Submitted in November 2025
Accepted in December 2025
Published Online in December 2025
https://doi.org/10.64190/abj.1.2.2026.8
https://aradojournal.org/

Assessing Entrepreneurial Culture in Palestinian Universities: A Quantitative Analysis of Four Cultural Dimensions from the GLOBE Model

AbdAlFattah A. Abu Madi(*)

University of Sfax, Tunisia

Palestine Technical University – Kadoorie, Palestine

Abstract

This study aims to assess the entrepreneurial culture in Palestinian universities by examining four selected dimensions of the GLOBE model: Performance Orientation, Future Orientation, Institutional Collectivism, and Humane Orientation. The research addresses a key gap in the literature by applying the GLOBE framework to the Palestinian higher education context, investigating the influence of university type and gender on cultural perceptions, and identifying which dimensions exert the greatest impact on entrepreneurial culture.

A descriptive-analytical methodology was adopted, and an electronic survey was administered to a purposive sample of 384 respondents drawn from three types of universities (traditional, polytechnic, and governmental). The validity and reliability of the instrument were verified (Cronbach's alpha = 0.91). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA with post-hoc tests, and multiple regression analysis.

Findings revealed high levels of all four cultural dimensions across the sampled universities. Statistically significant differences were found among university types in Institutional Collectivism and Humane Orientation, in favor of traditional and polytechnic universities over governmental institutions. Gender-based differences were insignificant for all dimensions except Humane Orientation. Multiple regression analysis showed that the four dimensions significantly predict entrepreneurial culture, with Performance Orientation and Future Orientation emerging as the most influential predictors.

The study concludes that Palestinian universities possess a viable foundation for building an institutional entrepreneurial culture, albeit with varying strengths across di-

* **Correspoinding author:** AbdAlFattah Ahmad Abu Madi, University of Sfax, Faculty of Economics and Management Sciences, Tunisia; Head of the Library Department, Palestine Technical University – Kadoorie, Palestine, Abdalfatah.abumadi@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2479-2201.

Citation: Abu Madi, AbdAlFattah A. (2026). Assessing Entrepreneurial Culture in Palestinian Universities: A Quantitative Analysis of Four Cultural Dimensions from the GLOBE Model. *ARADO Business Journal*, 2(1), 23- 48. https://doi.org/10.64190/abj.1.2.2026.8.

mensions. It recommends a strategic shift toward performance-oriented and future-focused policies to reinforce this culture. The research contributes to filling a theoretical and contextual gap by operationalizing the GLOBE model in Palestine and offers evidence-based insights for policymakers in higher education.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Culture, Entrepreneurship, Higher Education, Palestinian Universities, GLOBE Model.

Introduction

Global higher education systems are undergoing a fundamental transformation from the traditional university model to the entrepreneurial university model, which integrates teaching, research, and socio-economic impact (Etzkowitz, 2008). In the Palestinian context, fostering an entrepreneurial culture has become an urgent necessity in light of the alarming graduate unemployment rate, which reached 53% in 2023 (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, 2024), and given the unique political and economic challenges generated by Israeli occupation and its control measures.

Although several studies have addressed the structural and institutional aspects of entrepreneurship in Palestinian universities (e.g., Ibdair, 2022; Tabib, 2021; Awad & Salaimeh, 2023), they have largely neglected a systematic cultural analysis capable of diagnosing how supportive the environment is for entrepreneurial behavior. Thus, there is a clear need to apply a standardized cultural model that can quantitatively assess the cultural dimensions shaping entrepreneurial interactions on the ground.

The present study addresses this gap by applying four core cultural dimensions from the globally recognized GLOBE model-Performance Orientation, Future Orientation, Institutional Collectivism, and Humane Orientation-to the context of Palestinian universities. These dimensions provide a precise quantitative lens through which to examine the cultural fabric of universities, analyze differences across university types (traditional, polytechnic, governmental), and offer a robust empirical basis for policymakers seeking to design entrepreneurship-supportive academic environments.

The core research problem can be summarized in the following overarching question:

> *What is the level of availability of the four selected GLOBE dimensions in shaping the entrepreneurial culture within Palestinian universities from the perspective of the respondents?*

Research Objectives, Questions, and Hypotheses

Entrepreneurial culture in universities is a cornerstone for enhancing innovation and building competitive capacities in higher education systems. In Palestine, understanding the cultural characteristics that shape entrepreneurial behavior is critical for cultivating an enabling learning environment and designing policies that support entrepreneurship.

Research Objectives

This study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1- **Measure** the level of entrepreneurial culture in Palestinian universities through four selected cultural dimensions from the GLOBE model.

2- **Analyze** statistically significant differences in respondents' perceptions of entrepreneurial culture dimensions across Palestinian universities according to demographic variables: university type (traditional, polytechnic, governmental) and gender.

3- **Determine** the extent to which the four selected cultural dimensions contribute to shaping the overall perception of entrepreneurial culture in the Palestinian university environment.

4- **Provide** a practical framework to assist academic decision-makers in developing educational policies that strengthen entrepreneurial culture in higher education institutions.

Research Questions

In line with these objectives, the study addresses the following research questions:

1- What is the perceived level of availability of the four selected GLOBE dimensions in shaping entrepreneurial culture within Palestinian universities?

2- What are the patterns of differences in the four entrepreneurial culture dimensions among Palestinian universities according to university type and respondents' gender?

3- How do the four cultural dimensions contribute to explaining entrepreneurial culture in the Palestinian university environment from the respondents' perspective?

Research Hypotheses

Based on the research questions, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- **H1:** It is expected that there are statistically significant differences in the perceived dimensions of entrepreneurial culture among Palestinian universities according to their classification (traditional, polytechnic, governmental), from the respondents' perspectives.
- **H2:** It is expected that the four cultural dimensions-Performance Orientation, Future Orientation, Institutional Collectivism, and Humane Orientation-significantly contribute to shaping perceptions of entrepreneurial culture within Palestinian universities.
- **H3:** It is expected that there are statistically significant differences in the perceived dimensions of entrepreneurial culture among respondents according to their gender.

Literature Review

The Role of Universities in Promoting Entrepreneurial Culture

The shift toward the knowledge economy has positioned universities as the primary incubators of knowledge production (Ismail et al., 2023). Traditionally, universities were limited to teaching and research, but economic and knowledge developments have added a third mission: contributing to socio-economic development, which led to the emergence of the entrepreneurial university concept (Etzkowitz, 2008). Universities have thus moved from being mere centers of knowledge to becoming engines of growth.

Entrepreneurship education has evolved significantly since the first course proposed by Myles Mace at Harvard University, with a notable expansion in the number of courses, academic programs, and entrepreneurship centers (Kuratko & Morris, 2017). Nevertheless, universities still face substantial challenges, including financial and technological constraints, a shortage of qualified faculty, administrative hurdles, and societal challenges related to diversity, inclusion, and freedom of expression. These realities underscore the need to strengthen the role of universities in disseminating an entrepreneurial culture.

Entrepreneurship Education and Its Relationship to Entrepreneurial Culture

Entrepreneurship education represents a bridge between theory and practice, and between knowledge and institutional culture. Its aim is not limited to teaching how to write a business plan but extends to instilling entrepreneurial values and behaviors that underpin a culture of innovation and initiative. Effective entrepreneurship education requires sustainable organizational practices and innovative pedagogies that integrate knowledge with experiential learning (Learning by Doing) and expose learners to real-world work environments outside traditional classrooms.

With the evolution of teaching methods, models such as service learning have emerged. Empirical evidence shows a strong and direct relationship between the success of development experiences and the role of universities; as universities devote more attention to entrepreneurship, their contribution to development grows (Wang, 2019). This strengthens the importance of entrepreneurship education as a key mechanism for embedding entrepreneurial culture.

The Importance of Entrepreneurship Education

The importance of entrepreneurship education derives from its nature as a comprehensive system linking individual, institutional, and societal dimensions. It rests on five core pillars:

1- **A values and beliefs framework:** Encouraging risk-taking, learning from failure, and the pursuit of autonomy and innovation.

2- **An enabling environment:** Including supportive policies, facilitative regulations, tax incentives, and appropriate educational infrastructure (Javidan et al., 2006).

3- **Quantitative and qualitative indicators:** Used in leading journals such as Research Policy and Technovation to assess culture, including the number of startups, growth rates of small ventures, and qualitative analyses of media discourse and policy orientations.

4- **Economic and social impact:** Entrepreneurial culture contributes to job creation, economic diversification, and innovative solutions to societal challenges.

5- **Sustainable culture:** Studies such as Carter (2025) and Brentnall et al. (2025) emphasize that sustaining an entrepreneurial culture requires intergenerational knowledge transfer and re-shaping societal perceptions of entrepreneurship, embedding it as part of the knowledge economy.

Cultural Models for Analyzing Organizational Culture and Comparison with GLOBE

Cultural models are crucial tools for understanding how culture influences organizational behavior and leadership, especially in multicultural environments. Key models include:

- **Hofstede's Model:** Focuses on six national cultural dimensions, such as power distance and individualism, and is widely used in cross-national comparisons (Hofstede, 1980).
- **Trompenaars' Model:** Emphasizes cultural interaction and interpersonal relations more than organizational structures, making it useful for managing international teams (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).
- **Schwartz's Value Theory:** Concentrates on core values guiding behavior and is employed in cultural psychology; however, it does not provide direct quantitative tools for institutions (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2007).
- **Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck's Model:** Offers an anthropological lens on value orientations but is predominantly qualitative and not readily applicable to large-scale statistical analysis (Soares et al., 2007).
- **GLOBE Model:** Distinguished by its comprehensiveness and ability to integrate national and organizational culture, offering nine quantitative dimensions for analyzing leadership and institutional behavior, which makes it particularly suitable for universities in unstable environments (House et al., 2004).

Why GLOBE is the Most Suitable Model for this Study

The GLOBE model is considered the most appropriate framework for the present study because it:

- Integrates national and organizational cultural levels.
- Provides precise quantitative measurement tools.
- Adapts well to diverse contexts, including Palestinian universities.

- Enables the interpretation of leadership, innovation, and entrepreneurial behavior in unstable and complex environments.

Entrepreneurial Culture

1- Defining Entrepreneurial Culture

Entrepreneurial culture forms an integrated framework that stimulates innovation and risk-taking, transcending individual behavior to become an institutional system and societal philosophy. In the university context, its importance stems from its capacity to promote entrepreneurial thinking and support calculated risk-taking, where concepts of autonomy and innovation intersect with educational policies and institutional practices.

Definitions of entrepreneurial culture vary across research traditions. The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) defines it as a set of societal values, beliefs, and attitudes that encourage the adoption of entrepreneurial behavior and the appreciation of risk and innovation (Reynolds, 2005). Hayton et al. (2002) describe it as a social and organizational environment that supports generating ideas and transforming them into viable ventures. Urban (2020) depicts entrepreneurial culture as an interactive environment that fosters proactive thinking, creativity, and risk-taking.

Recent studies such as Stephan and Pathak (2022) emphasize that entrepreneurial culture emerges from the interaction between educational institutions and societal values, making the analysis of cultural dimensions a key entry point for assessing a society's ability to adopt entrepreneurship as a lifestyle and developmental tool.

2- Entrepreneurship vs. Entrepreneurial Culture

It is essential to distinguish between entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial culture. Entrepreneurship refers to the concrete act or behavior of launching or developing a venture, whereas entrepreneurial culture represents the broader climate and environment that encourage and sustain such acts. Entrepreneurship is a personal or group behavior, while entrepreneurial culture is the collective setting that legitimizes and supports that behavior over time.

3- Importance of Entrepreneurial Culture in the University Environment

Entrepreneurial culture is increasingly important in universities as it prepares students and graduates to navigate a rapidly changing labor market and enhances their capacity to innovate and translate ideas into viable projects. In the era of the knowledge economy, such culture becomes a foundational requirement for graduating entrepreneurial individuals capable of leading ventures and contributing to socio-economic development.

Universities play a central role in fostering this culture by integrating entrepreneurship concepts into curricula, establishing business incubators and innovation

centers, encouraging applied research linked to market needs, and building effective partnerships with both public and private sectors. The impact of entrepreneurial culture goes beyond individual development to function as a lever for sustainable development at the societal level.

Clarifying the concept also requires differentiating entrepreneurial culture from partially overlapping terms such as "entrepreneurial spirit" or "entrepreneurial climate." These terms typically refer to specific aspects, while entrepreneurial culture is a broader construct encompassing values, beliefs, and behaviors that support innovation and initiative at different levels.

The Role of Universities in Promoting and Strengthening Entrepreneurial Culture

Traditionally, universities focused on two missions: teaching and research. However, economic and knowledge transformations have imposed a third mission-contributing to community and economic development-giving rise to the notion of the entrepreneurial university (Etzkowitz, 2008). Universities thus have become engines of growth rather than mere knowledge producers.

They play a pivotal role in building entrepreneurial culture through:

1- **Developing academic programs and curricula** that strengthen entrepreneurial competencies, including critical, analytical, synthetic, and holistic thinking.

2- **Providing supportive environments** via physical infrastructure, financial and non-financial resources, business incubators, and project support centers.

3- **Anchoring entrepreneurial values** such as autonomy, responsibility, future planning, and teamwork.

4- **Forging partnerships** with relevant stakeholders in the public, private, and non-profit sectors.

Selected GLOBE Dimensions in this Study

The GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) project offers one of the most comprehensive frameworks for measuring cultural dimensions. It consists of nine dimensions; this study selects four that are particularly relevant to the Palestinian university context:

- **Performance Orientation:** The extent to which a university encourages achievement and excellence in academic and professional domains. It is fundamental to entrepreneurship as it fuels the pursuit of excellence, hard work, and goal attainment.
- **Future Orientation:** The degree to which a university promotes long-term planning and the postponement of immediate gratification. This is directly related to entrepreneurs' capacity for strategic planning and tolerance of short-term risks for long-term gains.

- **Institutional Collectivism:** The degree to which a university supports collective work and distributes resources fairly and efficiently. It reflects the institution's ability to build a supportive environment for entrepreneurial projects and to provide equitable resource allocation that encourages collaborative initiatives.
- **Humane Orientation:** The extent to which a university values individuals and promotes tolerance, fairness, and social support. It aligns closely with social entrepreneurship, which develops ventures that address societal problems.

Theoretical Framework

Previous research provides the foundation for the current study, which offers a critical reading of the literature on entrepreneurial culture in universities and identifies key gaps that this research seeks to address.

GLOBE as the Main Analytical Framework

The study adopts the GLOBE model of leadership and organizational behavior (Guerrero et al., 2024; Javidan et al., 2004) as its principal theoretical framework. Four specific dimensions are selected based on their high relevance to the Palestinian context and their explanatory power in capturing entrepreneurial culture in academic institutions. Other dimensions are excluded to maintain methodological focus on those deemed most decisive in shaping the local entrepreneurial environment.

Measuring Cultural Dimensions and Bridging the Gap between Description and Analysis

Local studies have often focused on structural and descriptive dimensions (e.g., Hamed, 2007; Abdullah et al., 2014) or adopted advanced quantitative methods while neglecting deeper cultural aspects (e.g., Aldalou, 2016; Abu 'Odeh, 2016). The standardized GLOBE measures provide a powerful tool for filling this gap (Gupta et al., 2004), in contrast to some local attempts that lack comprehensiveness (Al-Sous, 2021; Al-'Arjawi, 2022).

Accordingly, the study operationally defines university entrepreneurial culture as:

The prevailing system of values and practices derived from the four selected GLOBE dimensions, which directs individual and collective behavior toward initiating ventures that create economic and social value.

Explaining Institutional and Gender Variations

The study draws on **institutional theory** to explain how organizational culture varies according to the nature of the institution itself. This helps interpret expected cultural differences among traditional universities (which may act as "reservoirs" of collective values), polytechnic institutions (which function as "laboratories" for social adaptation), and governmental universities (which face stronger bureaucratic constraints), consistent with previous contextual studies (Abu Shammala, 2020; Al-Ma'mari, 2021).

It also makes use of **social role theory** to interpret potential female advantage in humane orientation, while taking into account local findings that indicate overall gender cultural homogeneity (Al-Miliji, 2020).

Integrated Explanatory Value of the Dimensions

To determine the relative explanatory power of each dimension, the study employs multiple regression analysis, building on GLOBE-based evidence that suggests context-specific variation in the influence of cultural dimensions (Javidan et al., 2004). This approach addresses a methodological gap in local literature regarding the absence of integrated models (Abdelmoula, 2020; Al-Sharman, 2019).

On the theoretical level, the study integrates **social capital theory** (to explain Humane Orientation and Institutional Collectivism) with **competitive advantage theory** (to explain Performance and Future Orientation), thus offering an integrated framework whose importance has been underscored by policy literature (Al-Bajouri, 2017; Ben 'Atiyyah & Miyah, 2024).

Targeted Research Gaps

The study seeks to address three main gaps:

1- **Theoretical Gap:** This is, to the author's knowledge, the first comprehensive application of the GLOBE model to the Palestinian context, whereas prior local work relied on partial or ad hoc models (Mansour, 2018; Salama et al., 2022).

2- **Methodological Gap:** The research combines precise quantitative measurement of the four dimensions with a deeper qualitative interpretation of institutional differences.

3- **Applied Gap:** It directly links cultural results to institutional policy design, responding to calls in earlier studies (Mousa, 2018; Al-Bajouri, 2017).

Research Design and Methodology

Research Design

The study adopts a **descriptive-analytical** design, which is well-suited for providing an accurate picture of cultural phenomena and analyzing relationships between variables without intervening in the natural setting of respondents. This design allows for examining individual and institutional perceptions within a complex and changing cultural context, testing hypotheses, and identifying patterns of relationships between variables.

According to Creswell and Creswell (2023), the descriptive-analytical approach is appropriate when the goal is to:

- **Describe the phenomenon:** Provide a precise quantitative and qualitative picture of entrepreneurial culture in Palestinian universities.
- **Analyze relationships:** Examine correlations among cultural dimensions and demographic/institutional variables.

- **Test causal hypotheses:** Identify the relative effects of cultural dimensions on the overall perception of entrepreneurial culture.
- **Derive generalizable results:** Offer practical recommendations for higher education policy.

This approach is aligned with the study's aim to understand the availability of entrepreneurial culture, analyze differences among university types, and examine the effects of demographic variables on perceptions of entrepreneurial culture.

Studies such as Aminova et al. (2020) have shown that these cultural dimensions play a pivotal role in promoting entrepreneurial culture in environments where social ties and institutional cooperation are strong, features that are particularly salient in the Palestinian context.

Variables

1- **Independent Variables:** The four GLOBE dimensions:
   - Performance Orientation
   - Future Orientation
   - Institutional Collectivism
   - Humane Orientation
2- **Dependent Variable:** Overall perception of entrepreneurial culture in the university environment, as reported by stakeholders affiliated with Palestinian universities.
3- Control variables:
   - University type (traditional, polytechnic, governmental)
   - Respondent gender (male, female)

Operational Definition of Entrepreneurial Culture:

Based on the preceding theoretical definitions, entrepreneurial culture is defined in this study as:

A system of values, beliefs, and behaviors that stimulates initiative, calculated risk-taking, creativity, innovation, and the pursuit of economic and social opportunities. This culture is a key factor in shaping a supportive environment for entrepreneurship, directly influencing individuals' willingness to engage in entrepreneurial activities and determining societal acceptance of concepts such as failure, risk, and individual success.

Rationale for Selecting the Four GLOBE Dimensions

The selection of the four dimensions is grounded in methodological and contextual considerations. These dimensions were carefully chosen from the nine GLOBE dimensions to maximize relevance to entrepreneurial culture in Palestinian universities.

Direct Relevance to Entrepreneurial Culture:

- *Performance Orientation* reflects the extent to which achievement and excellence are incentivized, consistent with entrepreneurs' pursuit of clear goals.
- *Future Orientation* is central to strategic planning and risk tolerance-core elements of entrepreneurial ventures.
- *Institutional Collectivism* captures the extent of support for collaborative work and team-based projects, facilitating internal networks that increase the likelihood of entrepreneurial success.
- *Humane Orientation* embodies the ethical and social pillar of entrepreneurship, especially in contexts that require innovative solutions to social problems.

Suitability to the Palestinian Context:

Palestinian universities operate under conditions of political and economic instability and resource scarcity. This makes it crucial to focus on dimensions that reveal how these institutions respond through innovation, planning, cooperation, and justice. Aminova et al. (2020) show that these four dimensions are particularly salient in cultures facing external pressures, such as Palestine.

Alignment with Research Objectives, Questions, and Hypotheses:

The selected dimensions enable comparison among the three types of universities and testing of the moderating roles of university type and gender in shaping perceptions of entrepreneurial culture. The hypotheses are built on the expectation that these dimensions will vary by university classification, thus offering a rich analytical framework.

Exclusion of other GLOBE dimensions:

Five dimensions (e.g., Uncertainty Avoidance, Assertiveness, Gender Egalitarianism) were excluded because they are either less directly related to entrepreneurial behavior in the academic context or require in-depth qualitative measures challenging to implement within the current study's logistical and temporal constraints. Some of these dimensions also align more closely with national cultural contexts than with organizational culture, which may reduce their analytical precision for university-level studies.

Added Value:

This choice allows the study to move beyond superficial treatments of the GLOBE model and to offer a deeper, focused analysis of the dimensions most influential in constructing entrepreneurial culture in universities-thus filling a clear gap in Arab and Palestinian scholarship.

Link to University Models:

Focusing on these dimensions facilitates systematic comparison among the three university types-traditional, polytechnic, governmental-each with different administra-

tive structures and funding mechanisms. This provides insight into how institutional models drive entrepreneurial culture.

Population, Sample, and Instrument

Population and Sample

The population consists of students and staff (academic and administrative) in three Palestinian universities. Table 1 presents the population distribution:

Table 1. Size of the Study Population by University Type

University Type	Staff	Students	Total Population
Traditional	2188	24,231	26,419
Polytechnic	479	5,637	6,116
Governmental	553	9,739	10,292
Total	3220	39,607	40,827

Source: Annual Statistical Yearbook of Higher Education Institutions (2023–2024), compiled by the researcher.

To ensure adequate representation of the strata shown in Table 1, a two-stage sampling strategy was employed:

Purposive Sampling:

The three universities were intentionally selected to represent the main models of higher education in Palestine (traditional, polytechnic, governmental).

Stratified Random Sampling:

Within each university, the population was divided into strata (students and staff). Random samples were then drawn from available lists of students and employees using random selection procedures.

The final sample included **384 valid responses**, justified statistically using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table at a 95% confidence level and 0.05 significance level. This size is considered sufficient for generalizing results for the population. Table 2 shows the sample distribution:

Table 2. Sample Distribution by University Type and Gender (n = 384)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
University Type	Traditional	142	37.0
	Polytechnic	128	33.3
	Governmental	114	29.7
Gender	Male	198	51.6
	Female	186	48.4

Source: Prepared by the researcher.

This sampling strategy captures diversity in Palestinian higher education models and enables comparative analysis of GLOBE dimensions across distinct academic environments.

Instrument Development

A structured **survey questionnaire** was developed as the primary tool to measure the four GLOBE-derived cultural dimensions of entrepreneurial culture in Palestinian universities, as well as the dependent variable-overall perception of entrepreneurial culture.

The instrument was tailored to the Palestinian university context with careful attention to cultural and institutional specificities. It consists of **20 statements**, distributed evenly across the four dimensions (5 items per dimension). The overall perception of entrepreneurial culture for each respondent is operationalized as the **mean score** of their responses to these 20 items. Higher means indicate more positive perceptions of the entrepreneurial culture.

Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree), allowing precise quantitative estimation of agreement levels and calculation of individual and aggregate perception scores.

Table 3. Distribution of Questionnaire Items Across the Four Selected GLOBE Dimensions

No.	GLOBE Dimension	Item
1	Performance Orientation	The university encourages academic excellence and individual achievement.
2		Entrepreneurs are rewarded for high performance and innovative initiatives.
3		The university continually seeks to improve the quality of education.
4		Entrepreneurs are motivated to achieve tangible results in their projects.
5		The university values achievement more than effort alone.
6	Future Orientation	The university encourages long-term thinking and future planning.
7		Entrepreneurs are trained to set strategic goals for their projects.
8		University curricula include concepts related to sustainable development.
9		There is a focus on developing skills that can be enhanced in the future.
10		The university encourages delaying immediate gratification in favor of long-term goals.
11	Institutional Collectivism	Student entrepreneurial projects are carried out in a team spirit.
12		The university encourages collaboration among different disciplines.
13		Resources are distributed fairly among entrepreneurs.
14		Collective achievements are valued more than individual ones.
15		Relationships within the university are built on collaborative work.
16	Humane Orientation	Values of respect and empathy prevail in the university environment.
17		Entrepreneurs receive support in addressing their social and economic circumstances.
18		The university encourages voluntary work and community service.
19		Entrepreneurs are treated with fairness and justice.
20		Human relationships on campus are highly valued.

Source: Items adapted from Stephan & Pathak (2022) and Song et al. (2021), linguistically and contextually tailored to the Palestinian university environment.

Validity and Reliability

1- **Face Validity:**

The questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of academic experts in management, entrepreneurship, and educational measurement, who assessed the clarity and relevance of items. Revisions were made based on their feedback to ensure that the statements adequately represent the intended constructs.

2- **Construct Validity:**

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using Principal Components Analysis (PCA) with Oblimin rotation was conducted. Results showed that items loaded clearly onto the four targeted factors, supporting the instrument's structure. Only items with factor loadings greater than 0.50 on their theoretical factor were retained, ensuring discriminant validity among dimensions.

3- **Reliability:**

Cronbach's alpha for the entire instrument was **0.91**, indicating excellent internal consistency (Taber, 2018). Subscale alphas for each of the four dimensions were all above 0.70, confirming acceptable reliability across dimensions.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using **SPSS v.28**, employing both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive Statistics

- Frequencies and percentages to describe sample characteristics.
- Means and standard deviations to summarize responses on each item and dimension.

Inferential Statistics

1- **Independent Samples t-test:**

Used to examine gender-based differences in perceptions of the cultural dimensions.

2- **One-Way ANOVA:**

Used to test differences among the three university types in perceived cultural dimensions.

3- **Post-hoc Tests (LSD, Tukey):**

Applied to identify which specific university types differ when ANOVA results were significant.

4- **Multiple Regression Analysis:**

Used to assess the predictive power of the four cultural dimensions on the overall perception of entrepreneurial culture and to estimate the relative contribution of each dimension.

Assumption Checks

Prior to inferential analysis, key statistical assumptions were tested:

1- **Multicollinearity:**

Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all independent variables were below 10, indicating no problematic multicollinearity.

2- **Normality of Residuals:**

Assessed using normal probability plots (Q-Q plots), which suggested that residuals were approximately normally distributed.

3- **Linearity:**

Scatterplots confirmed a linear relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable.

4- **Significance Level:**

A p-value of ≤ **0.05** was used as the threshold for statistical significance.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics of Cultural Dimensions

To answer Research Question 1 regarding the level of availability of the four GLOBE dimensions, means and standard deviations were calculated. The Likert scale range (1–5) was divided as follows:

- 1.00–2.33: Low
- 2.34–3.67: Moderate
- 3.68–5.00: High

Table 4. Levels of the Five-Point Likert Scale and Mean Ranges

Response	Value	Mean Range	Level
Strongly Disagree	1	1.00–2.33	Low
Disagree	2		
Neutral	3	2.34–3.67	Medium
Agree	4		
Strongly Agree	5	3.68–5.00	High

The descriptive statistics for the four dimensions are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics and Ranking of GLOBE Cultural Dimensions (n = 384)

Dimension	No. of Items	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)	Rank
Performance Orientation	5	3.87	0.71	4
Future Orientation	5	3.94	0.68	3
Institutional Collectivism	5	4.01	0.65	2
Humane Orientation	5	4.09	0.62	1

All four dimensions obtained mean scores above the neutral point (3.0), indicating a generally **high presence** of entrepreneurial culture in the surveyed universities. Humane Orientation ranked highest (M = 4.09), followed by Institutional Collectivism (M = 4.01), Future Orientation (M = 3.94), and Performance Orientation (M = 3.87).

This ordering underscores the importance of societal values within Palestinian campuses. The primacy of humane and collectivist dimensions aligns with findings that emphasize the role of humanistic values in challenging contexts (Al-Shaker & Al-Bihani, 2023) and a preference for cooperation in Arab cultures (Aminova et al., 2020). The relatively high scores for Future and Performance Orientation-despite ranking lower-suggest a notable level of strategic awareness consistent with innovation literature (Guerrero et al., 2024).

The study contributes uniquely by:

1- Revealing a clear priority for humane and collective dimensions over purely performance-based individualism, in contrast with some studies where performance overshadowed social values.

2- Demonstrating gender homogeneity across most dimensions, contradicting research such as Alghamdi et al. (2024) that found gender-based biases in entrepreneurial perceptions.

3- Providing a quantitative basis for the relative importance of these dimensions in Palestinian universities, thereby filling a knowledge gap in the local literature and offering a scientific foundation for policymakers to design programs and incubators that leverage institutional cooperation and social capital.

Gender Differences (t-test Results)

To address Research Question 2 and test Hypothesis 3, an independent samples t-test was conducted to examine gender differences across the four cultural dimensions.

Table 6. Independent Samples t-test Results for Gender Differences in GLOBE Dimensions (n = 384)

Dimension	Mean (Males)	Mean (Females)	t	df	p-value
Performance Orientation	3.91	3.83	1.12	382	0.263
Future Orientation	3.98	3.90	1.01	382	0.312
Institutional Collectivism	4.03	3.99	0.61	382	0.543
Humane Orientation	4.01	4.17	-2.36	382	0.019

No statistically significant gender differences were found for Performance Orientation, Future Orientation, or Institutional Collectivism ($p > 0.05$). This supports Hypothesis 3 regarding the general neutrality of perceptions across genders and indicates a high degree of cultural convergence in Palestinian universities, contrasting with contexts where gender-based biases are more pronounced (Alghamdi et al., 2024).

However, a significant difference emerged in **Humane Orientation** ($t = -2.36$, $p = 0.019$), with females reporting higher mean scores ($M = 4.17$) than males ($M = 4.01$). This finding is consistent with broader social literature indicating that women often place greater emphasis on empathy and supportive relationships-critical elements for a safe and encouraging entrepreneurial environment. Though the difference is modest, it offers nuanced insight that can inform more inclusive support programs sensitive to subtle cultural variations.

Overall, these results contribute to Palestinian scholarship by highlighting strong gender neutrality in most cultural dimensions alongside a specific gender-related difference in humane values.

Differences among Universities (ANOVA Results)

To address Research Question 2 and test Hypothesis 1 regarding differences by university type, a one-way ANOVA was conducted across the three university types.

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA Results for Differences among Universities

Dimension	Mean (Trad.)	Mean (Poly.)	Mean (Govt.)	F	p-value
Performance Orientation	3.92	3.85	3.83	1.14	0.321
Future Orientation	4.01	3.88	3.91	2.03	0.133
Institutional Collectivism	4.09	4.03	3.89	3.56	0.029
Humane Orientation	4.17	4.14	3.94	4.12	0.017

Significant differences were found in **Institutional Collectivism** ($F = 3.56$, $p = 0.029$) and **Humane Orientation** ($F = 4.12$, $p = 0.017$), while no significant differences appeared for Performance or Future Orientation.

Post-hoc tests (LSD and Tukey) showed that **traditional and polytechnic universities** scored significantly higher than governmental universities on both Institutional Collectivism and Humane Orientation. This provides robust empirical support for Hypothesis 1 and answers Research Question 2.

These results confirm the suitability of the GLOBE-based theoretical framework in explaining cultural differences in Arab higher education contexts. The findings also reinforce and extend previous work (Awad & Salaimeh, 2023), which linked administrative autonomy to greater entrepreneurial flexibility, by demonstrating that the most institutionally flexible universities also show stronger humane and collectivist cultures.

The data reveal that social dimensions (collectivism and humane orientation) are more sensitive to institutional structures than competitive dimensions (performance and future orientation). This advances the literature by demonstrating that in academic settings, particularly in the Arab context, social and relational values may be the primary drivers of sustained entrepreneurial culture-an insight that has been underemphasized in prior work focused mainly on performance and innovation indicators.

From a theoretical standpoint, the results support viewing GLOBE not merely as a descriptive tool but as an analytical framework capable of explaining institutional variations in entrepreneurial culture. Practically, the findings underscore the need for institutional policies that strengthen the social dimensions underpinning entrepreneurship, especially within governmental universities constrained by bureaucracy.

Multiple Regression Analysis

To address Research Question 3 and test Hypothesis 2, multiple regression analysis was conducted with the four cultural dimensions as independent variables and the overall perception of entrepreneurial culture as the dependent variable.

Table 8. Multiple Regression Results

Dimension	Unstandardized B	Standardized β	p-value
Performance Orientation	0.214	0.278	0.000
Future Orientation	0.187	0.241	0.000
Institutional Collectivism	0.165	0.198	0.000
Humane Orientation	0.142	0.156	0.004

The model explains **61%** of the variance in the overall perception of entrepreneurial culture ($R^2 = 0.61$). To account for the number of predictors and sample size, the **Adjusted R^2** was calculated and found to be **0.60**, which provides a more conservative and accurate estimate of explained variance (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2017).

All four dimensions are significant predictors, confirming Hypothesis 2. **Performance Orientation** ($\beta = 0.278$) and **Future Orientation** ($\beta = 0.241$) exert the strongest standardized effects, followed by Institutional Collectivism and Humane Orientation.

This pattern resonates with international findings (Guerrero et al., 2024; Fayolle et al., 2022), where strategic, performance-related dimensions are central to entrepreneurial ecosystems. However, this study adds a crucial contextual insight: although humane and collectivist values have somewhat lower direct predictive power, they remain significant, and their high mean levels indicate that in the Palestinian context, a **balanced integration** of competitive and social dimensions is essential.

The study thus provides the first quantitative evidence on the **relative importance** of specific GLOBE dimensions in shaping entrepreneurial culture in Palestinian universities-extending the application of the GLOBE model from business environ-

ments to the academic sector and offering a firm empirical basis for targeted policy interventions.

Discussion

The results point to a distinctive institutional environment within Palestinian universities, where broader societal values are reflected strongly on campus. A notable **institutional paradox** emerges: traditional universities score higher on standardized cultural indicators, while polytechnic institutions appear to have a deeper and more sustainable **community impact**.

This paradox can be understood through the interaction of three main institutional mechanisms:

1- **Governance Mechanism:**
- In traditional universities, stable hierarchical structures translate symbolic affiliation into systematic policies, raising average adherence to values.
- In polytechnic universities, project-based flexible governance may generate greater real-world societal impact-even when formal cultural scores are slightly lower-through active community partnerships.

2- **Social Formation Mechanism:**
- Larger traditional universities create dense internal interaction, which increases internal cohesion indicators.
- Smaller and outward-oriented polytechnic institutions redirect interaction toward community projects, producing wider societal impact despite somewhat lower internal measurement averages.

3- **Cognitive Formation Mechanism:**
- Theoretical disciplines in traditional universities cultivate high awareness of values (reflected in moderate-to-high performance scores).
- Applied disciplines in polytechnic institutions translate values into practical competencies embedded in real-world projects-performance that is measured more accurately by societal outcomes than by discourse-based indicators.

In the Palestinian context, this paradox represents not a weakness but a **functional complementarity** within the university system: the "incubator model" (traditional university) preserves the value framework, while the "transformative model" (polytechnic institution) ensures profound societal impact. Together, they transform universities into laboratories for **solidarity-based entrepreneurship** that effectively mobilizes diverse institutional characteristics.

These findings highlight the need to develop **mixed evaluation tools** that capture both the internal spread of values and their external societal impact, thereby enabling sustainable policies that support social and economic growth.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the results in light of the research objectives and questions, the study reaches several key conclusions:

1- **A robust cultural foundation for entrepreneurial culture exists in Palestinian universities.**

All four selected GLOBE dimensions are present at relatively high levels, especially Humane Orientation and Institutional Collectivism. This diverges from some regional studies (e.g., Alghamdi et al., 2024) that reported weaker social dimensions and reflects the particular importance of social relationships and community support in the Palestinian context.

2- **University classification is a primary determinant of cultural differences.**

Significant differences across traditional, polytechnic, and governmental universities-particularly in Humane Orientation and Institutional Collectivism-point to the role of institutional models and governance structures in shaping cultural profiles. This extends previous work (Awad & Salaimeh, 2023) by adding a cultural layer to earlier structural interpretations.

3- **Performance and Future Orientation are the main drivers of entrepreneurial culture.**

Regression results show that these two dimensions have the strongest predictive power, confirming international findings (Guerrero et al., 2024; Fayolle et al., 2022). The study contributes by quantifying their relative importance in the Palestinian context.

4- **A distinctive "solidarity-based entrepreneurial model" is emerging.**

The clear primacy of humane and collectivist dimensions suggests the existence of a **solidarity-oriented entrepreneurial model** capable of transforming social capital into a source of competitive advantage. This calls for rethinking entrepreneurial culture to include the capacity to convert social values into innovative assets.

5- **Methodological contribution: multi-level cultural diagnosis.**

The study introduces a **multi-level cultural diagnostic approach** that captures complex interactions among institutional structures and cultural characteristics, providing a transferable analytical tool for other contexts characterized by a gap between global models and local realities.

6- **Toward "cultural transformation engineering".**

The findings demonstrate that developing entrepreneurial culture does not require importing ready-made models. Rather, it calls for designing culturally ground-

ed transformation processes that leverage local value constellations while integrating global competitive dimensions.

Recommendations

In light of the main conclusions-particularly the solidarity-based entrepreneurial model, the interplay between global competitiveness and local specificity, and institutional adaptation-the study offers a set of actionable recommendations, organized by implementation priority.

Policy-Level Recommendations for Universities (0-12 months: Highest Priority)

1- **Differentiated Governance by University Type:**

- **Traditional universities:** Convert strong Institutional Collectivism into explicit policies that support **community-based collaborative entrepreneurship**, such as transforming student clubs into incubators and expanding service-learning programs.
- **Polytechnic universities:** Institutionalize existing flexibility and community engagement through **permanent liaison units** that co-design entrepreneurial projects with external stakeholders based on real societal needs.
- **Governmental universities:** Reduce bureaucratic rigidity and increase operational flexibility through **delegated authority**, flexible budgeting, and streamlined procedures.

2- **Culturally Balanced Incentive Systems:**

- Develop a **culturally balanced performance scorecard** linking promotions and rewards to composite indicators of all four dimensions: measurable outcomes (performance), strategic foresight (future), social impact (humane orientation), and collective cohesion (collectivism).

Mechanisms for Transforming Values into Assets (12–24 months: Medium Priority)

1- **Solidarity-based Platforms and Financing:**

Establish **solidarity entrepreneurship platforms** that leverage dense social networks and empathy (especially the female advantage in humane orientation) to support community-oriented business models, such as microfinance incubators.

2- **Value-Driven Investment Funds:**

Create investment funds that adopt dual criteria-economic feasibility and social value-rewarding projects that balance entrepreneurial culture dimensions.

3- **Integrative Ecosystem Building:**

Form **alliances among universities** (e.g., "value-and-application coalition") and develop **balanced ecosystem performance indicators**, including measures of social capital and humane impact.

Capacity-Building Recommendations (Ongoing Priority)

1- **Embedding Competencies in Curricula:**

Introduce a compulsory course on **social and solidarity entrepreneurship** across disciplines and adopt **project-based learning** and **service learning** as standard pedagogical strategies.

2- **Gender-Sensitive but Neutral Policies:**

While maintaining gender neutrality in opportunities and support, strategically leverage women's relative strength in humane orientation by engaging them in leading community-based entrepreneurial initiatives and mentorship programs.

Long-Term Monitoring and Development (24-36 months)

1- **Entrepreneurial Models Observatory:**

Establish a **"Local Entrepreneurship Models Observatory"**-in partnership with relevant national bodies-to develop measurement tools, assess policy impact, and conduct longitudinal studies on cultural dynamics.

Guidance for Future Research

Encourage qualitative studies to explore internal mechanisms behind observed patterns, and **comparative regional research** (e.g., with Jordan and Tunisia) to test the transferability of the solidarity-based model.

References

- Abdallah, S., Al-Natsheh, B., & Hattawi, M. (2014). *Policies for promoting entrepreneurship among youth in the State of Palestine*. Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS).
- Abu Ouda, M. (2016). *The suitability of higher education outputs and the needs of the Palestinian labor market: A case study of the Faculty of Commerce, Gaza Strip* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Al-Azhar University.
- Al-Bajouri, A. (2017). *Building the institutional capacities of local units as a requirement for activating decentralization, a comparative study with application to the Egyptian case*. Arab Administrative Development Organization (ARADO).
- Al-Dahiri, S. (2010). *Counselling psychology: Its methods and theories*. Dar Wael Publishing.
- Al-Dalu, H. (2016). *A proposed strategy for aligning higher education outputs with the needs of the labor market in Palestine* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Al-Aqsa University.
- Al-Milegi, R. (2020). A proposed strategy to activate the role of university administration in establishing a culture of entrepreneurship at the University of Hail in light of some national directions of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Arab Studies in Education and Psychology, (127)*, 119–182.
- Al-Shaker, M. A., & Al-Bihani, N. (2023). Transforming education: A systematic review of practices and policies in entrepreneurial universities. *Scientific Journal of King Faisal University (Humanities and Administrative Sciences), 24* (1), 1-18.
- Al-Sharman, A., & Zaki, M. (2019). The extent of entrepreneurship application among graduate students in Jordanian public universities and the role of educational leaders in its development. *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Educational and Psychological Research and Studies, 10* (28).
- Al-Sous, M. M. J. (2021). *The role of Palestinian universities in entrepreneurial education and its role in economic development* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Faculty of Education, Islamic University.
- Alghamdi, M., Alzahrani, F., & Alotaibi, H. (2024). Comparative analysis of entrepreneurial orientation in Saudi technical and research universities. *Arab Journal of Higher Education Studies, 18* (2), 45–67.
- Aminova, M., & Mareef, S. (2020). Entrepreneurship ecosystem in Arab world: The status quo, impediments and the ways forward. *International Journal of Business Ethics and Governance, 3* (2), 241–254.
- Aminova, M., Mareef, S., & Machado, C. (2020). Entrepreneurship ecosystem in the Arab world: Current status, challenges, and prospects. *International Journal of Business Ethics and Governance, 3* (3), 1–20.

- Awad, I. M., & Salaimeh, M. K. (2023). Towards an entrepreneurial university model: Evidence from Palestine Polytechnic University. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 12* (9). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00280-5
- Ben Attia, H., & Mayah, A. (2024). An analytical study of the reality of environmental performance in industrial institutions - Ma'aden company as a model. *Al-Aseel Journal for Economic and Administrative Research, 8* (2), 338–356.
- Brentnall, C., Higgins, D., Verduijn, K., & Hytti, U. (Eds.). (2025). Entrepreneurship education in a time between worlds: Transforming theory, practice and scholarship [Special issue]. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development. 36* (3-4), April.
- Carter, E. (2025). Sustainable entrepreneurship cultures: The role of knowledge transfer and generational dynamics. *Journal of Sustainable Business and Entrepreneurship, 15* (2), 88–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/JSBE.2025.123456
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Etzkowitz, H. (2008). *The triple helix: University-industry-government innovation in action*. Routledge.
- Fayolle, A. (2007). *Entrepreneurship and new value creation, the dynamic of the entrepreneurial process*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fayolle, A., Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2022). Entrepreneurship in the MENA region: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 17* (1), 1–9.
- Fayolle, A., Liñán, F., & Bazet, S. (2022). On the worth of entrepreneurship education: Entrepreneurship beyond entrepreneurship?, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 34* (7-8), 643–668. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2045952
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* . (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., & Fayolle, A. (2024). Strategic management of entrepreneurial universities: A global perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 190*, 122456.
- Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., & Zaar, F. (2024). *Entrepreneurial universities and regional development*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gupta, V., Hanges, P. J., & Javidan, M. (2004). Cultural clusters: Conceptual and empirical studies. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. (pp. 178–213). Sage Publications.
- Hamed, M. (2007). *Towards policies for promoting entrepreneurship among youth in the West Bank and Gaza Strip*. Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS).

- Hayton, J. C., George, G., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). National culture and entrepreneurship: A review of behavioral research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26* (4), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225870202600403
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications.
- Ibdair, A. O. (2022). *Towards an entrepreneurial university model and possibilities of implementation in Palestine: Evidence from Al-Quds University,* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Al-Quds University.
- Ibrahim Abdulmawla, T., & Mohammed, M. (2020). The role of King Khalid University in developing a business culture among its students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*.
- Ismail, R. N. A., Hussein, A. M., Gabrael, A., et al. (2023). Evaluating the role of private universities in achieving an entrepreneurship culture. *The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Sulaimani*, (ISSN 2520-7377), 358–387.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Sully de Luque, M., & House, R. J. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 20* (1), 67–81. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2006.19873410
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Row, Peterson & Company.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30* (3), 607–610.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2017). Corporate Entrepreneurship 2.0: Research development and future directions. *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship, 13* (6), 441–490. http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/0300000082
- Mansour, W., & Abdel Jawad, I. (2018). *Entrepreneurship challenges in Palestine. Sustainable Development in a Changing Environment conference*, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, An-Najah National University.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith—a failure of analysis. *Human Relations, 55* (1), 89–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702551004
- Mousa, A. (2018). The entrepreneurship system in the universities of Singapore, Taiwan, and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A comparative study. *Al-Tarbiya Journal (Al-Azhar): A Refereed Scientific Journal for Educational, Psychological and Social Research, 37* (178 P2), 585–628.
- Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS). (2024). *Graduate unemployment statistics in Palestine*. (PCBS).

- Reynolds, P. D. (2005). Paul D. Reynolds: Entrepreneurship research innovator, coordinator, and disseminator. *Small Business Economics, 24* (4), 351–358. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-005-2015-1
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Cultural values in organizations: Insights for Europe. *European Journal of International Management, 1* (3), 176–190. https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2007.014692
- Salama, A., Saleh, A., Mansour, L., Hamad, M., & Abu Watfa, Y. (2022). *Mechanisms for aligning higher education outputs with labor market requirements in the West Bank* [Policy paper]. MASARAT Center.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values with implications for business. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48* (1), 23–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00047.x
- Smith, P. B., & Peterson, M. F. (2005). *Culture, organizations, and work*. Sage Publications.
- Soares, A. M., Farhangmehr, M., & Shoham, A. (2007). Hofstede's dimensions of culture in international marketing studies. *Journal of Business Research, 60* (3), 277–284.
- Stephan, U., & Pathak, S. (2022). Beyond cultural values: Cultural leadership ideals and entrepreneurship. *Journal of International Business Studies, 53* (8), 1629–1661. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-022-00527-3
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2017). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education, 48* (6), 1273–1296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2
- Tabib, S. (2021). *Assessing entrepreneurship practices at the Palestinian higher education institutions* [Unpublished master's thesis]. An-Najah National University.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Urban, B. (2020). Entrepreneurship culture: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Management & Organization, 26* (6), 1152–1172. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.15
- Wang, C. J. Q. (2019). Research on the evaluation of education in innovation and entrepreneurship in local universities background big data. *Annual Meeting on Management Engineering* (AMME 2019).