entrepreneurial engagement.

Location and Entrepreneurial Engagement

Physical environment influences innovation and entrepreneurship by shaping opportunities for collaboration, resource access, and exposure to creative activity (Strange & Banning, 2015). Strategic campus locations—such as innovation hubs, co-working spaces, or central student activity areas—promote social interaction and experimentation, both of which enhance entrepreneurial engagement.

H5: Location is positively associated with student organizations' entrepreneurial engagement.

Innovative Culture and Entrepreneurial Engagement

Innovative culture—defined by openness to new ideas, creativity, experimentation, and reduced fear of failure—is one of the strongest predictors of entrepreneurial behavior (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Culture shapes norms and expectations, influencing whether students perceive entrepreneurship as feasible and valued. Research consistently shows that innovation-driven environments increase entrepreneurial engagement, opportunity pursuit, and venture creation (Walter & Block, 2021).

H6: Innovative culture is positively associated with student organizations' entrepreneurial engagement.

METHODS

Research Design

his study employed a **quantitative, cross-sectional research design** to examine associations among key institutional and organizational factors and student entrepreneurial engagement in higher education. Because the intention was not to infer causal or predictive relationships but to determine the strength and direction of associations, a correlation-based approach was most appropriate. This design aligns with prior organizational and entrepreneurship research exploring how perceptions of support, leadership, culture, and resources relate to engagement and innovation (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Nabi et al., 2017). Descriptive statistics, reliability testing, and Pearson correlation analysis were used to answer the research questions and test the association-based hypotheses.

Participants

A total of **916 student organization members** from various higher education institutions in the Philippines participated in the study. Participants represented diverse academic disciplines and organizational types, including program-based, socio-civic, cultural, religious, and special-interest organizations. Eligibility required that respondents be currently affiliated with an officially recognized student organization during data collection. No responses were excluded, as all surveys were complete and met validity checks. The large sample enhances the generalizability of findings and reflects the broad range of experiences and organizational contexts that shape student entrepreneurial engagement.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire consisting of seven constructs:

1. Organizational Commitment
2. Entrepreneurial Leadership
3. Organizational Support
4. Access to Finance
5. Location Advantages
6. Innovative Culture
7. Entrepreneurial Engagement

Items were adapted from validated organizational behavior and entrepreneurship scales to ensure conceptual alignment with the study variables. All constructs were measured using a seven-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree), allowing nuanced assessment of respondents' perceptions.

Reliability Testing

Cronbach's alpha values demonstrated strong internal consistency across the instrument. The overall scale achieved $\alpha = .969$, indicating excellent reliability. The seven-item subset scale used for specific analyses demonstrated $\alpha = .752$, reflecting acceptable reliability consistent with standards for social science research (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). These results confirm that the items reliably measured each construct.

Data Collection

Data were gathered over one week through a combination of online and in-person administration. Online surveys were distributed using learning management systems, official school communication channels, and student organization networks. In-person distribution occurred during organization assemblies, leadership meetings, and campus events.

Participation was **voluntary and anonymous**, and all respondents provided informed consent before completing the survey. Ethical standards consistent with the American Psychological Association and the Philippine Social Science Council were followed throughout the research process.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using **IBM SPSS**. Analytical procedures were structured to address the research objectives and test the proposed hypotheses. The following statistical techniques were applied:

Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviations were computed to summarize participants' perceptions of each construct. These values provided insight into the general level of organizational support, financial access, innovative culture, and entrepreneurial engagement among student organizations.

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of each construct and the overall scale. Values above .70 were considered acceptable, while values above .90 indicated excellent reliability.

Pearson Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationships among the key study variables. This allowed the identification of linear associations and the strength of relationships between institutional factors and entrepreneurial engagement.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical standards in educational and organizational research. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents, and no personally identifiable information was collected. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents retained the right to decline participation without penalty. All data were stored securely and used solely for academic purposes.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the descriptive results for key variables. Means indicate strong perceived organizational support, innovative culture, organizational commitment, and entrepreneurial engagement.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Key Indicators (N=916)

Construct / Item	Mean	SD	Notes
Location (LOC1)	5.50	1.173	High perceived location advantage
Perceived Organizational Support (POS5)	5.76	0.979	Highest POS item observed
Access to Finance (AF1)	4.93	1.244	Moderate perceived access
Organizational Commitment (OC1)	5.92	0.810	High commitment rating
Innovative Culture (IC6)	5.82	0.930	Strong perception of innovation culture
Entrepreneurial Engagement (SOE1)	6.46	0.699	Highest among all constructs

Descriptive results reveal that students perceive their organizational environments as highly supportive of innovation and entrepreneurial engagement, though financial access remains a moderate concern.

Table 1 shows that entrepreneurial engagement received the highest mean score ($M = 6.46$, $SD = .699$), indicating strong organizational involvement in innovation-focused activities. Organizational commitment ($M = 5.92$, $SD = .810$), innovative culture ($M = 5.82$, $SD = .930$), and organizational support ($M = 5.76$, $SD = .979$) were also rated highly. Location advantages were similarly perceived positively ($M = 5.50$, $SD = 1.173$). However, access to finance reflected a moderate perception ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 1.244$).

These results suggest that while students generally experience supportive, innovation-oriented environments, financial constraints persist. High organizational support and innovative culture suggest fertile environments for idea generation and collaboration. Strong organizational commitment indicates that students identify positively with their organizations, a factor associated

with discretionary effort and initiative-taking. The moderate perception of financial access aligns with research showing that student entrepreneurs in developing countries often face structural economic barriers that limit project implementation.

Overall, the descriptive data portray student organizations as vibrant learning ecosystems conducive to entrepreneurial engagement, though they may benefit from strengthened financial support mechanisms.

Table 2. Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha)

Scale / Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Interpretation
Overall Instrument (All Variables)	57	0.969	Excellent reliability
7-Item Construct Scale	7	0.752	Acceptable reliability

Reliability analysis demonstrates that the instrument used in the study is statistically robust and internally consistent.

As reported in Table 2, the overall instrument achieved $\alpha = .969$, reflecting excellent internal consistency. The seven-item scale achieved $\alpha = .752$, indicating acceptable reliability.

These values meet and exceed recommended thresholds in social science research, suggesting that the constructs were measured reliably and consistently across participants. The high alpha of the full instrument indicates that the items collectively capture the underlying constructs related to organizational climates and engagement. The acceptable alpha of the shorter scale suggests balanced item performance without redundancy.

These reliability results justify the use of Pearson correlation for hypothesis testing and support confidence in the accuracy of the subsequent analyses.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Matrix of Study Variables (N = 916)

Variables	OC	EL	OS	AF	LOC	IC	SOE
1. Organizational Commitment (OC)	—	.612	.544	.421	.389	.508	.563
2. Entrepreneurial Leadership (EL)	.612	—	.658	.472	.441	.589	.618
3. Organizational Support (OS)	.544	.658	—	.703	.655	.714	.676
4. Access to Finance (AF)	.421	.472	.703	—	.611	.584	.497
5. Location (LOC)	.389	.441	.655	.611	—	.563	.472
6. Innovative Culture (IC)	.508	.589	.714	.584	.563	—	.693
7. Student Org. Entrepreneurial Engagement (SOE)	.563	.618	.676	.497	.472	.693	—

Reliability analysis demonstrates that the instrument used in the study is statistically robust and internally consistent.

As reported in Table 2, the overall instrument achieved $\alpha = .969$, reflecting excellent internal consistency. The seven-item scale achieved $\alpha = .752$, indicating acceptable reliability.

These values meet and exceed recommended thresholds in social science research, suggesting that the constructs were measured reliably and consistently across participants. The high alpha of the full instrument indicates that the items collectively capture the underlying constructs related to organizational climates and engagement. The acceptable alpha of the shorter scale suggests balanced item performance without redundancy.

These reliability results justify the use of Pearson correlation for hypothesis testing and support confidence in the accuracy of the subsequent analyses.

DISCUSSION

This study examined how institutional and organizational factors are associated with entrepreneurial engagement among student organization members in Philippine higher education institutions. Anchored in an ecosystem perspective, the findings demonstrate that entrepreneurial engagement emerges from a constellation of organizational characteristics—commitment, leadership, support, innovative culture, resource access, and physical environments—that collectively shape students' experiences. Because the study used correlation analysis rather than causal modeling, the Discussion interprets these relationships as associations rather than effects. Even within this framework, the results provide meaningful insights into the organizational conditions that accompany entrepreneurial involvement.

The descriptive results show that student organization members generally perceive their environments as highly supportive of innovation and engagement. High mean scores for entrepreneurial engagement, organizational support, innovative culture, and organizational commitment indicate that students are immersed in vibrant organizational climates that encourage creativity, initiative, and participation. These findings reflect earlier studies emphasizing that student involvement is shaped by environments that promote psychological safety, social interaction, and opportunities for active participation (Astin, 1999; Shinnar et al., 2021). The strong perceptions of innovative culture suggest that many student organizations within Philippine HEIs foster norms that encourage exploration and openness—conditions recognized in literature as conducive to entrepreneurial behavior (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Meanwhile, moderate perceptions of access to finance align with persistent financial constraints documented among youth and student entrepreneurs in developing economies (Sutter et al., 2019), signaling a structural challenge that may limit students' capacity to bring entrepreneurial ideas to fruition.

The reliability analysis further strengthens the study, confirming that the constructs used—organizational support, innovative culture, entrepreneurial leadership, and others—are measured consistently and reliably. This ensures that the patterns observed in the correlation matrix reflect genuine relationships rather than artifacts of poor measurement.

The correlation analysis reveals several noteworthy associations. First, innovative culture shows the strongest association with entrepreneurial engagement ($r = .693$). This aligns with theoretical models positing that creativity-supportive environments are foundational to entrepreneurship, as they nurture curiosity, risk tolerance, and experimentation (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). When organizations encourage new ideas and accept failure as part of learning, members become more willing to participate in innovation-related activities. This association highlights the central role of cultural conditions in shaping student engagement—an implication that resonates strongly with literature advocating for innovation-oriented university ecosystems (Fayolle, 2023).

Second, entrepreneurial leadership exhibits a significant association with entrepreneurial engagement ($r = .618$). Prior studies argue that leaders who articulate compelling visions, empower members, and model opportunity-seeking behaviors create climates that support action-oriented learning and creativity (Renko et al., 2015). Within student organizations, leadership dynamics tend to be especially influential because leaders often mediate access to resources, facilitate brainstorming, and coordinate collaborative efforts. The strength of this association suggests that leadership development may be an important strategy for universities seeking to promote student entrepreneurship.

Third, organizational support correlates strongly with both entrepreneurial engagement ($r = .676$) and other organizational variables such as access to finance ($r = .703$), location ($r = .655$), and innovative culture ($r = .714$). These patterns align with perceived organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), which posits that individuals respond positively when they believe their organization values their contributions and provides needed resources. In this study, organizational support appears to be a cornerstone of students' experiences—its associations with resource availability, physical space, and cultural orientation indicate that support may function as a multidimensional enabling condition embedded throughout the organizational environment.

Organizational commitment ($r = .563$) also shows meaningful associations with entrepreneurial engagement, suggesting that students who feel emotionally connected to their organizations may be more inclined to participate actively in entrepreneurial activities. This aligns with research showing that committed members tend to exert discretionary effort and engage in organizational initiatives beyond formal expectations (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Access to finance and location both exhibit significant but more moderate associations with engagement. These relationships highlight the importance of structural supports in entrepreneurship: financial accessibility reduces perceived barriers to action, while strategic locations—such as innovation hubs or accessible meeting spaces—encourage interaction, collaboration, and creativity (Strange & Banning, 2015). While these factors alone may not determine engagement, they appear to contribute meaningfully to environments where entrepreneurial activities can flourish.

Taken together, the findings affirm an ecosystemic understanding of student entrepreneurial engagement. Rather than emerging from a single dominant factor, engagement appears associated with a supportive constellation of leadership strength, cultural openness, perceived institutional support, resource accessibility, and emotional commitment. This pattern resonates with literature calling for more holistic approaches to entrepreneurship education—approaches that recognize how innovation ecosystems within universities shape students' opportunities for entrepreneurial learning (Walter & Block, 2021; Maritz et al., 2023).

This study contributes to scholarly understanding by conceptualizing student organizations as significant entrepreneurial learning environments. Within these organizations, students practice decision-making, solve problems collaboratively, and initiate creative projects. The associations identified underscore the potential of student organizations to serve as grassroots incubators where entrepreneurial engagement is nurtured through everyday organizational experiences. These findings advance the field by demonstrating that organizational climates—not only coursework or formal entrepreneurship programs—are meaningfully related to students' entrepreneurial involvement.

Finally, the results reflect the socio-cultural and institutional realities of Philippine higher education, where student organizations play a central role in campus life. Understanding how organizational structures, leadership, culture, and resources relate to engagement provides valuable guidance for institutions seeking to strengthen innovation and entrepreneurship among Filipino students. Given the national emphasis on cultivating entrepreneurial capacities to support economic development, the insights generated by this study hold both academic and practical significance.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the associations between institutional and organizational factors and entrepreneurial engagement among student organization members in Philippine higher education institutions. The findings demonstrate that entrepreneurial engagement is significantly associated with innovative culture, entrepreneurial leadership, organizational support, access to finance, location advantages, and organizational commitment. These

associations indicate that entrepreneurial engagement is not an isolated or purely individual phenomenon; rather, it is situated within organizational ecosystems that support, encourage, and resource students' entrepreneurial activities.

The strongest associations—particularly with innovative culture and organizational support—emphasize the importance of cultivating environments where creativity, experimentation, and institutional backing are embedded in daily organizational life. The study's results contribute to entrepreneurship education research by highlighting the role of student organizations as informal yet powerful entrepreneurial learning spaces. It also fills a regional gap by providing empirical insights from the Philippine context, where institutional factors influencing student entrepreneurship have received limited scholarly attention.

By reframing entrepreneurial engagement as a relational and contextual phenomenon, this study underscores the need for higher education institutions to strengthen their organizational ecosystems. Doing so will not only support student entrepreneurship but also contribute to broader national goals related to innovation, employability, and sustainable development.

IMPLICATIONS

Theoretical Implications

1. ***Supports ecosystem-based theories.***

The associations observed across variables reinforce models that view entrepreneurship as emerging from environmental conditions rather than individual traits alone.

2. ***Extends organizational behavior theories to student contexts.***

The findings confirm that perceived organizational support, commitment, and leadership are relevant frameworks for understanding student engagement in entrepreneurial activities.

3. ***Positions student organizations as entrepreneurial environments.***

The study expands the conversation on entrepreneurship education by demonstrating that student organizations serve as meaningful sites of entrepreneurial learning.

Practical Implications

1. ***Enhance organizational support systems***

Universities can bolster entrepreneurial engagement by providing stronger administrative backing, mentorship, and recognition for student initiatives.

2. ***Invest in leadership development***

Training programs for student leaders can foster entrepreneurial leadership competencies that positively shape organizational climates.

3. ***Strengthen innovation culture***

Institutions should cultivate norms that encourage creativity, risk-taking, and experimentation through workshops, competitions, and collaborative events.

4. ***Expand access to finance***

Micro-grants, seed funding programs, and partnerships with external organizations can help reduce financial barriers for student-led projects.

5. ***Improve physical spaces***

Creating accessible, collaborative spaces—such as innovation hubs or student co-working areas—can support entrepreneurial engagement.

Policy Implications

1. ***Integrate organizational ecosystem development into institutional policies***

Recognize student organizations as partners in entrepreneurship development and support them through structured programs and funding.

2. ***Promote public-private collaboration***

Government agencies and industry partners should collaborate with HEIs to provide resources, mentorship, and real-world opportunities.

3. ***Support youth entrepreneurship initiatives***

National policies should prioritize funding and support for entrepreneurship programs targeting student and youth populations.

REFERENCES

- Abualrejal, H., Dwaikat, N., & Al-Dweik, G. (2022). Perceived organizational support and innovative behavior among university students: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(3), 1223–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-01-2021-0027>
- Aldrich, H. E., & Cliff, J. E. (2003). The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: Toward a family embeddedness perspective. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(5), 573–596. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(03\)00011-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00011-9)
- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001>
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518–529.
- Audretsch, D. B., & Belitski, M. (2021). Knowledge complexity and entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 57(4), 1565–1582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00371-5>
- Bagheri, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurial leadership on entrepreneurial intention and opportunity recognition among students. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55(1), 102–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12259>
- Cope, J. (2021). Developing entrepreneurial learning: The challenge of learning from experience. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(1), 25–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258720958022>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(99\)00055-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4)
- Fayolle, A. (2023). Advancing entrepreneurship education research: Current debates and future directions. *International Small Business Journal*, 41(2), 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02662426221123235>
- Fetters, M. L., Greene, P. G., Rice, M. P., & Butler, J. S. (2010). *The development of university-based entrepreneurship ecosystems: Global practices*. Edward Elgar.
- GEM—Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. (2023). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Global Report 2023/2024*. Global Entrepreneurship Research Association.
- Giones, F., & Brem, A. (2017). Digital technology entrepreneurship: A definition and research agenda. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 7(5), 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1076>
- Jena, R. K. (2022). The effect of organizational commitment on innovative work behavior: A moderated mediation model. *Global Business Review*, 23(1), 147–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919895551>
- Maritz, A., Perenyi, A., Waal, G. A., de Andrade, D., & McKinney-Bolger, A. (2023). Entrepreneurship education innovation and its impact on student entrepreneurial outcomes. *Education + Training*, 65(7), 889–912. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2022-0024>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. SAGE Publications.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2019). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implications of contextual influences. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1521462>
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0026>
- Newey, L. R., & Zahra, S. A. (2021). The evolving role of entrepreneurial leadership in dynamic environments. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 16, e00276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2021.e00276>
- Newman, A., Obschonka, M., Schwarz, S., Cohen, M., & Nielsen, I. (2019). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: A systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 21(1), 5–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12199>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Rauch, A., & Hulsink, W. (2015). Putting entrepreneurship education where the intention to act lies: An investigation into the impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial behavior. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0293>
- Renko, M., El Tarabishy, A., Carsrud, A., & Brännback, M. (2015). Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership style. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(1), 54–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12086>

- Santos, S. C., & Liguori, E. (2019). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions: Outcomes of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(3), 1025–1043. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12488>
- Santos, S. C., Neumeier, X., & Morris, M. H. (2020). Entrepreneurship education in developing countries: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 58(4), 780–809. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2019.1693704>
- Sansone, G., Ughetto, E., & Landoni, P. (2021). Entrepreneurial intention and motivation: The role of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 59(3), 478–506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2020.1779559>
- Shinnar, R. S., Pruett, M., & Toney, B. (2021). Student organizations and entrepreneurial intentions: The role of learning and leadership. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 4(2), 158–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420922549>
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2015). *Designing for learning: Creating campus environments for student success* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Sutter, C., Bruton, G. D., & Chen, J. (2019). Entrepreneurship as a solution to extreme poverty: A review and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(1), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.06.003>
- Walter, S. G., & Block, J. H. (2021). Outcomes of entrepreneurship education: An institutional perspective. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 36(3), 106017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2021.106017>