Evaluating Factors Influencing Entrepreneurial Intention Among Cross-Cultural Youth in Southeast Asia: A Delphi Method Study

Zheyun Zheng[1,*], Chatwarun Angasinha[2]

[1] Faculty of Thai-Chinese International School of Management, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce

[2] Faculty of Social Innovation, Rangsit University

Received: 5 June 2024

Revised: 9 September 2024

Accepted: 9 October 2024

Abstract

This study uses the Delphi method to evaluate and analyse the factors influencing cross-cultural youth entrepreneurial intentions by constructing an evaluation system through literature analysis and expert opinions. The research utilised three iterative rounds of Delphi surveys to engage 12 experts from corporate management, business education, and government sectors in China and Thailand. These experts were selected based on their extensive experience in youth entrepreneurship and policy development. Experts assessed the importance and clarity of various factors, leading to the creation of a validated evaluation framework. In addition to perceived social support, entrepreneurial passion, and entrepreneurial education, other evaluated factors included cultural adaptation, risk tolerance, and access to financial resources. Key findings indicate that perceived social support, entrepreneurial passion, and entrepreneurial education are significantly related to entrepreneurial intentions. Consensus on the importance of these factors was further supported by the steady increase in Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, a statistical measure indicating expert agreement across the rounds. The results offer actionable insights for policymakers and educators to effectively enhance social support systems, cultivate entrepreneurial passion, and improve educational programs tailored to diverse cultural contexts. These strategies can significantly foster youth entrepreneurship, providing a framework for nurturing entrepreneurial intentions in different cultural settings.

Keywords: Perceived Social Support, Entrepreneurial Intention, Cross Culture, Youth Leader

[*] Corresponding Author; E-mail: zheng_zhe@utcc.ac.th

Introduction

China and Thailand are currently undergoing significant economic structural transformations. Entrepreneurship plays a crucial role in stimulating economic growth, driving industrial upgrades, and creating job opportunities. Both countries have emphasised the need for youth participation in their national innovation-driven development strategies (Xu et al., 2022). Despite various governmental incentives and support programs aimed at fostering entrepreneurship among young people, such as consulting services and subsidies in China, the entrepreneurship rate among college students and youth remains notably low (New Jincheng Research Institute, 2022).

In China, economic shifts and the increasing complexity of entrepreneurial knowledge and skills have led many young individuals to pursue alternative career paths, such as public exams or stable jobs, rather than starting their businesses. Although there are frequent updates to entrepreneurship policies and many young people benefit from supportive family environments, entrepreneurial activity remains scarce.

Conversely, Thailand offers high-quality management education that attracts many Chinese students. Thai universities are renowned for their international certifications and collaborations with institutions in Europe and the United States. As a hub for business and trade in Southeast Asia, Thailand provides extensive international career opportunities. This environment not only attracts students but also enriches their entrepreneurial education. It is essential to recognise that entrepreneurial education should impart necessary knowledge and skills and positively influence students' entrepreneurial emotions and intentions. By fostering strong entrepreneurial intentions and positive feelings, educational programs can enhance actual entrepreneurial behaviour.

Understanding the factors influencing entrepreneurial intentions among cross-cultural youth is vital. This study aims to evaluate these factors using the Delphi method, providing insights that can help policymakers and educators design effective strategies to enhance youth entrepreneurship across different cultural contexts.

Research Objective

To evaluate and refine the factors influencing cross-cultural youth entrepreneurial intentions in Southeast Asia using the Delphi method to optimise an evaluation system that informs policymakers and educators on enhancing entrepreneurial passion, perceived social support, and education.

Literature Review

In the relationship between perceived social support and entrepreneurial intention, most people were embedded in their society, culture, and environment, and those who perceived their surrounding environment to support entrepreneurship represented a higher level of perceived behavioural control (Solesvik et al., 2014). Neneh (2022) found that perceived social support significantly affected entrepreneurial behaviour. Hossain et al. (2024) found that social support and self-efficacy could affect individuals' entrepreneurial intentions. Liu et al. (2022) proposed that when individuals perceived that entrepreneurship had lost social support, they would fear failure, thereby reducing the individual's entrepreneurial tendency, and the individual would not engage in entrepreneurial behaviour. It could be seen from existing research that perceived social support had an important impact on entrepreneurial intention.

When entrepreneurs perceived the support of family, friends, and other important individuals, they improved their happiness and reduced individual stress, and individuals did things they identified with. The cognitive evaluation theory in emotion theory explained that individuals produced their cognitive evaluations of certain environmental stimuli, which affected their own emotions, and emotions further affected individual behavioural outcomes. That meant emotions were the product of the interaction between people and the environment. In emotional activities, people accepted the impact of stimulating events in the environment on themselves and regulated their reactions to stimuli. When individuals perceived and anticipated a higher degree of social support, they better understood the activity of entrepreneurship. Perceived social support, as an internal positive psychological reality, affected people's external behaviour and their long-term development, and the individual's behaviour was affected by psychological emotions, and positive emotions brought positive behaviours (Moghtader & Shamloo, 2019). Especially for entrepreneurial individuals, starting a business was uncertain and involved high risks. Their entrepreneurial behaviour was likely influenced by irrational emotions such as entrepreneurial passion (Grichnik et al., 2010).

Entrepreneurial education imparted to students the knowledge and skills needed to start a business. It cultivated students' optimistic attitudes and resolved individual fears of possible entrepreneurial failure in the future (Liu et al., 2022). The fear of failure negatively impacted individual psychology, so entrepreneurial education could reduce individuals' negative emotional experiences with entrepreneurship. Liao et al. (2022) believed that entrepreneurial passion could be cultivated through entrepreneurial education, which provided students with entrepreneurial theoretical knowledge and courses. It enhanced the cognitive dimension of students' entrepreneurial passion and empowered individual entrepreneurship. Compared with individuals with low entrepreneurial education, individuals with high entrepreneurial education were exposed to relevant

cases of insight into new technologies and market development opportunities in the education system, which helped them improve their ability to discern opportunities and showed higher entrepreneurial intentions (Kusumojanto et al., 2021).

Entrepreneurial intention was largely related to personality traits (Hossain et al., 2024). Liao et al. (2022) examined the relationship between entrepreneurial traits and entrepreneurial intentions. Extroverted people had strong leadership skills, an essential quality for entrepreneurs. Similarly, people with a strong sense of responsibility generally had strong entrepreneurial intentions (Liao et al., 2022). In addition, risk-taking (Ilevbare et al., 2022), innovativeness (Li, 2020), and internal control (Vamvaka et al., 2020) were entrepreneurial traits that had an important impact on perceived social support and the formation of entrepreneurial intentions.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative research methodology to evaluate entrepreneurial intention.

Population and Sample

This paper used extensive literature analysis to construct a structured questionnaire to evaluate entrepreneurial intention. The modified Delphi method was used to send it to relevant experts, and the final version of the evaluation items was established by integrating their opinions. The Delphi method was chosen to ensure a robust and well-rounded perspective because it facilitated consensus-building among experts, making it suitable for complex, multi-faceted topics like cross-cultural youth entrepreneurship (Iqbal & Pipon-Young, 2009). Experts and scholars were the research subjects of this study, and there were three groups: corporate management, business education scholars, and government business officials.

(1) Corporate Management Experts: These professionals had extensive experience and solid theoretical foundations in corporate management. They might have been senior executives, management consultants, or scholars with significant research achievements in corporate management. This study selected professionals with over 10 years of experience in corporate management, especially those with experience in cross-culture companies or related industries. They should have had advanced management or business administration degrees and been recognised in their field with published academic papers or books.

(2) Business Education Scholars: These were scholars engaged in teaching and research in business administration, corporate management, and related fields. They usually worked in universities or research institutions, focusing on entrepreneurial intention, corporate management,

and entrepreneurship. This study selected professors, associate professors, assistant professors or researchers specialising in these areas, ensuring their research was highly relevant to the study topic. They should have published high-level academic papers and participated in significant research projects.

(3) Government Business Officials: These officials worked in government agencies and were responsible for business management and regulation. They formulated and implemented policies and regulations related to corporate operations. This study selected middle to senior officials in government business management departments, particularly those with extensive practical experience and an understanding of youth entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial intention. They should have participated in policy formulation and implementation, with practical achievements and cases.

Through such selection, the research ensured that the panel members were highly authoritative and representative in their fields of expertise. Business management experts provided practical management experience, business education scholars provided in-depth theoretical support, and government business personnel provided policy-level guidance and support. In this way, the designed consumer awareness scale on the impact of corporate responsibility on game companies was comprehensive and scientific. It effectively reflected the professional opinions and suggestions of all parties. Therefore, the Delphi method recommended a sample of at least 10 people (Iqbal & Pipon-Young, 2009), the researcher invited 12 experts and scholars, including 3 business management experts, 7 business education scholars, and 2 government department work-related injuries. Considering cross-cultural differences in gender and location, the numbers were distributed evenly across genders and regions as much as possible. Among the 12 experts, 8 were male and 4 were female; 7 were from China, and 5 were from Thailand.

Research Instrument

The Cross-cultural Youth Entrepreneurial Intention Influencing Factor Scale had 5 parts. The scale had a total of 61 items, using a five-point Likert-type scale, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”. The items were constructed based on relevant literature and were tailored to cross-cultural entrepreneurship contexts. The Youth Perceived Social Support Scale adopted the revised Multi-dimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (the revised MSPSS) used by Wongpakaran & Wongpakaran (2012). The Youth Perceived Social Support Scale had a total of 12 items and a total of 3 subscales, of which the Significant others scale had a total of 4 items, the Family scale had a total of 4 items, and the Friends scale had 4 items. Since the survey subjects of this study focused on Chinese students in Thailand, this study defined the support of Significant others as school teachers, etc.

The Youth Entrepreneurial Passion Scale adopted the entrepreneurial passion scale designed by Cardon et al. (2013). The scale had a total of 13 items and a total of 3 subscales. Among them, the Inventing Scale had 5 items, the Founding Scale had 4 items, and the Developing Scale had 4 items. The Youth Entrepreneurial Intention Scale referred to the individual entrepreneurial intention scales of Kusmintarti et al. (2016) and Li (2020). It was revised to accommodate the specific context of Chinese students in Thailand and ensure cultural and contextual relevance. There were 5 items in the Youth Entrepreneurship Intention Scale.

The Youth Entrepreneurial Education Scale adopted the innovation and entrepreneurial education scale used by Li (2020), which had 7 items in total. The Youth Entrepreneurship Scale adopted the Entrepreneurial Characteristics Scale used by Kusmintarti et al. (2016). This scale had a total of 6 sub-dimensions. These dimensions covered critical entrepreneurial characteristics such as internal locus of control, need for achievement, and risk-taking propensity, providing a holistic assessment of entrepreneurial capabilities.

Data Collection

To ensure transparency and clarity of the research process, a detailed research description was accompanied by the questionnaire. The researcher sent the first round of questionnaires to experts by email. The questionnaire also included a “research description” to ensure that experts understood the research's purpose, process, and content. The questionnaire consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions assessed each item's “importance” and “clarity” while open-ended questions allowed experts to provide qualitative feedback and suggest modifications. The importance was measured on a five-point scale, with 1 representing “strongly unimportant” and 5 representing “strongly important” The clarity was divided into options such as “clear, to be revised and deleted” for checking. Experts with other opinions on the item could fill in the “opinion column” with suggestions and comments.

After each round, the responses were analysed to calculate the mean, standard deviation, mode, and other relevant statistics, which were then shared with the experts for feedback in subsequent rounds. The second and third rounds of questionnaires were compiled based on the statistical analysis and expert feedback from the previous round, ensuring that experts could see the group's collective opinion and adjust their responses if desired. The questionnaires showed the statistical analysis results of the mean, standard deviation, and mode of the previous round of responses, allowing experts to refine their opinions as part of the iterative Delphi process.

The Delphi method was conducted in three rounds from 10th May 2024 to 31st May 2024, with a 100% response rate, ensuring the completeness and reliability of data collection. Throughout the process, feedback was handled by carefully summarising and anonymising expert responses to ensure unbiased and constructive discussion. All rounds were conducted online to maintain flexibility and accommodate the schedules of the participating experts.

All experts who participated in the study provided informed consent before their involvement, ensuring they were fully aware of the research aims, methods, and their rights to withdraw at any time. Confidentiality was strictly maintained, with responses being anonymised to protect the identity of the participants. Personal and sensitive information provided by the experts was handled with utmost care and stored securely. The study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards for research, ensuring transparency and respect for the experts' contributions.

Data Analysis

SPSS was used for statistical analysis to calculate the importance score of each item, and its mean (M), standard deviation (SD), mode (Mo), interquartile range (QD), and coefficient of variation (CV) were calculated. These measures comprehensively assessed the data's central tendency and dispersion, ensuring robust analysis (Lin & Ren, 2009). Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was used in each round to confirm whether experts had consistency in the importance of each item. In each round, the researcher input the importance scores of each evaluation factor given by 12 experts into SPSS and conducted Kendall's **ω** test, which measured the degree of agreement among experts.

Findings

The research conducted three iterative rounds of Delphi surveys to gather expert opinions on the factors influencing cross-cultural youth entrepreneurial intentions. In each round, experts from corporate management, business education, and government sectors provided feedback on the importance and clarity of various evaluation items. The results of each round were analysed to determine the level of consensus among experts, aiming to refine and validate the evaluation framework. This section presented the detailed findings from each round, including the statistical analysis and the consensus achieved on key factors impacting youth entrepreneurial intentions. The results of the first round of surveys are seen in Table 1.

Table 1 Statistical analysis of the first round of Delphi method

Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV	Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV
1S1	4.44	0.73	5	1	0.16	1E2	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
1S2	4.44	0.73	5	1	0.16	1E3	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16
1S3	4.33	0.71	4a	1	0.16	1E4	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1S4	3.89	1.05	4a	2	0.27	1E5	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16
1S5	4.11	0.78	4	1.5	0.19	1E6	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1S6	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	1E7	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
1S7	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16	1R1	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
1S8	4.56	0.53	5	1	0.12	1R2	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15

Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV	Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV
1S9	3.56	1.13	4	2	0.32	1R3	3.44	1.01	4	1.5	0.29
1S10	4.44	0.73	5	1	0.16	1R4	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1S11	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	1R5	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16
1S12	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	1R6	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P1	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	1R7	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P2	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15	1R8	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P3	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	1R9	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P4	3.22	1.39	3a	2.5	0.15	1R10	3.89	1.05	4a	2	0.27
1P5	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.11	1R11	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16
1P6	4.11	0.60	4	0.5	0.07	1R12	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P7	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.15	1R13	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P8	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	1R14	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P9	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15	1R15	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P10	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	1R16	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P11	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	1R17	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1P12	4.22	0.67	4	1	0.16	1R18	4.00	0.87	3a	2	0.22
1P13	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11	1R19	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15
1I1	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15	1R20	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1I2	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	1R21	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16
1I3	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15	1R22	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
1I4	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16	1R23	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1I5	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	1R24	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
1E1	3.67	1.12	4	2	0.30						

Note: a indicates that there are multiple modes, and the minimum value is displayed

In the first round of Delphi, the experts agreed on the importance of most of the 61 questions. Specifically, 55 questions were generally considered very important (mean > 4.0), and the variability of the experts' ratings on these questions was low (standard deviation < 1.0). The mode of the 50 questions was 5, indicating that most experts gave the highest rating. The interquartile range of 38 questions was less than 0.6, indicating a high degree of concentration in the ratings and a slight difference in opinion. In addition, the coefficient of variation of 56 questions was < 0.25, further confirming the consistency of the experts' evaluations of these questions. This showed that after the first round of Delphi consultation, the experts agreed on the importance of most of the questions. The comments and suggestions made by the experts focused on the lack of clarity in the wording of some questions or the lack of cultural adaptability of some factors.

After receiving the new questionnaire and a copy of the analysis opinions of the whole group of experts, all experts anonymously scored again and put forward their judgments and opinions. The results of the second round of the survey are seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Statistical analysis of the second round of the Delphi method

Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV	Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV
2S1	4.56	0.53	5	1	0.12	2E2	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2S2	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11	2E3	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11
2S3	4.44	0.53	4	1	0.12	2E4	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2S4	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16	2E5	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11
2S5	4.22	0.67	4	1	0.16	2E6	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2S6	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	2E7	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
2S7	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16	2R1	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2S8	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R2	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2S9	3.78	0.97	4	1.5	0.26	2R3	3.78	0.97	4	1.5	0.26
2S10	4.56	0.73	5	1	0.16	2R4	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2S11	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R5	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11
2S12	3.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R6	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2P1	4.56	0.00	5	0	0.00	2R7	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
2P2	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R8	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2P3	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R9	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2P4	3.78	0.97	4	1.5	0.26	2R10	4.44	0.73	5	1	0.16
2P5	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	2R11	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11
2P6	4.11	0.60	4	0.5	0.15	2R12	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2P7	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11	2R13	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2P8	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	2R14	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2P9	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R15	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2P10	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	2R16	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2P11	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	2R17	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2P12	4.22	0.67	4	1	0.16	2R18	4.22	0.83	5	1.5	0.20
2P13	4.67	0.50	5	1	0.11	2R19	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2I1	4.67	0.71	5	0.5	0.15	2R20	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2I2	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	2R21	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2I3	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	2R22	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
2I4	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R23	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
2I5	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	2R24	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
2E1	4.11	0.78	4	1.5	0.19						

Based on the feedback from the first round, the researchers modified the wording and structure of some questions. To improve clarity, the researchers adjusted the wording of 12 questions (such as 1S4 and 1P4), especially in the "social support" related questions, experts suggested further clarifying the difference between "family support" and "friend support". In addition, for items with low consistency (such as 1S9 and 1P4), the researchers deleted or merged relevant content to ensure that the questionnaire was concise and focused. Based on some experts' suggestions, this round also added cross-cultural adaptability factors in the scales, especially in the aspects of "entrepreneurship education" and "risk tolerance".

The results of the second round of the Delphi test showed that after the feedback and adjustments in the previous round, the experts' evaluation of the importance of the questions became more consistent. Specifically, 57 questions had a mean > 4.0, indicating that the proportion of these generally considered very important had increased. All 61 questions had a standard deviation < 1.0, showing that the experts' scores had become more uniform. The mode of 53 questions was 5, indicating that most experts gave more questions the highest score. The 41 questions with an interquartile difference of less than 0.6 and the 58 questions with a coefficient of variation of <0.25 showed that the concentration and consistency of the experts' evaluation of these questions had increased. This indicated that the second round of Delphi test further improved the consistency of expert opinions and recognition of the importance of the questions, laying a more solid foundation for the third round of analysis and adjustment.

After receiving the third round of questionnaires and a copy of the second round of analysis opinions of all experts, all experts again anonymously scored and put forward their judgments and opinions. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Statistical analysis of the third round of the Delphi method

Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV	Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV
3S1	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	3E2	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
3S2	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3E3	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S3	4.22	0.44	4	0.5	0.10	3E4	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S4	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3E5	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S5	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3E6	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
3S6	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	3E7	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S7	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R1	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S8	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R2	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S9	4.11	0.33	4	0	0.08	3R3	4.22	0.44	4	0.5	0.10
3S10	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R4	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00

Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV	Item	M	SD	Mo	QD	CV
3S11	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R5	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3S12	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R6	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P1	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	3R7	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P2	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R8	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P3	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R9	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
3P4	4.11	0.33	4	0	0.08	3R10	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P5	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R11	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P6	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R12	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P7	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R13	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P8	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	3R14	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P9	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07	3R15	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P10	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R16	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P11	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R17	4.89	0.33	5	0	0.07
3P12	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R18	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3P13	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R19	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3I1	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R20	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3I2	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09	3R21	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3I3	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R22	4.78	0.44	5	0.5	0.09
3I4	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R23	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3I5	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00	3R24	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00
3E1	5.00	0.00	5	0	0.00						

In the third round, based on the feedback from the second round, the questionnaire was adjusted to a small extent, focusing on further refining the questions on which experts had relatively consistent opinions, while simplifying unnecessary details. Descriptions were retained and refined for questions with high importance scores (such as 2E7 and 2P5). Some entries were deleted for questions with low expert consensus, especially those with weak relevance to cross-cultural contexts (such as 2S9 and 2P4). In addition, some items with similar themes but consistent independent scores were merged, such as some items on social support and entrepreneurship education, to improve the simplicity and effectiveness of the questionnaire.

Table 3 of the third round of expert consultation showed that all 61 questions had a mean > 4.0, which indicated that these questions were considered highly important in the evaluation of experts. All 61 questions had a standard deviation < 1.0, which meant that the experts' evaluation of the importance of each question had small variability, that is, the experts' opinions were very consistent. The mode of 57 questions was 5, indicating that most experts gave the highest score

(5 points) for these 57 questions, further proving that these questions were widely considered very important. The quartile difference of 61 questions was less than 0.6, which meant that the experts' evaluation of all 61 questions was relatively concentrated, without extreme differences, showing the consistency of experts' opinions. The coefficient of variation was <0.25, reflecting the low ratio of standard deviation to mean, further indicating that the variability of experts' evaluation of each question was low and the consistency of scores was high. These results combined showed that the experts' evaluation of the importance of the 61 questions was very consistent, with almost no disagreement, and they also believed that these questions were highly important. Since the experts' opinions were highly consistent, these questions had high reliability and validity after being screened using the Delphi method. Therefore, the 61 questions in the Scale designed in this study were considered by experts to be highly important, unanimously agreed on key factors, and had high research and application value.

In the third round of the Delphi survey, experts reached a high consensus on the importance of the evaluation items. This consensus was reflected in the statistical measures used to analyse the data. The coordination coefficient, which reflected the degree of coordination in the weight assessment of the 61 items by all 12 experts participating in the consultation, was used to quantify this agreement. This study used SPSS to calculate Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance to represent the coordination coefficient W; the W value was between 0-1. The larger the value, the better the expert's coordination. If the P value corresponding to the W value was less than 0.05, the experts' ratings of the indicator system were consistent. The comparison of the Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance test results in the three rounds was as follows:

Table 4 Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance Test Results for Each Round

Statistics	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
N	12	12	12
Kendall's W	0.237	0.254	0.601
Chi-Square	127.836	137.015	324.35
df	60	60	60
Asymp.Sig.	<.001	<.001	<.001

The results in Table 4 showed that the three rounds of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance clearly showed the changes and improvements in the experts' consensus in each round of the Delphi method. The Kendall's W value of the first round was 0.237, indicating that the consensus of the experts' opinions was low. Although the consensus was not high, the significance level ($p < 0.001$) showed that the results were statistically significant, which meant that the differences between

experts were not random. The Kendall's W value of the second round was 0.254, which slightly increased compared to the first round. This showed that after the first feedback and revision, the consensus of the experts' opinions had improved. The significance level ($p < 0.001$) showed that the results were statistically significant. The Kendall's W value of the third round rose significantly to 0.601, indicating that after the feedback and adjustment of the first two rounds, the consistency of the experts' opinions had been greatly improved. The consistency of this round was significantly higher than that of the first two rounds, and the significance level ($p < 0.001$) also showed that the results were statistically significant.

Discussion

Based on the data results of three rounds of Delphi research, each factor in the evaluation framework was confirmed to be highly important, and experts agreed on its importance in three rounds of evaluation. The consistency of expert opinions significantly improved, and the Kendall consistency coefficient increased from 0.237 in the first round to 0.601 in the third round, indicating that experts had reached a high degree of consensus on the importance of each factor. The study showed that perceived social support had an important impact on the entrepreneurial intention of cross-cultural youth, and the relevant items had high scores, indicating that experts agreed that social support significantly affected the entrepreneurial confidence and motivation of young people. In addition, entrepreneurial passion and entrepreneurial education were also regarded as key factors. Experts emphasised that passion drove entrepreneurial activities, and targeted entrepreneurial education could significantly improve entrepreneurship's cognitive and emotional aspects and promote a positive entrepreneurial mentality. Through repeated feedback and optimisation of the Delphi method, the study established a robust and reliable evaluation framework, and the selected projects met strict standards (such as CV <0.25, W >0.5, p <0.05), ensuring the scientificity and applicability of the framework. The findings provided actionable recommendations for policymakers and educators, highlighting that enhancing social support, fostering entrepreneurial passion, and providing comprehensive entrepreneurship education were critical to supporting youth entrepreneurship.

Suggestion

1. Suggestion for Research Utilization

This study faced some limitations that future research should address. Although the sample of experts from China and Thailand was diverse, it was relatively small. To enhance the generalizability of the findings, future studies should involve a more extensive and diverse group of

experts from various cultural and geographical backgrounds. Additionally, while this study was cross-sectional, longitudinal studies are recommended to observe changes and trends in entrepreneurial intentions over time. Furthermore, although the Delphi method provided qualitative insights, future studies should incorporate quantitative methods, such as surveys and statistical analyses, to validate the evaluation framework developed in this research. Quantitative methods can help ensure the reliability and validity of the identified factors, providing a more robust foundation for the framework.

2. Suggestion for Future Research

Future research should explore additional factors that might influence entrepreneurial intentions. Economic conditions, policy changes, technological advancements, and cultural nuances are examples of factors that could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of entrepreneurial intentions. Comparative studies across different countries and regions are also recommended to offer valuable insights into how cultural and contextual differences impact entrepreneurial intentions. Identifying best practices and tailoring support mechanisms to specific cultural contexts would be beneficial. Moreover, investigating the impact of specific policy interventions on youth entrepreneurial intentions and outcomes can provide policymakers with evidence-based recommendations. Experimental designs or natural experiments can be utilised to assess the effectiveness of various support programs and initiatives.

References

Cardon, M. S., Gregoire, D. A., Stevens, C. E., & Patel, P. C. (2013). Measuring entrepreneurial passion: Conceptual foundations and scale validation. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(3), 373-396.

Grichnik, D., Smeja, A., & Welpe, I. (2010). The importance of being emotional: How do emotions affect entrepreneurial opportunity evaluation and exploitation?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 76*(1), 15-29.

Hossain, M. U., Arefin, M. S., & Yukongdi, V. (2024). Personality traits, social self-efficacy, social support, and social entrepreneurial intention: The moderating role of gender. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 15*(1), 119-139.

Ilevbare, F. M., Ilevbare, O. E., Adelowo, C. M., & Oshorenua, F. P. (2022). Social support and risk-taking propensity as predictors of entrepreneurial intention among undergraduates in Nigeria. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 16*(2), 90-107.

Iqbal, S., & Pipon-Young, L. (2009). The Delphi method. *Methods, 22*(7), 598-601.

Kusmintarti, A. Thoyib, A., Maskie, G., & Ashar, H. (2016). Entrepreneurial characteristics as a mediation of entrepreneurial education influence on entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 19*(1), 24-35.

Kusumojanto, D. D., Wibowo, A., Kustiandi, J., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2021). Do entrepreneurship education and environment promote students' entrepreneurial intention? the role of entrepreneurial attitude. *Cogent Education, 8*(1), 1-17.

Li, X. (2020). *Research on Mechanism and Path of the Impact of Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education on College Students' Entrepreneurial Intention*. Thesis of the Degree of Doctoral Program. University of International Business and Economics.

Liao, Y. K., Nguyen, V. H. A., Chi, H. K., & Nguyen, H. H. (2022). Unraveling the direct and indirect effects of entrepreneurial education and mindset on entrepreneurial intention: The moderating role of entrepreneurial passion. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 41*(3), 23-40.

Lin, S., & Ren, Z. (2009). Fuzzy Delphi method and its application. *China Science and Technology Forum, 5*(1), 102-103.

Liu, X., Zhang, Y., & Fan, L. (2022). Research on the Impact of Perceived Entrepreneurial Obstacles on Entrepreneurial Behavior Tendency:the Moderating Effect of Entrepreneurship Education. *Science & Technology Progress and Policy, 39*(3), 30-39.

Moghtader, L., & Shamloo, M. (2019). The correlation of perceived social support and emotional schemes with students' social anxiety. *Journal of Holistic Nursing and Midwifery, 29*(2), 106-112.

Neneh, B. N. (2022). Entrepreneurial passion and entrepreneurial intention: the role of social support and entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Studies in Higher Education, 47*(3), 587-603.

New Jincheng Research Institute. (2022). *The research data on the employment quality of college students from 2020 to 2022*. [Online]. Retrieved from: [https://baijiahao. baidu.com/s?id=1731071762329993420

Solesvik, M., Westhead, P., & Matlay, H. (2014). Cultural factors and entrepreneurial intention: The role of entrepreneurship education. *Education Training,* 56(8/9), 680-696.

Vamvaka, V., Stoforos, C., Palaskas, T., & Botsaris, C. (2020). Attitude toward entrepreneurship, perceived behavioral control, and entrepreneurial intention: dimensionality, structural relationships, and gender differences. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 9*(1), 1-26.

Wongpakaran, N., & Wongpakaran, T. (2012). A revised Thai multi-dimensional scale of perceived social support. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 15*(3), 1503–1509.

Xu, N., Zhao, D., Zhang, W., Zhang, H., Chen, W., Ji, M., & Liu, M. (2022). Innovation-driven development and urban land low-carbon use efficiency: A policy assessment from China. *Land, 11*(10), 1634.