

Entrepreneurship Education, Entrepreneurial Intention and Digital Entrepreneurship in Higher Education: A Bibliometric Analysis and Future Research Agenda

Muhammad Ridzwan Bin Rahim¹, Nor Aslily Sarkam^{2*}, Nor Faezah Mohamad Razi³

^{1,2}Fakulti Pengurusan Teknologi dan Teknousahawanan, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, 75450 Ayer Keroh, Melaka, Malaysia

³Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, Universiti Teknologi MARA Perak Branch Tapah Campus, 35400 Tapah Road, Perak, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700207>

Received: 08 July 2026; Accepted: 13 July 2026; Published: 29 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a bibliometric analysis of research on entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship in higher education, identifying publication trends, intellectual structures and emerging research opportunities. This study contributes to the entrepreneurship and technology adoption literature by mapping the intellectual structure of research on entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship in higher education, while identifying opportunities for future TAM-based investigations. Bibliometric analysis is appropriate for mapping large-scale scientific output because it enables the systematic examination of publication trends, influential journals, productive authors, citation impact, keyword relationships and thematic structures. Data were retrieved from Scopus and analysed using the Bibliometrix R package through the Biblioshiny interface. final dataset consisted of 3,576 Scopus-indexed documents published between 2021 and 2026, including 4,497 journal articles and 146 review papers. Results show that publication output increased from 530 documents in 2021 to 765 documents in 2025, while 2026 recorded 382 documents because the year was still incomplete at the time of data extraction. The most relevant sources were the International Journal of Management Education, Sustainability (Switzerland) and Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy. The most productive author was Duong CD, and the most globally cited document was Neneh (2022). Keyword co-occurrence and thematic mapping revealed three dominant research streams: entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship. Importantly, digital entrepreneurship and digital transformation appeared as emerging or declining themes rather than dominant motor themes. TAM-related constructs such as perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use were not highly visible in the bibliometric structure. This finding strengthens the case for future TAM-based studies that explain how higher education students accept and use digital technologies for entrepreneurial behavior.

Keywords: digital entrepreneurship; entrepreneurship education; entrepreneurial intention; higher education; Technology Acceptance Model; perceived usefulness; perceived ease of use.

INTRODUCTION

Digital entrepreneurship has become an increasingly important research area because digital technologies reshape how entrepreneurial opportunities are identified, created and exploited (Duong, 2024; Lesinskis et al., 2025). Digital platforms, social media, online marketplaces, artificial intelligence and data-driven business tools allow students and early-stage entrepreneurs to engage with markets without relying only on conventional physical business infrastructure (Duong, 2024; Wardoyo et al., 2025). In higher education, this development is especially relevant because universities are expected to prepare students for digital economies and entrepreneurial career pathways (Froehlich et al., 2023; Hoti et al., 2024).

Entrepreneurship education is one of the strongest areas connected to students' entrepreneurial development (Martins et al., 2022; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2023). Previous systematic and meta-analytic studies show that entrepreneurship education can shape students' entrepreneurial knowledge, self-efficacy, attitudes and intention, although the strength of the relationship may vary according to programme design, prior intention and context (Martins et al., 2022). Entrepreneurial intention is also widely used in entrepreneurship research because entrepreneurial action is usually preceded by intention, attitudes, perceived behavioral control and social influences. As a result, literature often studies entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention together when examining how higher education students develop entrepreneurial readiness (Froehlich et al., 2023; Martins et al., 2022).

The rise of digital entrepreneurship adds another theoretical concern: students may not engage in digital entrepreneurial behavior unless they accept digital tools as useful, easy to use and relevant to entrepreneurial goals. TAM explains technology acceptance through perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, which influence behavioral intention and technology use. Recent studies have begun to connect TAM with digital entrepreneurship education and digital entrepreneurial intention, suggesting that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use may help explain students' willingness to engage in digital business activities (Wardoyo et al., 2025). Nevertheless, it remains unclear whether TAM-based terms are central in the broader entrepreneurship education and digital entrepreneurship literature.

Bibliometric analysis is useful for addressing this problem because it provides a structured overview of large literature collections rather than relying only on narrative interpretation. Bibliometric methods can identify publication productivity, leading sources, influential authors, highly cited documents, keyword clusters and emerging themes. Therefore, this study maps recent Scopus-indexed research on entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship in higher education. The purpose is to provide a comprehensive research landscape of the field and identify theoretical and methodological opportunities for future studies on technology-enabled entrepreneurial behaviour.

Overview of Key Concepts

Digital entrepreneurship and digital entrepreneurial behavior

Digital entrepreneurship refers to entrepreneurial processes and outcomes that are enabled, shaped or transformed by digital technologies. Unlike conventional entrepreneurship, digital entrepreneurship involves platform-based value creation, digital resources, online customer interaction, digital scalability and technology-enabled opportunity recognition (Duong, 2024; Lesinskis et al., 2025). Digital entrepreneurial behavior among students can therefore be understood as observable actions or readiness to use digital tools, digital platforms and online business mechanisms for entrepreneurial activities. This behavioral focus is important because many studies remain concentrated on intention, while fewer studies directly examine technology-enabled entrepreneurial behavior (Wardoyo et al., 2025; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2023).

Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention in higher education

Entrepreneurship education seeks to develop entrepreneurial knowledge, skills, mindset and opportunity recognition among learners (Martins et al., 2022; Froehlich et al., 2023). In higher education, entrepreneurship education is often linked to employability, innovation, self-employment and venture creation (Froehlich et al., 2023; Martins et al., 2022). Entrepreneurial intention is frequently used as a key outcome because students' intention to become entrepreneurs is a strong predictor of later entrepreneurial behavior within intention-based models (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2023; Wardoyo et al., 2025). Meta-analytic evidence indicates that entrepreneurship education is associated with entrepreneurial intention, although the relationship is complex and may depend on prior intention, pedagogical quality and contextual factors.

Technology Acceptance Model and digital entrepreneurship

TAM was introduced to explain why users accept or reject information technology. The model emphasises perceived usefulness, referring to the degree to which a person believes that using a technology will improve


performance, and perceived ease of use, referring to the degree to which a person believes that using a technology will be free of effort. In digital entrepreneurship research, TAM is relevant because students may engage in digital entrepreneurial behavior only when they believe that digital tools are useful and easy to use for business purposes (Wardoyo et al., 2025). Therefore, if TAM-related constructs are weakly represented in the broader bibliometric map, this may signal an important research gap.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The research design of the study was bibliometric. Bibliometric analysis is suitable for researchers that need to assess a large number of publications using quantitative indicators and science mapping. The approach complements systematic literature studies in that it gives macro level evidence on a field's structure, such as production, influence, collaboration and conceptual growth.

Figure 1: Methodology flowchart



Data source and search strategy

The bibliographic dataset was extracted from Scopus due to its extensive journal coverage and structured metadata fields useful for bibliometric analysis such as authors, titles, years, abstracts, author keywords,

indexed keywords, source titles, citations and references. The search strategy was designed to capture the broader intellectual domain surrounding entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship. Preliminary searches using TAM-specific keywords generated limited records; therefore, a broader search approach was adopted to identify the wider research structure and subsequently determine the position of TAM-related constructs within the field. The search strategy and data extraction criteria utilized in the investigation are presented in Table 1.


A broad search strategy was intentionally adopted to capture the wider intellectual domain surrounding entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship. Preliminary searches using Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)-related keywords produced a relatively limited number of records. Therefore, broader entrepreneurship-related keywords were employed to map the field before identifying TAM-related research gaps. The search was conducted in the Scopus database using the TITLE-ABS-KEY field. Retrieved records were screened following the PRISMA framework based on the predefined inclusion criteria (English-language articles and review papers published between 2021 and 2026). Duplicate, incomplete, and inconsistent bibliographic records were removed during the data cleaning process in Bibliometrix or Biblioshiny. Following screening and cleaning, the final dataset consisted of 3,576 documents, which were used for all subsequent bibliometric analyses.

Table 1: Search strategy and data extraction criteria.

Element	Description
Database	Scopus
Search field	TITLE-ABS-KEY
Search query	("Digital entrepreneurship" OR "digital entrepreneurial behavior" OR "digital entrepreneurial behaviour" OR "entrepreneurial intention" OR "entrepreneurship education") AND ("higher education" OR student* OR "university student*" OR "college student*")
Publication years	2021-2026
Language	English
Document type	Articles and reviews
Initial records retrieved	3579
Records removed during data cleaning	3
Final records	3,576 documents
Average citation per document	10.57

To improve transparency and reproducibility, this study adapted the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) framework to document the identification, screening, eligibility assessment and inclusion of publications. Unlike conventional systematic reviews that synthesis empirical findings, the PRISMA workflow in this study was adapted for bibliometric analysis. The process involved identifying records from the Scopus database, screening publications according to the predefined search criteria, assessing their eligibility based on language, publication period and document type, and performing bibliographic data cleaning before importing the final dataset into Bibliometrix/Biblioshiny for science mapping. The adapted workflow is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2: The flow diagram of the study is adapted based on the PRISMA framework



Data analysis procedure

The exported Scopus CSV file was imported into Biblioshiny, the web interface of the Bibliometrix R package. Bibliometrix supports a complete science mapping workflow, including data conversion, descriptive bibliometric analysis, source analysis, author analysis, citation analysis, keyword co-occurrence and thematic mapping. Figure 2 illustrates the overall research procedure adopted from PRISMA. The major outputs included main bibliometric information, annual scientific production, most relevant sources, most relevant authors, most globally cited documents, keyword co-occurrence network and thematic map.

Keyword co-occurrence analysis was used to examine conceptual relationships among keywords. Co-word analysis assumes that keywords appearing together across documents can reveal the intellectual and thematic structure of a research field. Thematic mapping was interpreted using centrality and density, where centrality indicates the relevance of a theme to the overall field and density indicates the internal development of a theme

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of the bibliometric dataset

Following the PRISMA-based screening and data cleaning procedures described in the methodology, the final dataset comprised 3,576 documents published between 2021 and 2026 from 1,053 sources. The main bibliometric characteristics of the dataset generated by Bibliometrix/Biblioshiny are presented in Figure 3. The overview summarizes the dataset in terms of publication output, document characteristics, authorship, collaboration patterns, citations, and keyword information, providing the foundation for the subsequent bibliometric analyses.

The bibliometric dataset shown in Figure 3 covers the period from 2021 to 2026 and consists of 1,053 sources that generated a total of 3,576 documents. The reported annual growth rate of –6.34% should be interpreted cautiously because the 2026 publication year is incomplete at the time of data extraction. publication output over the study period. The average document age is 2.49 years, while the average number of citations per

document is 10.57, supported by 153,687 references, indicating strong engagement with the existing literature. The dataset includes 8,096 authors, with 445 single-authored documents, an average of 3.13 co-authors per document, and an international collaboration rate of 25.81%, demonstrating a highly collaborative research field. In addition, the dataset contains 6,433 author keywords, reflecting the diversity of research themes explored in entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention, and digital entrepreneurship.

Figure 3: Main information dashboard




Table 2: Main information table

MAIN INFORMATION ABOUT DATA	
Timespan	2021:2026
Sources (Journals, Books, etc)	1053
Documents	3576
Annual Growth Rate %	-6.34
Document Average Age	2.49
Average citations per doc	10.57
References	153687
DOCUMENT CONTENTS	
Keywords Plus (ID)	4249
Author's Keywords (DE)	6433
AUTHORS	
Authors	8096
Authors of single-authored docs	445
AUTHORS COLLABORATION	
Single-authored docs	517
Co-Authors per Doc	3.13
International co-authorship %	25.81


DOCUMENT TYPES

article	2646
book	48
book chapter	311
conference paper	484
conference review	34
data paper	1
review	51
short survey	1

Annual scientific production

The line chart in Figure 4 makes the same trajectory more visible. Growth is modest in the first three years, becomes pronounced after 2023 and peaks in 2025. This suggests that the domain is still expanding and that student-focused digital entrepreneurship research has not yet reached saturation.

Figure 4: Annual scientific production line chart



According to the annual scientific production data presented in Table 3, the publication output increases steadily from 530 documents in 2021 to 551 in 2022, 596 in 2023, 752 in 2024 and 765 in 2025 and then decreases to 382 in 2026. The pattern shows an increasing interest in the topic, then a decline, but the latter should be interpreted as a temporal artefact rather than a sudden loss of relevance.

Table 3: Annual scientific production table

Year	Articles
2021	530
2022	551
2023	596
2024	752
2025	765
2026	382

Most relevant sources

The analysis of the most relevant sources reveals the leading outlets for publications in the dataset, highlighting the primary channels for scholarly communication. The International Journal of Management Education is the top source with 197 articles, followed by Sustainability (Switzerland) with 120 articles, and Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy contributing 75 articles. Other notable sources include Education and Training (68 articles), Industry and Higher Education (64 articles), and the Proceedings of the European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship, ECIE (60 articles). Additional contributions come from Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences (53 articles), Entrepreneurship Education (49 articles), Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems (48 articles), and Administrative Sciences (46 articles). The horizontal bar lengths in the plot clearly reflect the volume of documents per source, emphasizing the dominance of management and education-related journals. Collectively, this distribution demonstrates the interdisciplinary nature of the research field, with strong representation in management, sustainability, entrepreneurship, education, and innovation, while also identifying the key publication outlets most frequently used by researchers in this domain.

Figure 5: Most relevant sources plot




Table 4: Top ten most relevant sources

Source	Articles
International Journal of Management Education	197
Sustainability (Switzerland)	120
Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy	75
Education and Training	68
Industry and Higher Education	64
Proceedings of the European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship, ECIE	60
Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences	53
Entrepreneurship Education	49
Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems	48
Administrative Sciences	46

Most relevant authors

The bibliometric data is from 2021 to 2026, from a total of 1,053 sources generating a total of 3,576 documents. The documents have a total of 153681 references, an average citation per document of 10.57 and an average age of 2.49 years-old, showing a strong academic involvement, while the annual growth rate is small, -6.34% [20]. The dataset includes 8,096 authors and 445 single-authored papers, with an average of 3.13 co-authors per document. International co-authorship accounts for 25.81%, indicating substantial collaboration and global connectivity within the research field. It has 6,433 authors' keywords, which illustrates the diversity of research themes. Analysis of the highest-impact sources indicates publications are concentrated in a few journals and conferences with the International Journal of Management Education (197 articles) sustainability (Switzerland) (120 articles), and Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy (75 articles) leading, followed closely by sites such as Education & Training (68 articles), Industry and Higher Education (64 articles) and Proceedings of European Conference on Innovation in Early Stage Research 60 articles, signifying strong representation for management, education, Sustainability and entrepreneurship research. The most globally cited papers still highlight influential works such as Neneh BN (2022, Studies in Higher Education, 283 citations), Cui J (2021, International Journal of Management Education, 276) and Elnadi M (2021, International Journal of Management Education, 267) with high total citations and citations-per-annum; they also show more recent papers with strong global uptake based on an overall normalized score. Such an overview collectively illustrates the active, collaborative and interdisciplinary nature of the discipline including the key outlets for publication and seminal publications that have inspired approaches.

Figure 6: Most relevant authors plot




Table 5: Most relevant authors table

Author	Articles	Articles fractionalized
Duong CD	53	26.57
Narmaditya BS	22	4.28
Wang Y	20	8.63
Sahinidis AG	18	5.40
Li Y	17	7.70
Tsaknis PA	17	4.90
Wang J	16	6.65
Wibowo A	16	3.16

Wraae B	15	6.67
Zhang J	14	5.60

Most Global Cited Documents

The bibliometric data is from 2021 to 2026, through a total of 1,053 sources producing a total of 3,576 documents. The documents show a strong academic engagement with an average document age of 2.49 years-old, total of 153681 references, and an average of 10.57 citations per document despite a modest annual growth rate of -6.34% [20]. The authors range from 8,096 and includes 445 single-authored documents with an average of 3.13 co-authors per document while the percentage of international co-authorship is accounted as 25.81% showing that it has very much collaboration and global connection. It consists of 6,433 authors' keywords, which indicates diversity in the research topics. Analysis of the highest-impact sources show that publications are concentrated in a few journals and conferences with the International Journal of Management Education (197 articles) sustainability (Switzerland) (120 articles), and Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy (75 articles), leading, followed closely by sites such as Education & Training (68 articles), Industry and Higher Education (64 articles) and Proceedings of European Conference on Innovation in Early Stage Research 60 articles, signifying strong representation for management, education, Sustainability and entrepreneurship research. The most globally cited documents continue to emphasize such influential works as Neneh BN (2022, Studies in Higher Education, 283 citations), Cui J (2021, International Journal of Management Education, 276), and Elnadi M (2021, International Journal of Management Education, 267) with both high total citations and citations-per-annum; while they further reveal more recently published work receiving strong uptake across the world based on an overall normalized score. Collectively, such an overview highlights the active, collaborative and interdisciplinary nature of the field including the major outlets for publication and seminal works that have influenced approaches.

Figure 7: Most globally cited documents in the dataset




Table 6: Top ten most globally cited documents


Paper	DOI	Total citations	TC per year	Normalized TC
Neneh BN, 2022, Stud High Educ	10.1080/03075079.2020.1770716	283	56.60	15.48
Cui J, 2021, Int J Manage Educ	10.1016/j.ijme.2019.04.001	276	46.00	11.92
Elnadi M, 2021, Int J Manage Educ	10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100458	267	44.50	11.53

Barba-Sánchez V, 2022, European Res Manag Bus Econ	10.1016/j.iedeen.2021.100184	229	45.80	12.53
Núñez-Canal M, 2022, Technol Forecast Soc Change	10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121270	226	45.20	12.36
Yi G, 2021, Int Entrep Manag J	10.1007/s11365-020-00649-y	212	35.30	9.15
Cui J, 2022, Int J Manage Educ	10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100639	198	39.60	10.83
Maheshwari G, 2023, Manag Rev Q	10.1007/s11301-022-00289-2	194	48.50	15.60
Iwu CG, 2021, Int J Manage Educ	10.1016/j.ijme.2019.03.007	186	31.00	8.03

Keyword co-occurrence network

The keyword network reveals three broad conceptual zones: entrepreneurship education and student learning, entrepreneurial intention and behavioural constructs, and digital entrepreneurship or innovation. Entrepreneurship education represents the dominant intellectual foundation of the field, demonstrating that previous studies mainly emphasise educational interventions and entrepreneurial capability development. However, the weaker position of digital entrepreneurship highlights a continuing research gap regarding how students adopt and apply digital technologies in entrepreneurial activities.

Figure 8: Keyword co-occurrence network



The co-occurrence network analysis reveals the structural relationships between key concepts in the dataset, with a Community Detection Modularity (Q) of 0.194, indicating moderate clustering among related keywords. The table 7 shows that “entrepreneurship education” and “students” are the most central nodes, with the highest betweenness scores of 157.026 and 76.121, respectively, demonstrating that these terms serve as critical bridges connecting multiple themes within the research field. Closeness centrality values, such as 0.021 for “entrepreneurship education,” indicate that these nodes are well-positioned to interact efficiently with other keywords, while PageRank scores, including 0.107 for “entrepreneurship education” and 0.092 for “students,” highlight their influence and prominence in the network. Other relevant concepts, including “education computing,” “engineering education,” “teaching,” “curricula,” “college students,” “experiential learning,” “artificial intelligence,” and “innovation and entrepreneurship education,” form interconnected clusters that illustrate the multidisciplinary focus of the field, linking educational methods, student populations, emerging technologies, and entrepreneurial skills. Collectively, these network metrics emphasize the centrality and thematic importance of specific keywords, offering insights into the structure, focus, and intellectual connectivity of research trends in education and entrepreneurship.

Table 7: Selected co-occurrence indicators

Node	Cluster	Betweenness	Closeness	PageRank
entrepreneurship education	1	157.026	0.021	0.107
higher education	1	76.121	0.020	0.092
students	1	10.496	0.019	0.048
education computing	1	5.554	0.019	0.034
experiential learning	1	2.123	0.017	0.029
college students	1	2.063	0.017	0.029
entrepreneurial mindset	1	1.241	0.015	0.020
teaching	1	0.531	0.016	0.013
entrepreneurial competencies	1	0.487	0.015	0.012
engineering education	1	0.152	0.014	0.012

Thematic map analysis

The thematic map is the most theoretically useful output for the present project. Entrepreneurship education, students and education computing occupy the upper left or niche area, showing a well-defined but not yet fully dominant educational cluster. Entrepreneurial intention sits in the basic-theme area, which means it is foundational but still underdeveloped in relation to the wider field.

The thematic map reveals that entrepreneurship education remains the dominant intellectual foundation of the field, connecting educational approaches with entrepreneurial outcomes. Entrepreneurial intention represents a fundamental research stream, while digital entrepreneurship remains an emerging area requiring stronger integration with technology adoption theories. These findings indicate an opportunity for TAM-based studies to explain how students accept and apply digital technologies in entrepreneurial activities.

Figure 9: Thematic map of the scopus





Figure 10: Network thematic map



Digital entrepreneurship appears in the emerging/declining quadrant, indicating that technology-mediated entrepreneurial behaviour has not yet become a dominant research stream. This suggests that the field remains insufficiently integrated between entrepreneurship theories and technology adoption perspectives. Future TAM-based studies should examine how perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and behavioural intention influence the transition from technology acceptance towards actual digital entrepreneurial behaviour.

Table 8: Selected thematic map indicators

Occurrences	Words	Cluster	Cluster label
1389	entrepreneurship education	1	entrepreneurship education
714	students	1	entrepreneurship education
303	education computing	1	entrepreneurship education
203	engineering education	1	entrepreneurship education
163	teaching	1	entrepreneurship education
161	curricula	1	entrepreneurship education
141	college students	1	entrepreneurship education
120	experiential learning	1	entrepreneurship education
84	artificial intelligence	1	entrepreneurship education
80	innovation and entrepreneurship education	1	entrepreneurship education

Future Research Agenda For Tam-Based Digital Entrepreneurial Behaviour Studies

The future research agenda was developed directly from the bibliometric findings presented in the keyword co-occurrence network, thematic map and conceptual structure analyses. Future bibliometric studies may incorporate complementary techniques such as co-citation analysis, bibliographic coupling, collaboration network analysis and thematic evolution analysis to provide deeper insights into intellectual development and knowledge relationships within the field. Digital entrepreneurship was positioned within the emerging theme quadrant, indicating that the topic remains underdeveloped. Consequently, future studies should investigate the evolution of digital entrepreneurial behavior through longitudinal and empirical approaches. Entrepreneurial

intention was identified as a basic theme, suggesting that future research should focus on understanding how entrepreneurial intention translates into actual entrepreneurial behavior. In addition, the limited visibility of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) constructs within the keyword network indicates an opportunity to develop and validate TAM-based models to explain students' adoption of digital technologies for entrepreneurial activities. These proposed research directions are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9: Future research agenda derived from the bibliometric findings

Bibliometric Finding	Future Direction
Digital entrepreneurship located in the emerging theme quadrant	Conduct longitudinal studies on digital entrepreneurial behavior among higher education students.
Entrepreneurial intention remains a basic theme	Examine the transition from entrepreneurial intention to actual digital entrepreneurial behavior.
TAM keywords absent from dominant clusters	Develop and validate TAM-based models incorporating perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and behavioral intention.
Entrepreneurship education dominates the literature	Investigate how entrepreneurship education influences students' digital entrepreneurial behavior using technology acceptance perspectives.
Higher education appears as a central research context	Compare digital entrepreneurial behavior across universities, countries and educational systems.

CONCLUSION

This bibliometric analysis mapped a final cleaned dataset of 3,576 Scopus-indexed documents published between 2021 and 2026 after PRISMA-based screening and data cleaning procedures. The findings provide a reliable overview of the research landscape on entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention and digital entrepreneurship in higher education. The findings show that publication activity increased strongly from 2021 to 2025, indicating growing scholarly attention. The most relevant sources were the International Journal of Management Education, Sustainability (Switzerland) and Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy. The most productive author was Duong CD, while Neneh (2022) was the most globally cited document. This study is limited by the use of a single database (Scopus), restriction to English-language publications, and the selected publication period. Future studies may incorporate Web of Science, Dimensions, or Crossref databases for broader coverage.

The conceptual structure revealed that entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention dominate the field. Digital entrepreneurship and digital transformation were present but appeared as emerging or less central themes. This finding highlights an important opportunity for future research to examine digital entrepreneurial behaviour by integrating entrepreneurship education perspectives with technology adoption theories. The weak visibility of TAM-related terms such as perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use strengthens the justification for future TAM-based investigations.

Overall, this paper contributes by providing a structured bibliometric map of a growing research domain. It also proposes a research agenda connecting entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial intention, digital entrepreneurship and TAM. The findings provide a foundation for future empirical studies examining the determinants of digital entrepreneurial behaviour among higher education students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM) for giving the authors an opportunity, support, and facilities to accomplish this project paper.

REFERENCES

1. Anwar, I., Yasin, N., Prasanna, S., Salamzadeh, A., & Saleem, I. (2024). Transition from entrepreneurial intention to venture gestation behavior: A longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2024.2379105>
2. Balaji, S., Malarkodi, M., Uma, K., Padma, S. R., & Soundararajan, R. P. (2025). Agribusiness startup among agricultural students: Awareness, perception, constraints and students’ expectations from the university. *Plant Science Today*, 12(sp4). <https://doi.org/10.14719/pst.10228>
3. Bartoli, C., & Brunetta, F. (2025). *Entrepreneurship education and student empowerment*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003607649>
4. Cekule, L., Cekuls, A., & Dunska, M. (2023). The role of education in fostering entrepreneurial intentions among business students. <https://doi.org/10.4995/head23.2023.16159>
5. Charokopaki, A., & Douros, P. (2025). Optimism, general Self-Efficacy, and entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy among greek students: Research, management, and society. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(7), 242. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15070242>
6. Chen, S., Wu, R., & He, D. (2024). Research on quality evaluation of College students’ innovation and entrepreneurship education based on ant colony algorithm. *Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*, 171–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-63133-7_17
7. Duong, C. D. (2024). ChatGPT adoption and digital entrepreneurial intentions: An empirical research based on the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 12(2), 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.15678/eber.2024.120208>
8. Fröhlich, M., Weik, S., Defort, A. M., & Welp, I. M. (2023). Impact of Entrepreneurship education programs at University: Quasi-Experimental evidence. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2023(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amproc.2023.78bp>
9. Grant, K. (2022). Enabling undergraduate student entrepreneurs to Structure their own experiential learning course. *European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 17(1), 249–257. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ecie.17.1.652>
10. Hoti, A., Kasap, S., & Malaj, A. (2024). Fostering entrepreneurial mindset in students: A modular framework for Integrating entrepreneurship education into engineering capstone projects. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 14(1), 32. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0004>
11. Hyams-Ssekasi, D., & Taheri, F. (2022). Re-assessing entrepreneurship education and gamification as a learning process. *Technology and Entrepreneurship Education*, 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-84292-5_1
12. İlerisoy, Z. Y., Aycı, A., Aycı, H., & Kınacı, E. B. (2021). Impacts of architectural education on entrepreneurial intention: A case study of senior architects from six universities in Turkey. *ArchNet-IJAR*, 15(3), 719–737. <https://doi.org/10.1108/arch-11-2020-0269>
13. Koropogui, S. T., St-Jean, É., & Chouchane, R. (2026). Developing entrepreneurial identity through entrepreneurship education: A configurational analysis. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 24(2), 101396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2026.101396>
14. Koropogui, S. T., St-Jean, É., & Pepin, M. (2025). Experiential learning approaches in university entrepreneurship education: A systematic review. 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035325795.00010>
15. Lazendic-Galloway, J., Reymen, I. M. M. J., Bruns, M., Helker, K., & Vermunt, J. D. (2021). Students' experiences with challenge-based learning at TU/e innovation Space: Overview of five key characteristics across a broad range of courses. In H.-U. Hei, H.-M. Järvinen, A. Mayer, & A. Schultz (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 49th SEFI Annual Conference 2021: Blended learning in engineering education: Challenging, enlightening – and lasting?* (pp. 1006–1008). European Society for Engineering Education (SEFI). <https://www.sefi.be/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SEFI49th-Proceedings-final.pdf>
16. Lesinskas, K., Mavlutova, I., & Hermanis, J. (2025). The emergence and significance of Artificial intelligence in Digital tools for Entrepreneurship education. *Wseas Transactions on Environment and Development*, 21, 1160–1167. <https://doi.org/10.37394/232015.2025.21.97>

17. Llorente-Portillo, C., Dobson, J. A., Fraser, N. K. O., & Gómez-Urquijo, L. (2024). Entrepreneurial intention development: The contribution of specialized entrepreneurship academic programs. *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, 11(2), 221–254. <https://doi.org/10.18543/tjhe.2633>
18. Long, N. N., Linh, B. T. T., & Hoa, Le T. K. (2024). The quantifiable impact of 2007-2022 on students' intentions to become entrepreneurs and the implications for research and start-up activities. 15(1), 39–58. <https://gea-college.si/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PAPER-Long.pdf>
19. Lose, T., & Priviledge Cheteni. (2024). Readiness for New ventures in South Africa through entrepreneurship education: A reflective thematic approach. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2315693>
20. Martins, I., Perez, J. P., & Novoa, S. (2022). Developing orientation to achieve entrepreneurial intention: A pretest-post-test analysis of entrepreneurship education programs. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 100593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100593>
21. Nguyen, Q. D., & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of entrepreneurial capacity. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(1), 100730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100730>
22. Nițu-Antonie, R. D., Feder, E.-S., Stamenovic, K., & Brudan, A. (2022). A moderated Serial–Parallel mediation model of sustainable entrepreneurial intention of Youth with higher education studies in Romania. *Sustainability*, 14(20), 13342. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013342>
23. Ortiz Gonzalez, D. J., & Machucho Cadena, R. (2025). Implications of Technology use for Entrepreneurial intent in the context of Mexican higher education. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 20(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-27242025000100003>
24. Pliakoura, A. P., Beligiannis, G. N., Chatzitheodoridis, F., & Kontogeorgos, A. (2021). The impact of locus of control and motivations in predicting entrepreneurial intentions among farmers: A field research. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/jadee-11-2020-0272>
25. Radianto, W. E. D., Salim, I., Christian, S., Efrata, T. C., & Dewi, L. (2022). Does mental accounting play an important role in young entrepreneurs? Studies on entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(2), 140. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0040>
26. Ragazou, K., Passas, I., Garefalakis, A., Kourgiantakis, M., & Xanthos, G. (2022). Youth's entrepreneurial intention: A multinomial logistic regression analysis of the factors influencing greek HEI students in Time of Crisis. *Sustainability*, 14(20), 13164. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013164>
27. Ripollés, M., & Andreu Blesa. (2024). The role of teaching methods and students' learning motivation in turning an environmental mindset into entrepreneurial actions. *International Journal of Management Education*, 22(2), 100961–100961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100961>
28. Ronaghi, M. H., & Forouharfar, A. (2024). Virtual reality and the simulated experiences for the promotion of entrepreneurial intention: An exploratory contextual study for entrepreneurship education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 22(2), 100972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100972>
29. Salavou, H. E., Chalkos, G., & Lioukas, S. (2021). Linkages between entrepreneurial intentions and entrepreneurship education: New evidence on the gender imbalance. *Education + Training*, 63(6), 906–919. <https://doi.org/10.1108/et-10-2020-0301>
30. Soomro, B. A., Memon, M., & Shah, N. (2020). Attitudes towards entrepreneurship among the students of Thailand: An entrepreneurial attitude orientation approach. *Education + Training*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/et-01-2020-0014>
31. Sziegat, H. (2024). Virtual simulation games in Entrepreneurship education: Status quo and prospects. *European Conference on Games Based Learning*, 18(1), 1099–1106. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ecgbl.18.1.3001>
32. Tan, L. P. (2025). Breaking the chains: Psychological barriers and social entrepreneurial intentions in Vietnam. *Journal of the International Council for Small Business*, 7(2), 606–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2025.2518238>
33. Uansa-ard, S., & Wannamakok, W. (2022). University students' entrepreneurial intentions during Covid-19: The perspective of social cognitive career theory. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 18(3), 75–106. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20221833>

-
34. Wardoyo, C., Narmaditya, B. S., Qurrata, V. A., Satrio, Y. D., & Sahid, S. (2025). Are students ready for digital business? Antecedents of entrepreneurial intentions among indonesian students using a serial mediation. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101213>
 35. Zichella, G., & Reichstein, T. (2022). Students of entrepreneurship: Sorting, risk behaviour and implications for entrepreneurship programmes [Review of Students of entrepreneurship: Sorting, risk behaviour and implications for entrepreneurship programmes]. *Management Learning*, 135050762211015. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076221101516>