Cross-Cultural Study of Entrepreneurship and Ethics Education

Kavita Roy[1] & Khritish Swargiary[2]

1 Research Assistant, Department of Research and Development, EdTech Research Association (ERA), 15205 East North Lane, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA
2 Former Guest Lecturer, Department of Education, Bongaigaon College, Assam, India.

ARTICLE INFO

Corresponding author:
kavitaroy7777@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods comparative study explores entrepreneurship and business ethics education among young adults (20–30 years) in Bangalore, India, and Arizona, USA. Analyzing 200 participants (100 per region) through stratified random sampling, it highlights baseline disparities: Bangalore participants scored lower in entrepreneurial knowledge and ethical understanding compared to Arizona participants. Post-intervention, both groups showed significant improvements, with Bangalore participants experiencing notable gains in ethics knowledge, ethical scenario experience, and practical application interest. Arizona participants also improved ethics knowledge and scenario experience. Employment and socioeconomic differences were statistically significant. Using surveys, interviews, focus groups, and workshops, the study underscores cultural and institutional influences on learning, offering adaptive strategies to harmonize global standards with local contexts in entrepreneurship education.

SARI PATI

Penelitian komparatif dengan pendekatan metode campuran ini mengeksplorasi pendidikan kewirausahaan dan etika bisnis di kalangan dewasa muda (usia 20–30 tahun) di Bangalore, India, dan Arizona, Amerika Serikat. Dengan menganalisis 200 partisipan (masing-masing 100 dari setiap wilayah) melalui teknik stratified random sampling, studi ini mengungkapkan adanya disparitas awal: partisipan dari Bangalore menunjukkan skor lebih rendah dalam pengetahuan kewirausahaan dan pemahaman etika dibandingkan dengan partisipan dari Arizona. Setelah intervensi, kedua kelompok menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan, dengan partisipan dari Bangalore mengalami peningkatan yang mencolok dalam pengetahuan etika, pengalaman dalam skenario etika, dan minat terhadap penerapan praktis. Partisipan dari Arizona juga menunjukkan peningkatan dalam pengetahuan etika dan pengalaman skenario. Perbedaan dalam status pekerjaan dan kondisi sosial ekonomi terbukti signifikan secara statistik. Melalui penggunaan survei, wawancara, diskusi kelompok terarah, dan lokakarya, studi ini menekankan pengaruh budaya dan institusi dalam proses pembelajaran, serta menawarkan strategi adaptif untuk menyelaraskan standar global dengan konteks lokal dalam pendidikan kewirausahaan.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship education has emerged as a vital area of study, especially in a globalized economy where innovation and adaptability are highly valued. The focus on entrepreneurship and business ethics in educational curricula is particularly pertinent to young adults in their twenties, as they represent a demographic characterized by energy, open-mindedness, and a readiness to engage with innovative ideas. This study concentrates on exploring the educational practices, challenges, and opportunities related to entrepreneurship and business ethics for two distinct yet comparable groups: young Indians in Bangalore, India, and Arizona, USA, during the year 2024.

Significance of Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education aims to cultivate skills such as innovation, critical thinking, and the ability to navigate uncertainty (Fayolle & Gailly, 2008). It empowers individuals to recognize opportunities, evaluate risks, and take initiative to create value in their communities and beyond (Neck & Corbett, 2018). In the dynamic socio-economic contexts of Bangalore and Arizona, entrepreneurship education holds particular importance. Bangalore, often referred to as the «Silicon Valley of India,» boasts a thriving ecosystem of startups and tech innovation. Similarly, Arizona is home to a growing entrepreneurial culture, bolstered by its favorable policies and diverse economy (Startup Genome, 2023). These environments provide fertile ground for fostering entrepreneurial skills among young individuals.

Business Ethics and its Relevance

The inclusion of business ethics in education ensures that future entrepreneurs not only focus on profitability but also address social and environmental responsibilities (Crane & Matten, 2016). Business ethics education is critical in shaping moral reasoning and decision-making capabilities, which are indispensable in the contemporary globalized marketplace (Ferrell, Fraedrich, & Ferrell, 2019). For young adults in Bangalore and Arizona, learning ethical principles is particularly relevant given the increased scrutiny on corporate social responsibility and sustainable practices in both regions.

Demographics: Young Indians in Bangalore and Arizona

Young adults aged 20 to 30 represent a unique cohort poised to drive economic and social transformation. In Bangalore, this demographic benefits from the city's robust IT and educational infrastructure, which offers abundant opportunities for entrepreneurial ventures. The Indian government's initiatives such as "Startup India" and "Make in India" further encourage youth participation in entrepreneurship (Ministry of Commerce & Industry, 2022). In Arizona, a similar trend is observed, with universities like Arizona State University promoting entrepreneurial learning through programs such as the Edson Entrepreneurship + Innovation Institute (ASU, 2023).

Cultural similarities and differences between these groups also inform the focus of this research. Young Indians in Bangalore are often influenced by a collectivist culture that emphasizes community and familial ties, whereas those in Arizona may lean toward an individualistic approach to entrepreneurship (Hofstede, 2001). Despite these differences, both groups share a high level of adaptability, curiosity, and willingness to learn, making them ideal subjects for this study.

This research seeks to understand how education in entrepreneurship and business ethics can be tailored to effectively meet the needs of young Indians in Bangalore and Arizona. Specifically, it examines the pedagogical approaches, cultural influences, and socio-economic factors that shape the learning experiences of this demographic. The ultimate goal is to identify best practices and strategies for designing educational interventions that foster not only entrepreneurial success but also ethical business practices.

Entrepreneurship and business ethics education

is pivotal for equipping young adults with the tools needed to thrive in a competitive and ethically demanding world. By focusing on the experiences of young Indians in Bangalore and Arizona, this research aims to contribute valuable insights into the design of effective educational programs that resonate with the unique characteristics of these vibrant and promising communities.

The intersection of entrepreneurship education and business ethics has garnered increasing attention in recent academic discourse. While entrepreneurship education focuses on developing competencies like opportunity identification, risk-taking, and innovation (Fayolle & Gailly, 2008), business ethics ensures these practices are guided by principles of social responsibility and sustainability (Crane & Matten, 2016). This literature review explores the key themes, challenges, and pedagogical strategies related to these fields, specifically in the contexts of young adults in Bangalore, India, and Arizona, USA.

Entrepreneurship Education

Entrepreneurship education has evolved from traditional business studies to a more practice-oriented and multidisciplinary approach (Neck & Corbett, 2018). Studies highlight the importance of experiential learning, mentorship, and collaborative projects in fostering entrepreneurial skills (Pittaway & Cope, 2007). In the Indian context, programs such as Startup India have created an ecosystem that supports young entrepreneurs, particularly in urban hubs like Bangalore (NASSCOM, 2023). Similarly, in Arizona, higher education institutions emphasize innovation and entrepreneurship through initiatives like the Edson Entrepreneurship + Innovation Institute at Arizona State University (ASU, 2023). However, the scalability and inclusivity of such programs remain areas of concern, especially for underrepresented demographics.

Business Ethics Education

Business ethics education aims to equip learners with frameworks for ethical decision-making in complex, real-world situations (Ferrell, Fraedrich, & Ferrell, 2019). A significant body of literature underscores the role of ethical education in reducing corporate misconduct and fostering sustainable business practices (McDonald, 2015). In both Bangalore and Arizona, ethical dilemmas often arise due to cultural and regulatory differences, necessitating a contextualized approach to ethics education (Hofstede, 2001). However, research indicates that ethics education often lacks practical applications and fails to engage learners effectively, particularly younger demographics (Crane & Matten, 2016).

The Role of Culture in Education

Cultural dimensions significantly influence how entrepreneurship and business ethics are perceived and taught. Hofstede's (2001) cultural dimensions theory highlights the collectivist orientation of Indian society, which prioritizes community and relationships, compared to the individualistic culture prevalent in the United States. This cultural dichotomy impacts the pedagogical approaches required for effective education in Bangalore and Arizona. While Indian students may benefit from community-based learning and mentorship, their counterparts in Arizona might prefer individualized learning experiences and greater autonomy.

Challenges and Gaps in Existing Literature

Despite the growing interest in entrepreneurship and business ethics education, significant gaps remain. First, most studies focus on either entrepreneurship or ethics education in isolation, neglecting their interconnectedness. Second, while the unique cultural and socio-economic contexts of Bangalore and Arizona are acknowledged, comparative studies exploring these regions are scarce. Third, existing pedagogical models often fail to engage young adults in a way that leverages their energy, creativity, and openness to innovation. Finally, limited research addresses the longitudinal impact of such education on the entrepreneurial and ethical behaviors of young adults.

Research Gap

The gap lies in the lack of comparative, culturally nuanced studies that examine the integration of entrepreneurship and business ethics education tailored to the needs of young adults aged 20–30 in Bangalore and Arizona. Specifically, there is a need for pedagogical frameworks that not only impart theoretical knowledge but also foster practical skills, ethical decision-making, and cultural adaptability in these two diverse yet entrepreneurial regions.

Research Objectives

Based on the identified gaps, the following objectives are proposed:

1. To analyze the current state of entrepreneurship and business ethics education for young adults in Bangalore, India, and Arizona, USA.
2. To identify the cultural, socio-economic, and institutional factors influencing the learning experiences of this demographic in both regions.
3. To develop a comparative framework for integrating entrepreneurship and business ethics education tailored to the specific needs of young adults aged 20–30 in Bangalore and Arizona.
4. To propose pedagogical strategies that enhance practical engagement, ethical reasoning, and cross-cultural adaptability in entrepreneurship education.

METHODS

This section outlined the research design, instruments, sampling strategies, and procedures employed to address the objectives of the study on entrepreneurship and business ethics education among young adults aged 20–30 in Bangalore, India, and Arizona, USA, in 2024.

Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-methods comparative design, integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to gain a holistic understanding of the research objectives. Quantitative data provided measurable insights into participants' perceptions and learning outcomes, while qualitative data captured in-depth perspectives on cultural influences and personal experiences. The study spanned from January 2024 to July 2024.

Instruments and Tools

1. **Survey Questionnaire:** A structured questionnaire with Likert-scale questions captured quantitative data on attitudes, perceptions, and outcomes related to entrepreneurship and business ethics education.
2. **Semi-structured Interviews:** These were conducted with selected participants to gain qualitative insights into cultural and contextual influences on education.
3. **Focus Groups:** These explored collaborative perspectives and validated themes emerging from individual interviews.
4. **Pre- and Post-assessments:** These measured changes in knowledge, skills, and ethical reasoning before and after the educational interventions.
5. **Educational Workshops:** Customized sessions on entrepreneurship and business ethics were designed to serve as the intervention.

Locations and Duration

i. **Bangalore, India:** The study was conducted at the CBND (Center for Business and National Development (CBN)) institution.
ii. **Arizona, USA:** The study was conducted at the EdTech Research Association (ERA) headquarters, located at 15205 East North Lane, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA.
iii. **Duration per site:** The study lasted three months at each location (January to March 2024 in Bangalore; April to June 2024 in Arizona).

Sampling

1. **Sample Size:** A total of 200 participants (100 each in Bangalore and Arizona) were included.
2. **Sampling Technique:**
    i. **Stratified Random Sampling** ensured

representation from different educational institutions and socio-economic backgrounds.

ii. **Inclusion Criteria:**
   a. Age 20–30 years.
   b. Enrolled in or recently completed entrepreneurship or business ethics courses.
   c. Willingness to participate in workshops and assessments.

iii. **Exclusion Criteria:**
   a. Individuals with prior entrepreneurial experience exceeding two years.
   b. Participants unable to commit to the study's timeline.

Reliability and Validity

i. **Reliability:**
   a. Instruments were validated through Cronbach's Alpha to ensure internal consistency (target >0.8).
   b. Test-retest reliability confirmed consistency over time.

ii. **Validity:**
   a. Content validity was established through expert review of survey and interview protocols.
   b. Face validity was ensured by pilot testing with a sample of 20 participants (10 from each region) in December 2023.

Variables

i. **Independent Variable:** Educational interventions in entrepreneurship and business ethics.

ii **Dependent Variables:**
   a. Perceived knowledge and skills in entrepreneurship.
   b. Ethical reasoning and decision-making capabilities.

Research Procedure

Step 1: Preparation (November–December 2023)

i. Survey and interview instruments were developed and pilot-tested.
ii. Workshop content was finalized in collaboration with academic institutions.
iii. Ethical clearance and permissions were obtained from partner institutions in Bangalore and Arizona.

Step 2: Recruitment (January 2024 for Bangalore; April 2024 for Arizona)

i. Recruitment materials were distributed through institutional channels and social media.
ii. Applicants were screened based on inclusion and exclusion criteria.
iii. Informed consent was secured from all participants.

Step 3: Baseline Data Collection (Two Weeks per Region)

i. Pre-assessments and initial surveys were administered to all participants.
ii. Initial focus groups and interviews were conducted.

Step 4: Intervention (Six Weeks per Region)

i. Workshops on entrepreneurship and business ethics tailored to cultural contexts were delivered.
ii. Hands-on activities, case studies, and role-playing exercises were facilitated to enhance engagement.

Step 5: Post-Intervention Data Collection (Two Weeks per Region)

i. Post-assessments and follow-up surveys were administered.
ii. Concluding interviews and focus groups were conducted to gather reflective feedback.

Step 6: Data Analysis (July 2024)

i. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS (e.g., paired t-tests, ANOVA).
ii. Qualitative data were transcribed, coded, and analyzed using thematic analysis with NVivo software.

Step 7: Reporting and Dissemination (August–September 2024)

i. Findings were synthesized into a comprehensive report.
ii. Insights were shared with participating institutions and results were published in academic journals.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Participant Demographics Analysis

Table 1.1: Comprehensive Demographic Profile

Characteristic	Bangalore, India (n = 100)	Arizona, USA (n = 100)	Statistical Significance (p-value)
Age Distribution			0.672 (Not Significant)
20–23 years	38 (38%)	35 (35%)	
24–27 years	42 (42%)	40 (40%)	
28–30 years	20 (20%)	25 (25%)	
Mean Age	24.6 ± 2.3	25.1 ± 2.5	0.214
Gender Breakdown			0.541 (Not Significant)
Male	56 (56%)	52 (52%)	
Female	44 (44%)	47 (47%)	
Non-binary	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	
Educational Background			0.412 (Not Significant)
Undergraduate	70 (70%)	65 (65%)	
Postgraduate	30 (30%)	35 (35%)	
Field of Study			0.687 (Not Significant)
Business	50 (50%)	55 (55%)	
Engineering	30 (30%)	25 (25%)	
Humanities	20 (20%)	20 (20%)	
Employment Status			0.038 (Statistically Significant)
Full-time	20 (20%)	25 (25%)	
Part-time	30 (30%)	40 (40%)	
Unemployed	50 (50%)	35 (35%)	
Socioeconomic Background			0.012 (Statistically Significant)
Low-income	40 (40%)	20 (20%)	
Middle-income	50 (50%)	55 (55%)	
High-income	10 (10%)	25 (25%)	

2. Qualitative Findings Thematic Analysis

Table 2.1: Pre-Assessment Results with Disaggregated Metrics

Region	Metric	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Bangalore, India				
Knowledge of Entrepreneurship	3.2	± 0.8	Moderate understanding with significant variability	
Knowledge of Business Ethics	2.8	± 0.7	Below average ethical knowledge awareness	
Confidence in Ethical Decision-Making	2.9	± 0.9	Limited confidence with high variability	
Understanding Cultural Relevance	2.5	± 0.6	Lowest-scoring domain, indicating cultural learning opportunity	
Interest in Practical Application	3.0	± 0.7	Moderate practical engagement potential	
Experience in Ethical Scenarios	2.4	± 0.8	Limited prior exposure to complex ethical situations	
Team Collaboration Skills	3.1	± 0.8	Moderate collaborative capabilities	
Critical Thinking Skills	3.3	± 0.7	Relatively stronger analytical skills	

Region	Metric	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Arizona, USA				
Knowledge of Entrepreneurship	3.5	± 0.7	Relatively stronger baseline entrepreneurial knowledge	
Knowledge of Business Ethics	3.1	± 0.8	More developed ethical understanding	
Confidence in Ethical Decision-Making	3.2	± 0.6	More consistent confidence levels	
Understanding Cultural Relevance	3.4	± 0.7	More nuanced cultural perspective	
Interest in Practical Application	3.7	± 0.6	Higher practical engagement motivation	
Experience in Ethical Scenarios	3.0	± 0.5	More prior exposure to complex scenarios	
Team Collaboration Skills	3.5	± 0.7	Strong collaborative potential	
Critical Thinking Skills	3.6	± 0.6	Robust analytical capabilities	

Table 2.2: Post-Assessment Performance Metrics

Region	Metric	Pre-Intervention Score	Post-Intervention Score	Performance Improvement	Improvement Percentage
Bangalore, India					
Knowledge of Entrepreneurship	3.2	4.5	+1.3	40.6%	
Knowledge of Business Ethics	2.8	4.3	+1.5	53.6%	
Confidence in Ethical Decision-Making	2.9	4.2	+1.3	44.8%	
Understanding Cultural Relevance	2.5	3.8	+1.3	52.0%	
Interest in Practical Application	3.0	4.6	+1.6	53.3%	
Experience in Ethical Scenarios	2.4	3.9	+1.5	62.5%	
Team Collaboration Skills	3.1	4.2	+1.1	35.5%	
Critical Thinking Skills	3.3	4.5	+1.2	36.4%	
Arizona, USA					
Knowledge of Entrepreneurship	3.5	4.8	+1.3	37.1%	
Knowledge of Business Ethics	3.1	4.6	+1.5	48.4%	
Confidence in Ethical Decision-Making	3.2	4.5	+1.3	40.6%	
Understanding Cultural Relevance	3.4	4.3	+0.9	26.5%	
Interest in Practical Application	3.7	4.9	+1.2	32.4%	
Experience in Ethical Scenarios	3.0	4.4	+1.4	46.7%	
Team Collaboration Skills	3.5	4.6	+1.1	31.4%	
Critical Thinking Skills	3.6	4.7	+1.1	30.6%	

Table 2.3: Workshop Feedback Metrics with Comparative Analysis

Feedback Dimension	Bangalore, India	Arizona, USA	Comparative Difference
Engagement During Sessions	4.6 ± 0.6	4.8 ± 0.5	+0.2 in favor of Arizona
Clarity of Concepts	4.4 ± 0.7	4.7 ± 0.6	+0.3 in favor of Arizona
Usefulness of Case Studies	4.5 ± 0.7	4.8 ± 0.5	+0.3 in favor of Arizona
Relevance of Role-Playing Activities	4.3 ± 0.8	4.6 ± 0.7	+0.3 in favor of Arizona
Cultural Sensitivity in Content	4.2 ± 0.7	4.5 ± 0.6	+0.3 in favor of Arizona
Facilitator Effectiveness	4.7 ± 0.6	4.9 ± 0.5	+0.2 in favor of Arizona
Overall Satisfaction	4.6 ± 0.6	4.8 ± 0.5	+0.2 in favor of Arizona

3. Qualitative Findings Thematic Analysis

Table 3.1: Qualitative Insights with Contextual Nuancess

Theme	Bangalore, India	Arizona, USA	Cross-Cultural Comparative Insights
Cultural Relevance			
Local Value Interpretation	Strong community-centric perspective	Individualistic innovation focus	Fundamental cultural worldview differences
Decision-Making Influences	Family approval, collective impact	Personal achievement, competitive edge	Varied motivational structures
Sustainability Considerations	High emphasis on social responsibility	Technology-driven efficiency	Different sustainability conceptualizations
Perceived Barriers			
Financial Challenges	Limited access to capital, bureaucratic complexity	Advanced financial infrastructure	Structural economic ecosystem variations
Mentorship Dynamics	Limited professional networking opportunities	Robust mentorship ecosystems	Institutional support disparities
Regulatory Environment	Complex governmental procedures	More streamlined regulatory frameworks	Institutional flexibility differences
Skill Development			
Most Enhanced Skills	Team collaboration, communication	Critical thinking, adaptive problem-solving	Complementary skill development patterns
Learning Preferences	Collaborative, narrative-driven	Direct, outcome-oriented	Different cognitive engagement styles
Knowledge Application	Contextual, relationship-based	Strategic, efficiency-focused	Varied practical implementation approaches
Workshop Experience			
Preferred Learning Methods	Hands-on, culturally embedded activities	Diverse, technology-integrated approaches	Adaptable, contextually sensitive design
Case Study Resonance	Local entrepreneurial narratives	Global innovation scenarios	Importance of contextual relevance

The study's comprehensive analysis of entrepreneurship and business ethics education among young adults in Bangalore, India, and Arizona, USA, reveals nuanced insights into the current state of educational interventions and cross-cultural learning dynamics.

Objective 1: Analyzing the Current State of Entrepreneurship and Business Ethics Education
The pre-assessment results reveal a compelling narrative of initial disparities and subsequent educational transformation. Notably, the baseline assessments exposed significant regional variations in entrepreneurial and ethical knowledge. Bangalore

participants initially demonstrated more modest levels of entrepreneurial understanding (M = 3.2, SD = 0.8), with particularly low scores in cultural relevance (M = 2.5, SD = 0.6) and ethical scenario experience (M = 2.4, SD = 0.8).

In contrast, Arizona participants exhibited a more robust initial knowledge foundation, with higher baseline scores across multiple domains. The most pronounced differences emerged in practical application interest (Bangalore: M = 3.0, SD = 0.7; Arizona: M = 3.7, SD = 0.6) and cultural understanding (Bangalore: M = 2.5, SD = 0.6; Arizona: M = 3.4, SD = 0.7).

i. The post-intervention results were particularly illuminating. Bangalore showed the most dramatic improvements, with:
    a. Business ethics knowledge increasing by 53.6%
    b. Experience in ethical scenarios improving by 62.5%
    c. Interest in practical application rising by 53.3%
ii. Arizona participants also demonstrated significant growth, though with slightly less dramatic percentage increases:
    a. Business ethics knowledge improved by 48.4%
    b. Experience in ethical scenarios enhanced by 46.7%

Objective 2: Identifying Cultural and Socio-economic Influences

The demographic analysis revealed nuanced insights into cultural and socio-economic dynamics. Statistically significant differences emerged in two critical areas:

i. Employment Status (p = 0.038):
    a. Bangalore: 50% unemployed, 20% full-time, 30% part-time
    b. Arizona: 35% unemployed, 25% full-time, 40% part-time
ii. Socioeconomic Background (p = 0.012):
    a. Bangalore: 40% low-income, 50% middle-income, 10% high-income

b. Arizona: 20% low-income, 55% middle-income, 25% high-income

These disparities reflect deeper structural differences in economic opportunities and social mobility. The qualitative analysis (Table 5) further unpacked these nuances:

iii. Cultural Decision-Making Influences:
    a. Bangalore: Characterized by collective impact and family approval
    b. Arizona: Driven by individual achievement and competitive advantage
iv. Sustainability Considerations:
    a. Bangalore: Emphasized social responsibility and community welfare
    b. Arizona: Focused on technology-driven efficiency and innovation

Objective 3: Developing a Comparative Framework

The comparative framework emerged from multiple analytical dimensions:

i. Institutional Ecosystem Differences:
    a. Bangalore: Characterized by complex bureaucratic procedures and limited professional networking
    b. Arizona: Featuring streamlined regulatory frameworks and robust mentorship opportunities
ii. Skill Development Trajectories:
    a. Bangalore Strengths: Team collaboration, communication, contextual learning
    b. Arizona Strengths: Critical thinking, adaptive problem-solving, strategic implementation
iii. Learning Preference Variations:
    a. Bangalore: Collaborative, narrative-driven, relationship-based approaches
    b. Arizona: Direct, technology-integrated, outcome-oriented methodologies

Objective 4: Proposing Pedagogical Strategies

Workshop feedback metrics provided crucial insights for developing cross-culturally adaptive educational interventions:

Key Pedagogical Recommendations:

i. Develop flexible curriculum design that accommodates cultural learning preferences

ii. Integrate local entrepreneurial narratives and global innovation scenarios

iii. Balance collaborative and individual learning approaches

iv. Incorporate technology while maintaining cultural sensitivity

Limitations And Future Research Directions

While the study provides significant insights, several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

i. Relatively small sample size (n = 200)

ii. Narrow age demographic (20-30 years)

iii. Limited geographical representation

Recommended Future Research:

a. Expand sample size and demographic diversity

b. Conduct longitudinal studies tracking long-term educational impacts

c. Explore additional geographic contexts

d. Develop more sophisticated cross-cultural educational assessment tools

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION

The research contributes to existing literature by:

1. Providing empirical evidence of cultural variations in entrepreneurship education

2. Demonstrating the effectiveness of contextually sensitive pedagogical interventions

3. Highlighting the importance of adaptive learning strategies in global educational contexts

This comparative study illuminates the complex interplay between cultural context, educational intervention, and entrepreneurial skill development. The findings underscore the critical importance of developing nuanced, culturally responsive approaches to entrepreneurship and business ethics education.

CONCLUSION

The present study provides a nuanced exploration of entrepreneurship and business ethics education, revealing the complex interplay of cultural, economic, and institutional factors in young adults' learning experiences. By comparing educational approaches in Bangalore and Arizona, the research illuminates the critical importance of context-sensitive pedagogical interventions.

The findings demonstrate that entrepreneurial education is not a uniform process but a dynamic, culturally embedded experience. Significant variations were observed in learning preferences, decision-making frameworks, and skill development trajectories between the two regions. Bangalore's participants exhibited a more pronounced improvement in educational outcomes, particularly in business ethics knowledge and practical application, suggesting the transformative potential of targeted educational interventions.

Key insights emerged from the comparative analysis of cultural influences, institutional ecosystems, and learning methodologies. The study highlights the need for flexible, adaptable educational frameworks that can:

1. Accommodate diverse cultural learning preferences

2. Integrate local entrepreneurial narratives with global innovation perspectives

3. Balance collaborative and individual learning approaches

4. Maintain cultural sensitivity while advancing entrepreneurial competencies

Statistically significant differences in employment status and socioeconomic backgrounds further underscore the importance of contextually tailored educational strategies. The research contributes to the broader understanding of cross-cultural entrepreneurship education by demonstrating the potential for adaptive, culturally intelligent pedagogical models. ∎

REFERENCES

Arizona State University (ASU). (2023). Edson entrepreneurship + innovation institute. Retrieved from https://entrepreneurship.asu.edu

Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Li, H. L. (2020). Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: Where are we now and where do we need to move in the future? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 45*(1), 199-228.

Crane, A., & Matten, D. (2016). *Business ethics: Managing corporate citizenship and sustainability in the age of globalization* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). From craft to science: Teaching models and learning processes in entrepreneurship education. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(7), 569–593. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590810899838

Ferrell, O. C., Fraedrich, J., & Ferrell, L. (2019). *Business ethics: Ethical decision making and cases* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

McDonald, G. M. (2015). Ethical decision-making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(3), 11-23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2262-0

Ministry of Commerce & Industry. (2022). Startup India initiative. Retrieved from https://www.startupindia.gov.in

NASSCOM. (2023). Startup ecosystem report. Retrieved from https://nasscom.in

Neck, H. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2018). The scholarship of teaching and learning entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 8–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127417737286

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities. Princeton University Press.

Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479–510. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607080656

Research Results. (2024). *Comparative study of entrepreneurship and business ethics education in Bangalore and Arizona*.

Startup Genome. (2023). Global startup ecosystem report. Retrieved from https://startupgenome.com

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (2012). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in global business* (3rd ed.). Nicholas Brealey International.

Urban, B. (2019). Entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurial orientation: A case of selected undergraduate students. *Problems and Perspectives in Management, 17*(3), 140-152.

Zhang, Y., & Pegg, M. (2022). Contextual learning and cultural intelligence in entrepreneurship education: A comparative study. *International Journal of Educational Development, 86*, 102-118.