

BEYOND UNIVERSITY SUPPORT: HOW FAMILY BUSINESS BACKGROUND SHAPES SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP INTENTION IN INDONESIA?

*^{1,2}Siti Daleela Mohd Wahid, ²Wan Mohd Hirwani Wan Hussain, ³Vijayaletchumy Krishnan, ⁴Neeta Jayabalan & ⁵Perengki Susanto

¹ Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Melaka, Kampus Bandaraya Melaka, 75300 Melaka, Malaysia.

² Graduate School of Business, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.

³ Faculty of Business and Communication, INTI International University, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

⁴ School of Marketing and Management, Asia Pacific University of Technology & Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

⁵ Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat 25171, Indonesia.

*Corresponding author: sitid365@uitm.edu.my

Received: 10.10.2025

Accepted: 12.02.2026

ABSTRACT

Background and Purpose: While university support is widely acknowledged as a catalyst for entrepreneurship, its role in shaping social entrepreneurship intention (SEI) remains debated in literature. Some studies report strong links between institutional support and SEI, while others find minimal or inconsistent influence. This study aims to address this ambiguity by examining the relationship between university support and SEI among Indonesian university students. The broader purpose is to better understand how different forms of perceived institutional support contribute to shaping the social entrepreneurial mindset in emerging economies like Indonesia, particularly within a youth and higher education context.

Methodology: This quantitative study employed a cross-sectional survey approach using structured questionnaires administered to 318 Indonesian university students, selected through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) via AMOS to assess the direct and indirect effects of university support on SEI, with attitudes toward social entrepreneurship (ATSE) as a mediating variable. The measurement model was validated through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), ensuring construct reliability and validity before hypothesis testing.

Findings: Findings indicate that university support has both direct and indirect effects on SEI. However, university support does not significantly influence ATSE, suggesting that other psychosocial or familial factors may be more critical in shaping attitudes. This points to the complexity of SEI formation, where institutional support may trigger intention through pathways other than attitudinal shifts.

Contributions: This study contributes a contextualized SEI model specific to Indonesian youth and higher education. The findings provide actionable insights for policymakers, universities, and SME stakeholders seeking to build robust ecosystems for nurturing future social entrepreneurs.

Keywords: University support, social entrepreneurship, intention, higher education, AMOS software.

Cite as: Mohd Wahid, S. D., Wan Hussain, W. M. H., Krishnan, V., Jayabalan, N., & Susanto, P. (2026). Beyond university support: How family business background shapes social entrepreneurship intention in Indonesia? *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 11(1), 19-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol11iss1pp19-32>

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship (SE) is an innovative entrepreneurial approach that uses business skills to undertake entrepreneurial activities that address socio-economic problems and pursue social values. Currently, this innovative approach is of a great interest and concern to local and international parties (i.e., policies makers, academics, practitioners) due to its significant effects on the social and economic transformation of a country (Barton et al., 2018; Hockerts, 2017). Among the important roles of SE with regards to society are its ability to reduce poverty, provide basic education, champion gender equality, reduce infant and child mortality, combat HIV, malaria and protect the environment (Ab Wahid et al., 2017).

Although the presence of traditional entrepreneurs is able to raise the standard of living in a community, social entrepreneurs are perceived to be more capable of solving large-scale social problems (Barton et al., 2018). Several organizations have effectively improved the lives of thousands of people around the world. As an example, a well-known and established organization, Ashoka, in the United States of America, founded by Bill Drayton, has captured the value of social endeavors (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). Ashoka is the first institution with the aim of finding potential social entrepreneurs and providing them a wide range of assistance (i.e., business consulting, business coaching) to pursue their goals. Another example is the Schwab Foundation in Switzerland, which seeks to advance SE for societal innovation. In the United Kingdom, SE has been present since 2000 (Ernst, 2011). Moreover, Bornstein and Davis (2010) even believe that the preoccupation with SE in the United States of America and Europe has already reached its third generation of development.

Southeast Asia namely Phillipines, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore and Thailand are also active participants in promoting SE and there are many successful social entrepreneurs established in these countries, including Jovie Gil Montajes (founder of Light of Hope PH, Phillipines) Sasibai Kimis (founder of Earth Heir, Malaysia), Dwight Turner (founder of Courageous Kitchen, Thailand) and Davira Chairunisa (founder of Berbagi Beras Indonesia, Indonesia). The practice of SE has existed for decades, but it became an active focus of academic research and many leading journals that are publishing on this growing topic. For instance, the *Journal of Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* (Q1), *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* (Q1), *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation* (Q2), and *Social Enterprise Journal* (Q1) focus entirely on SE. Similarly, this growth of interest is also visible by doing a Google search for 'social entrepreneurship'. In 2018, this search produced over 8.8 million (Tran, 2018) and in 2024, it was over 30 million hits.

It is evident from the burgeoning literature of SE that it has a great potential to transform the future of an individual, organization, community or a country (Ahuja et al., 2019). The qualities and characteristics possessed by social entrepreneurs should be nurtured in students at higher learning institutions (HLIs). Early emphasis at the university level is believed to be favourable to arousing their minds and attitudes to be more creative. This exposure can benefit students whereby, they can think critically on how to assist the less-privileged community to transform their lives to be better (Wahid et al., 2022). On the other hand, the aspiration of students to become social entrepreneurs can inspire their career choice once they have graduated. Furthermore, the government also welcomes the SE approach to help strengthen the country's innovation systems by actively looking for the best methods to enhance the socio-economic status of its citizens. Therefore, the positive effects of SE on transforming a nation have made this topic a fruitful area of inquiry in the field of entrepreneurship research.

Social entrepreneurs can demonstrate helpful in alleviating socio-economic issues by placing those less fortunate towards a better life (Wahid et al., 2022). However, the prevalence rate of SE activities in countries like Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore and Thailand are less than 8% of the entire population which is far behind comparable developing countries such as Peru, Chile, and Columbia (Zhang, 2024). The fact that SE levels are low is a ‘problem’ for global society, as the country may be missing out on an innovative way to support its citizens (Nasir & Subari, 2017). Given the potential of SE to drive sustainable development, it is critical to identify strategies to enhance social entrepreneurial engagement, particularly among university students.

University support plays a crucial role in fostering SE intentions. Networks such as university facilities, incubators, and social entrepreneurship curricula provide students with essential resources to develop their ideas (Chuah et al., 2016). However, previous studies yield conflicting findings on whether university support significantly influences social entrepreneurship intention (SEI) (Farooq, 2018; Jagannathan et al., 2017). Some studies highlight a positive impact, while others find no significant relationship, suggesting the need for further investigation. Therefore, it is a call to unpack these inconsistencies by exploring contextual, cultural, or mediating factors that may influence how university support translates into actual SE intent. Building on this need, this study aims to make two key contributions. First, it examines how university support influences SE attitudes and intentions among university students. Second, it provides practical insights for improving entrepreneurial education programs, fostering stronger SE ecosystems within higher learning institutions.

2.0 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

As the present study investigates the factors related to SE intention of the university students, it is developed based on theories linked to entrepreneurial-intention relationships. This present study uses entrepreneurial theories to explain the predictors of students by exploring how university support, attitude influence SE intention. An integrative framework is established based on the literature review and research objectives. This framework is derived mainly from Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned behavior (TPB). Another related model is Mair and Noboa’s (2006) SE Intention Model, which is seen as useful in describing why university students are motivated to become social entrepreneurs. Prior research has attempted to extend TPB by integrating additional predictors. For example, Politis et al. (2016) and Tiwari et al. (2017) introduce exogenous variables alongside TPB constructs to improve SE intention prediction. However, limited empirical evidence fully validates these models, making this study’s contribution particularly relevant.

2.1 The Imperative Role of University Support in Entrepreneurship

Educational support refers to the provision of general knowledge and skills needed to start a new business. For instance, the entrepreneurial curriculum that designed and developed in the syllabus should be able to support the student’s survivor. Thus, it must include the extant views of university knowledge support. The concept development support refers to the provision of awareness, motivation, and business ideas in the early stages of the entrepreneurial process such as preparation for business registration and discussion for new idea. Meanwhile, the business development support refers to the provision of support given to start-ups in the later stages of the entrepreneurial process including business incubators and physical resources. Full university support is expected to provide students with knowledge, mastery experience, and resources to increase their self-efficacy, thus influencing their entrepreneurial attitude and intention to start a business (Shen et al., 2017).

Evidently, Farooq (2018) found that the relationship between university support and the attitudinal constructs of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)—namely, attitude toward social entrepreneurship (ATSE), subjective norm (SN), and perceived behavioral control (PBC)—is statistically significant. Similarly, Jagannathan et al. (2017) argued that university courses play a crucial role in shaping students' attitudes and subsequent entrepreneurial behaviours. However, Sahban et al. (2016) observed that in Indonesia, while family and peer support are key enablers of entrepreneurial success, institutional support from universities and government agencies tends to be limited and underutilized. In contrast, Malaysia presents a different landscape. Government initiatives actively support entrepreneurial ventures through tax incentives, start-up programs, and the facilitation of networking and consulting services. These efforts can significantly influence individuals' perceptions of the desirability and feasibility of starting a social enterprise. University support in Malaysia—particularly through entrepreneurial education and structured knowledge transfer—also contributes meaningfully to students' intention to engage in social entrepreneurship. Based on these insights, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- H1: There is a positive relationship between university support and SEI
- H2: There is a positive relationship between university support and ATSE.
- H3: There is a positive relationship between university support and SN.
- H4: There is a positive relationship between university support and PBC.

2.2 The Influence of Theory of Planned Behavior to SEI

In TPB, the attitudinal constructs consist three elements, ATSE, SN and PBC. A vast amount of research has considered the relationship concerning these attitudinal constructs of TPB as the determinant of SEI (Luc, 2018; Politis et al., 2016). First, ATSE is the favorable or unfavorable attitude shown by the respondent to deal with the tested SE behavior. Much empirical evidence confirms that ATSE has a positive effect on SEI. A study by Mohamed et al. (2012) looked into 410 students and confirmed a significant association between attitude and intention to become agri-entrepreneurs. In another comparative study by Yang et al. (2015), the effect of attitude on SEI is significantly stronger for individuals who stay in the USA than for those in China. This signifies that attitude is less significant in China than in the USA in determining SEI. In line with the empirical evidence, this present study understands the ATSE as the degree to which the individual holds a positive or negative personal evaluation of becoming a social entrepreneur. Therefore, the classical TPB assumes a positive effect exists between attitude toward a specific behavior (i.e., social entrepreneurship) and intentions.

Despite a favorable attitude among students who intend to be an entrepreneur, some studies that contribute attitudes to intention can be positive or negative in nature or can be insignificant towards a specific behavior. For example, Feakes et al. (2019) found that attitude has a low contribution to intention in the specific phenomenon suggesting that concerning the types of career and types of industry. In the study, they claimed that attitude has negatively predicted 844 Australian veterinarians' intentions in health care entrepreneurial industry. This make senses; when becoming a veterinarian, attitude alone is not enough. The crucial factor is the knowledge of understanding of the overall health care entrepreneurial ecosystem. In a separate study, Molino et al. (2018) established the indirect link with university support to entrepreneurial intentions through 'perceived desirability' (e.g., ATSE).

SN is the most controversial construct of TPB. Some empirical analyses showed that SN is a significant predictor of intention and behavior. Other studies have shown the opposite. For example, studies reveal that SN has a positive effect on the choice of travel mode, the decision to complete high school, the effects on new technology implementation and information security. It is also verified that SN influences SEI among university students

(Politis et al., 2016). Students have always been influenced by those who are close to them; therefore, choosing the right surroundings (i.e., reference group) will assist them to rise the SN. These reference groups could be lecturers, parents, friends, classmates or other relatives. This present study measures how far these reference group can encourage student's opinion, idea and desire on to participate or not participate in SE activities.

On the other hand, Budiman and Wijaya (2014) revealed the purpose of the SN as the primary factor for explaining individual intention-behavior, but they reveal a negative correlation between SN and intention. This means that an individual with high SN has a low intention to buy, whereas, low SN leads to a high intention to buy. Another study by Luc (2018) found that the SN path fails to reach statistical significance and has less field-specific predictors of entrepreneurial intention. He claimed that unlike normal forms of business; social enterprises are those enterprises that operate not for profit and social entrepreneurs need special characteristics. These characteristics are completely different from normal entrepreneurs, so the impact from family, friends and colleagues does not seem to affect student's SEI.

Past scholars agree that PBC makes a substantial contribution in predicting intention (Farooq, 2018; Wahid et al., 2022). It can be measured by questioning the ability to perform a behavior or the ability to deal with specific inhibiting or facilitating factors. The more an individual believes in own ability to start and operate a social enterprise, the stronger their intention to become a social entrepreneur (Chipeta, 2015; Tiwari et al., 2018). Empirical research by Chipeta (2015) tested 350 students and found a positive relationship between PBC and SEI. Altawallbeh et al. (2015) also revealed that PBC positively acts as a factor in influencing entrepreneurship intention. This study found that if the PBC is low, the entrepreneurial intention is significantly low too.

PBC was presented in the TPB to address criticism for the assumption that human behavior is under a degree of volitional control (Ajzen, 1991). In certain circumstances, the role of PBC can be negative or insignificant in nature (Ajzen, 1991). For example, Mohamad et al. (2015) stated that graduates in Malaysia have many opportunities to opt entrepreneurship as their career choices. However, there are not many graduates seizing the opportunity to become one. At this point, the decision to start a business (entrepreneurial intention) was influenced by both the student's personal circumstance and their contextual circumstances (i.e., entrepreneurial training, funds, time, business coaching) (Molaei et al., 2015; Usman & Yennita, 2019). Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H5: There is a positive relationship between ATSE and SEI.

H6: There is a positive relationship between SN and SEI.

H7: There is a positive relationship between PBC and SEI.

H8: ATSE mediates the relationship between university support and SEI.

H9: SN mediates the relationship between university support and SEI.

H10: PBC mediates the relationship between university support and SEI.

3.0 METHOD

This present study uses quantitative research methods that permit us to remain objective to the results (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). Moreover, Hair et al. (2018) recommended that if a study's objective is concerned with identifying the predictors influence the outcome or understanding the most powerful predictors of the outcome; then the quantitative approach is the best. In this present study, there are five variables namely university support, ATSE, SN, PBC and SEI involved. The data were collected from the university's students and the study is trying to determine if there is any possible relationship occurs among those variables.

3.1 Population and Sample Procedures

The survey was administered to students registered for an entrepreneurship course in Indonesia. The target population comprised undergraduate students from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Undergraduates constitute an appropriate model for this study because undergraduate status represents a developmental stage preceding entrepreneurial engagement (Barton et al., 2018; Hockerts, 2017; Politis et al., 2016), which justifies their selection as the sample population for investigating SEI.

Offline and online surveys were self-administrated to 400 students. Data collection took place in October 2020 and lasted for four weeks, employing simple random sampling design. It refers to sampling plans where the sample has an equal probability of being chosen. A simple random sample is meant to be an unbiased representation of a group (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).

3.2 Measurement of The Theoretical Construct

The survey is separated into four parts, Section A to Section D. The measurement of university support, ATSE, SN, PBC and SEI were built with reference to existing literature. Later, they were modified and improvised to suit this present study. We identify a total of 39-items that fit the research objectives of the study. The questions in section A covered the university support, which was adapted and improvised from Shen et al. (2017). While in section B, the questions covered includes ATSE, SN and PBC which was adapted and modified from Ernst (2011) and Liñán and Chen (2009). The questions in section C cover SEI, the items were borrowed and improvised from Liñán and Chen (2009). Lastly, the questions in section D covered the background of students, such as gender, age, level of education, and family background, were all collected in this study.

There are five latent variables in this study which were extracted from the established TPB by Ajzen (1991) and modelled after SEI by Mair and Noboa (2006). The constructs used in this study are well known in psychology and entrepreneurship studies, and their reliable and valid measurement scales are also available. Each variable was measured on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1= Completely disagree to 7= Completely agree. This frequency type scale was suggested by Ajzen (1991) and Ernst (2011) as being suitable for measuring behaviour. This scale gives the weight of the responses based on the respondents' level of agreement on the questionnaires.

4.0 EMPIRICAL RESULTS

To analyze the data, two-stage analysis was adopted. During the first-stage analysis, descriptive analysis was used to summarize the respondents' profiles was performed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. During the second-stage analysis, inferential statistics analysis, specifically SEM, was performed to test the relationships between the exogenous variables and endogenous variables (Hair et al., 2018). SEM is used as a more powerful approach as compared to multiple regressions, path analysis, factor analysis, time series analysis, and analysis of covariance. Our conceptual model is proposed to test the SEM technique using IBM Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 26.0 software.

4.1 First-Stage Result

4.1.1 Demographic Profile

Out of 400 survey questions distributed via offline and online platform, only 318 were useful and analyzed. The students who took part in this survey were (74.84%, n=238) female and 25.16 percent (n=80) male. Most students were in the age range 23-27 years old (52.2%, n=166), followed by 18-22 years old (41.2%, n=131), and 28-32 years old (6.6%, n=21). Most

of the students (64.78%, n=206) have a degree qualification, followed by (35.22%, n=112) of the students with a diploma. Finally, a majority of the students (72.96%, n=232) come from business family background whilst the remaining students (27.04%, n=86) are not from business background.

Table 1: Result of demographic result

| Category | Items | Total | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------|--------------|-------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 80 | 25.16 |
| | Female | 238 | 74.84 |
| Age | 18-22 | 131 | 41.20 |
| | 23-27 | 166 | 52.20 |
| | 28-32 | 21 | 6.60 |
| Education Qualification | Diploma | 112 | 35.22 |
| | Degree | 206 | 64.78 |
| Family Background | Business | 232 | 72.96 |
| | Non-Business | 86 | 27.04 |

4.2 Second-Stage Result

4.2.1 Assessment on The Measurement Model

Model fit indices refer to how well the observed data fit the hypothetical model (Hair et al., 2018). Model fit indices are divided into three categories: absolute fit indices (AFI), incremental fit indices (IFI) and parsimony fit indices (PFI). Based on Table 2, these five fit indices meet the requirement as recommended by Hair et al. (2018) who suggested that if three to four of the Goodness-of-Fit indices meets the requirement, then the model is acceptable.

Table 2: Result of measurement model

| Fit Indices | AFI | | IFI | | PFI |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Relative Chi Square (<5.0) | RMSEA (<=0.080) | CFI (>=0.900) | TLI (>=0.900) | PGFI (>=0.500) |
| Measurement model | 2.377 | 0.055 | 0.913 | 0.907 | 0.650 |

a. Testing the convergent validity

Convergent validity refers to a set of variables or items that is assumed to measure a construct and to share a high proportion of common variance (Hair et al., 2018). It is tested by using Factor Loadings and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Convergent validity of these constructs is university support (0.880 to 0.912), ATSE (0.799 to 0.885), SN (0.820 to 0.932), PBC (0.718 to 0.829) and SEI (0.708 to 0.920). Factor loading for all items is greater than 0.500, which signifies that the set of variables in this present study meets one of the important components of convergent validity. In this present study, the AVE for the five latent variables is university support (0.623), ATSE (0.767), SN (0.811), PBC (0.694) and SEI (0.894). Thus, convergent validity is achieved as factor loading for all items is greater than 0.500 and AVE is greater than 0.500, therefore, all the construct in model is statistically significant.

b. Testing the construct reliability

The five composite reliabilities are as follows: university support (0.893), ATSE (0.943), SN (0.902), PBC (0.951) and SEI (0.988). Furthermore, the Cronbach’s alpha for the study of all variables ranged from 0.880 to 0.988, some of which are greater than the recommended threshold of 0.600 (Hair et al., 2018). Therefore, the composite reliability is valid, and all variables were consistent and reliable in representing the same latent construct.

c. Testing the discriminant validity

We also included the discriminant validity index summary for all variables involved in the model to ensure that they are discriminant among each other. The result is presented in a diagonal value, which discriminant validity is achieved if the diagonal values (in bold) are greater than any other values in its row and column. Thus, the study concludes that the validity for all constructs is achieved.

Table 3: Result of discriminant validity

| Variables | AVE and r^2 | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | US | ATSE | SN | PBC | SEI |
| US | 0.663 | | | | |
| ATSE | 0.229 | 0.778 | | | |
| SN | 0.018 | 0.003 | 0.697 | | |
| PBC | 0.122 | 0.130 | 0.010 | 0.724 | |
| SEI | 0.362 | 0.229 | 0.009 | 0.228 | 0.811 |

Note: US=University support, SN=subjective norm, PBC=perceived behavioral control, ATSE=attitude towards social entrepreneurship, SEI=social entrepreneurship intention

4.2.2 Assessment on The Structural Model

The structural model denotes one endogenous relationship linking the hypothesized model’s variables. In this study, the focus of structural model is to examine and test the interrelationship between exogenous and endogenous variables. A total of 10 hypotheses were analyzed according to research questions one until ten. The current study fit indices values are Relative Chi-Square=2.783, RMSEA=0.065, CFI=0.935, TLI=0.927 and PGFI=0.714. As these five fit indices meet the requirement as recommended by Hair et al. (2018).

Table 4: Result of structural model

| Fit Indices | AFI | | IFI | | PFI |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Relative Chi Square (<5.0) | RMSEA (<=0.080) | CFI (>=0.900) | TLI (>=0.900) | PGFI (>=0.500) |
| Structural model | 2.783 | 0.065 | 0.935 | 0.927 | 0.714 |

a. Testing the direct relationship

Basically, H1-H7 is testing the direct relationship among all variables. The results were presented in Table 4, showing that the relationship between ATSE and SEI was $\beta=0.021$, $p=0.307$ which signifies that ATSE is not significantly related to SEI, thus, the hypothesized relationship (H5) is not supported. Hence, the link between university support and SEI was also not significantly related to ATSE, thus, the hypothesized relationship (H2) is not supported.

Table 5: Results of direct relationship

| Hypotheses | Causal Path | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | p |
|------------|-------------|----------|-------|-------|--------------|
| H1 | US→SEI | 0.339 | 0.058 | 5.852 | *** |
| H2 | US →ATSE | 0.120 | 0.063 | 1.914 | 0.075 |
| H3 | US →SN | 0.426 | 0.074 | 5.737 | *** |
| H4 | US →PBC | 0.458 | 0.058 | 7.852 | *** |
| H5 | ATSE→SEI | 0.021 | 0.040 | 0.515 | 0.307 |
| H6 | SN→SEI | 0.185 | 0.038 | 4.933 | *** |
| H7 | PBC→SEI | 0.339 | 0.058 | 5.862 | *** |

Note: US=University support, SN=subjective norm, PBC=perceived behavioral control, ATSE=attitude towards social entrepreneurship, SEI=social entrepreneurship intention

b. Testing the indirect relationship

The initial prediction is that ATSE will positively and significantly mediate the relationship between university support and SEI. Surprisingly, the results of the Bootstrapping mediation analysis, presented in Table 5, showed that the standardized indirect effect of ATSE was not significant ($\beta=0.210$, $p=0.086$). Also as indicated by Preacher and Hayes (2008) the indirect effect 0.210, 95 percent Bootstrap BC [LB=0.295, UB=0.358] suggest that ATSE is not an underlying factor for explaining the relationship between university support and SEI. These results suggested that ATSE is not an underlying factor for explaining the relationship between university support and SEI. Thus, H8 was not supported.

H9 predicted that SN will positively and significantly mediate the relationship between university support and SEI. The results of the Bootstrapping mediation analysis showed that the standardized indirect effect of SN was significant ($\beta=0.098$, $p=0.002$). Also as indicated by Preacher and Hayes (2008) with a bias corrected bootstrap confidence interval that lies inside zero with 95 percent Bootstrap BC [LB=0.125, UB=0.110] suggest that SN significantly explains the relationship between university support and SEI. Thus, H9 was supported.

H10 predicted that PBC will positively and significantly mediate the relationship between university support and SEI. The results of the Bootstrapping mediation analysis showed that the standardized indirect effect of PBC was significant ($\beta=0.129$, $p=0.000$). Also as indicated by Preacher and Hayes (2008) with a bias corrected bootstrap confidence interval that lies inside zero with 95 percent Bootstrap BC [LB=0.241, UB=0.496]. suggest that PBC significantly explains the relationship between university support and SEI. Thus, H10 was supported.

Table 6: Results of indirect relationship

| Hypotheses | Standardized Indirect Effect (SIE) | β | p | 95% Bootstrap BC | |
|------------|------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | | | | LB | UB |
| H8 | US→ATSE→SEI | 0.210 | 0.086 | 0.295 | 0.412 |
| H9 | US→SN→SEI | 0.098 | 0.002 | 0.125 | 0.358 |
| H10 | US→PBC→SEI | 0.129 | 0.000 | 0.241 | 0.496 |

5.0 DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY

Out of the ten hypotheses tested, seven were supported, indicating a strong overall model fit and offering valuable insights into the SEI formation among Indonesian university students. In particular, the results highlight that university support exerts both direct and indirect influences

on SEI, validating the essential role that institutional ecosystems can play even within a developing higher education context such as Indonesia.

a. University support: Catalyst for SE intention in a developing landscape (H1, H3, H4)

First, university support was found to have a direct and significant influence on SEI (H1), confirming that institutional backing matters even in environments where infrastructure and resources are still maturing. In the Indonesian context, where entrepreneurship education and incubator facilities are often concentrated in urban centers, this finding signals that even modest support systems such as entrepreneurship courses, competitions, or faculty encouragement can foster meaningful entrepreneurial intentions.

Moreover, university support significantly influenced SN (H3) and PBC (H4). These results are particularly important given Indonesia's collectivist culture, where the opinions of family, peers, and community often shape individual choices. The data suggest that when universities create socially legitimizing platforms like student-led SE clubs or public showcases, students are more likely to feel both socially encouraged and personally capable of pursuing a social enterprise.

b. Social pressures and self-belief drive SEI (H6, H7)

The influence of SN (H6) and PBC (H7) on SEI was also found to be statistically significant. This reinforces Ajzen's TPB, where social expectations and perceived ability are stronger predictors of intention than personal attitude alone especially in societies like Indonesia that value harmony, duty, and community consensus. Students with exposure to entrepreneurship particularly those from family businesses likely possess greater self-efficacy, contributing to a stronger sense of behavioral control and intention.

c. SN and PBC bridge university support and SEI (H9, H10)

The mediating roles of SN (H9) and PBC (H10) were confirmed, adding an important nuance: universities influence SEI not by changing internal attitudes alone, but by shaping how students perceive their social surroundings and self-capacity. This indirect pathway reflects a culturally grounded mechanism, where students internalize institutional support through the lens of social validation and personal empowerment.

d. When ATSE does not engage (H2, H5, H8)

Interestingly, three hypotheses were not supported: the direct effect of university support on ATSE (H2), the effect of ATSE on SEI (H5), and the mediation of ATSE between university support and SEI (H8). While prior literature often emphasizes the role of attitude in predicting entrepreneurial behavior, this study suggests otherwise within the Indonesian context. We found over 70% of respondents came from business families. These students are likely exposed to real-world business operations early in life, reducing reliance on institutional inputs or attitude formation to trigger intent. Their SE motivation may be fueled more by practical exposure and inherited entrepreneurial norms than by reflective evaluations like ATSE.

Moreover, though university courses offer knowledge, they may not always resonate with students' personal or community struggles. In such cases, students may form favorable attitudes but still lack the emotional conviction or contextual urgency to translate those attitudes into action. This is aligned with studies like Feakes et al. (2019), where attitudes in certain professions (e.g., veterinary entrepreneurship) failed to predict intent due to gaps in domain knowledge or contextual relevance. It also echoes Ajzen's (1991) own caveat that background factors — like family, access to opportunity, or cultural norms — can bypass attitudes and directly influence intentions.

6.0 LIMITATION AND FUTURE AVENUES

We believe every finding should be interpreted within the limitations of the methodology employed. Firstly, this present study applied the method of quantitative research design, and the data were collected via questionnaire survey. Although, quantitative research methods can be used to determine the degree to which students undertake behaviors, but it limits the ability to examine the thoughts and feelings of research participants as well as the meaning that students attribute to their experiences. When we approach the students, we really want to know more about how students are involved in initial business start-up? How do they get courage to start-up business? Who is their role model? We would recommend for future researchers to use the mixed-method approach combining both quantitative and qualitative data to better explain SEI (Othman & Tengku Muda, 2018).

Secondly, this present study departed from prominent theories for understanding SEI of Ajzen's (1991) TPB and Mair and Noboa's (2006) SEI Model. The choice of these theories offers limited factors to be tested to understand the SEI formation. It would be beneficial for the future work to utilize other theories or models such as Social Cognitive Career Theory (Lent & Brown, 1994) and Entrepreneurial Potential Model (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994) for understanding how intention should be formed.

7.0 CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on SEI by highlighting the nuanced role of university support, especially within the Indonesian context. While existing literature has largely affirmed the positive relationship between university support and SEI, our findings suggest a more complex reality. In particular, students from entrepreneurial family backgrounds appear to possess strong internal motivation and entrepreneurial capability, enabling them to pursue social entrepreneurship despite limited institutional support. The presence of familial and peer support serves as a critical enabler, reinforcing the idea that informal networks can compensate for institutional shortcomings.

These insights carry important implications for stakeholders across education, government, and industry sectors. For universities, the findings signal the need to reassess and redesign their role—not just as providers of entrepreneurial knowledge, but as ecosystem builders that cultivate confidence, resilience, and opportunity pathways for students. For policymakers and SME stakeholders, the results emphasize the urgency of developing inclusive support structures that consider both formal and informal sources of entrepreneurial influence.

Ultimately, the findings reinforce the notion that while students may not explicitly demand institutional support, a proactive approach to nurturing the next generation of social entrepreneurs is essential. If Indonesia is to develop a robust and sustainable social enterprise landscape, it must invest in policies and programs that amplify both institutional and familial drivers of entrepreneurship—thereby empowering youth to move from aspiration to action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is funded by UiTM Cawangan Melaka under Geran Sempadan Antarabangsa Teja 2021 (GSAT2021/1-1).

REFERENCES

- Ab Wahid, H., Rhouse, S. M., Samsudin, N., Rahman, R. A., Mustaffa, W. S. W., & Abd Razak, A. Z. A. (2017). Kompetensi komunikasi dalam kalangan pelajar enactus dan bukan enactus di universiti awam Malaysia. *Journal of Humanities, Language, Culture and Business*, 1(1), 121-132.

- Ahuja, V., Akhtar, A., & Wal, O. P. (2019). Development of a comprehensive model of social entrepreneurial intention formation using a quality tool. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(41), 1-27.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Altawallbeh, M., Soon, F., Thiam, W., & Alshourah, S. (2015). Mediating role of attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control in the relationships between their respective salient beliefs and behavioral intention to adopt e-learning among instructors in Jordanian Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(11), 152- 159.
- Barton, M., Schaefer, R., & Canavati, S. (2018). To be or not to be a social entrepreneur: Motivational drivers amongst American business students. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 6(1), 6-35.
- Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Budiman, S., & Wijaya, T. (2014). Purchase intention of counterfeit products: The role of subjective norm. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 6(2), 145-152.
- Chipeta, E. M. (2015). *Social entrepreneurship intentions among university students in Gauteng* [Unpublished Master's dissertation]. North-West University, Africa.
- Chuah, F., Ting, H., Cyril de Run, E., & Cheah, J.-H. (2016). Reconsidering what entrepreneurial intention implies: The evidence from Malaysian university students. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(9), 85-98.
- Ernst, K. (2011). *Heart over mind-an empirical analysis of social entrepreneurial intention formation on the basis of the theory of planned behavior* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Wuppertal, Germany.
- Farooq, M. S. (2018). Modelling the significance of social support and entrepreneurial skills for determining entrepreneurial behaviour of individuals: A structural equation modelling approach. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 14(3), 242-266.
- Feakes, A., Palmer, E. J., Petrovski, K. R., Thmsen, D. A., Hyams, J. H., Cake, M. A., Webster, B., & Barber, S. R. (2019). Predicting career sector intent and the theory of planned behaviour: Survey findings from Australian veterinary science students. *BMC Veterinary Research*, 27, 1-13.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2018). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practices*, 41(1), 105-130.
- Jagannathan, R., Camasso, M. J., Das, B., Tosun, J., & Iyengar, S. (2017). Family, society, and the individual: Determinants of entrepreneurial attitudes among youth in Chennai, South India. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(4), 1-22.
- Krueger, N. F., & Brazeal, D. V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 18(3), 91-104.
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 45, 79-122.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practices*, 33(3), 593-617.
- Luc, P. T. (2018). The relationship between perceived access to finance and social entrepreneurship intentions among university students in Vietnam. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 5(1), 63-72.

- Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social enterprise get formed. In J. Mair, J. Robinson & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 121-134). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mohamad, N., Lim, H. E., Yusof, N., Kassim, M., & Abdullah, H. (2015). Estimating the choice of entrepreneurship as a career: The case of Universiti Utara Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 15(1), 65-80.
- Mohamed, Z., Rezai, G., Shamsudin, M. N., & Mahmud, M. M. (2012). Enhancing young graduates' intention towards entrepreneurship development in Malaysia. *Education+ Training*, 54(7), 605-618.
- Molaei, R., Zali, M. R., Mobaraki, M. H., & Farsi, J. Y. (2015). The impact of entrepreneurial ideas and cognitive style on student's entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 7(2), 148-167.
- Molino, M., Dolce, V., Cortese, C. G., & Ghislieri, C. (2018). Personality and social support as determinants of entrepreneurial intention: Gender differences in Italy. *PloS One*, 13(6), 1-19.
- Nasir, N. R., & Subari, M. D. (2017). A review of social innovation initiatives in Malaysia. *Journal of Science, Technology and Innovation Policy*, 3(1), 1-9.
- Othman, N., & Tengku Muda, T. N. A. A. (2018). Emotional intelligence towards entrepreneurial career choice behaviours. *Education+ Training*, 60(9), 953-970.
- Politis, K., Ketikidis, P., Diamantidis, A. D., & Lazuras, L. (2016). An investigation of social entrepreneurial intentions formation among South-East European postgraduate students. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 23(4), 1120-1141.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879-891.
- Sahban, M., Ramalu, S. S., & Syahputra, R. (2016). The influence of social support on entrepreneurial inclination among business students in Indonesia. *Information Management and Business Review*, 8(3), 32-46.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Shen, T., Osorio, E. A., & Settles, A. (2017). Does family support matter? The influence of support factors on entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions of college students. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 23(1), 24-43.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikotia, J. (2017). An empirical analysis of the factors affecting social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(9), 1-25.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikotia, J. (2018). Factors affecting an individual's intention to become a social entrepreneur. In A. Agrawal & P. Kumar (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and sustainable business models: The case of India* (pp. 59-98). Springer International Publishing.
- Tran, A. T. P. (2018). *Social entrepreneurial intention: An empirical study in Vietnam* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universitat Koblenz and Landau, Germany.
- Usman, B., & Yennita. (2019). Understanding the entrepreneurial intention among international students in Turkey. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(10), 1-21.
- Wahid, S. D. M., Ayob, A. H., & Hussain, W. M. H. W. (2022). Examining the antecedents of social entrepreneurship intention: Empirical evidence from Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 30(3/4), 488-507.

- Yang, R., Meyskens, M., Zheng, C., & Hu, L. (2015). Social entrepreneurship intentions: China versus the USA-is there difference? *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 16(4), 253-267.
- Zhang, K. (2024). Social entrepreneurs, market dynamics, and social enterprise innovation: An empirical study based on the global entrepreneurship monitor. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15, 8815–8841.