

## THE ROLES OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP INTENTION IN MALAYSIA

<sup>1</sup>Siti Daleela Mohd Wahid; <sup>2</sup>Shafinar Ismail; <sup>3</sup>Hazrel Moktar; <sup>4</sup>Wan Mohd Hirwani Wan Hussain; <sup>5</sup>Abu Hanifah Ayob

<sup>1,2</sup>Centre of Islamic Philanthropy & Social Finance and Faculty of Business Management, UiTM Melaka

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Business Management, UiTM Melaka

<sup>4</sup>Graduate School of Business, The National University of Malaysia

<sup>5</sup>Faculty of Economic & Management, The National University of Malaysia

Email: [sitid365@uitm.edu.my](mailto:sitid365@uitm.edu.my)

---

### KEYWORD

Social entrepreneurship  
Intention  
Demographic  
Enactus

---

### ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship (SE) is an innovative entrepreneurial approach gaining great interest from many parties due to its significant effects on the social and economic transformation. However, the current prevalence rate among Malaysian involving in SE recorded at the lowest level comparing to the neighboring countries like Singapore and Thailand. As suggested by previous literature, to investigate the factors lead to the issue, first step, we need to identify the profiling characteristics of the citizen who can be the potential social entrepreneurs. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to determine the demographic characteristics such as gender, age, category of institution and duration of being involve in SE-based program with the SE intention. We used stratified sampling technique to select the sample of 419 university students. The data was analyzed by using SPSS version 25. We proposed four hypotheses to be tested and surprising, there is a significant difference between category of institutions and SE intention. It is affirmed that students from public institutions has high intention to be a social entrepreneur as compared to students from private universities. Moreover, gender, age and duration of being involve in SE-based program have no significant difference towards student's SE intention. Discussion were made. Lastly, limitations of this paper as well as future research directions were enunciated clearly.

---

### INTRODUCTION

Social Entrepreneurship (SE) is an innovative entrepreneurial approach that uses business skills to undertake entrepreneurial activities that address socioeconomic problems and pursue social values. Currently, this innovative approach is of 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 (Ahuja et al., 2019; Barton et al., 2018; Chinchilla & Garcia, 2017; Hockerts, 2017; Medyanik & Al-Jawni, 2017). It is evident from the burgeoning literature of se that the qualities and characteristic possessed by social entrepreneurs should be nurtured among university students (Siti Daleela et al., 2018). Early emphasis at the university level is believed to be favorable to arousing their minds and attitudes to be more creative. This exposure can benefit the student whereby, the student needs to think critically on how to assist the less-privileged community to transform the lives to be better (Abu Hanifah, 2017; Noor Faizah et al., 2012).

On the other hand, the aspiration of students to become social entrepreneurs can inspire their career choice once they have graduated (Radin Siti Aishah *et al.*, 2016). 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 the socio-economic issues by placing those less fortunate towards a better life (Suhaimi *et al.*, 2013; Tran, 2017). However, the prevalence rate of se activity in Malaysia is less than 2% of the entire population which is far behind comparable developing countries such as Thailand, Indonesia and Argentina (Radin Siti Aishah *et al.*, 2016). Bosma *et al.*, (2016) and global entrepreneurship monitor 2015 (special topic report on social entrepreneurship) claim that malaysian citizens in the 18-64 age bracket who are active as social entrepreneurs is one of the lowest levels when compared to other efficiency-driven economies.

The fact that se levels are low is a 'problem' for malaysian society, as the country may be missing out on an innovative way to support its citizens (Noor Rizawati & Mustafa Din, 2017; Wan Mohd Hirwani *et al.*, 2014). With this regard, it is timely to identify the characteristic of a social entrepreneur to ensure we occupied the potential social entrepreneur with skills and knowledge of se. Therefore, this study advances the studies of Chipeta *et al.* (2016), Nga & Shamuganathan (2010), Radin Siti Aishah *et al.* (2016) and Noorseha *et al.* (2013) both theoretically and methodologically. Theoretically, Chipeta *et al.* (2016) and Tran & Tran (2018) investigating gender and age characteristics only. in this present, we broaden the characteristic's by adding category of institutions and duration of being active in the social-based program. Previous studies, Nga & Shamuganathan (2010) and Radin Siti Aishah *et al.* (2016) looked at private and public university students separately, or only studied a small number of institutions (noorseha *et al.*, 2013). this present study is unique by greatly expanding the sample to include a large number of students at both public and private institutions.

## HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

### Social Entrepreneurship in Malaysia

Social entrepreneurial conduct is noticeable in Malaysia since 1986 by Prof. David Gibbons and Prof. Sukor Kassim with the founding of the Cooperation and Ikhtiar Project which combine the concept of entrepreneurship and social development (Mohd Ali Bahari & Suhaimi, 2016; Raudah, Wan Fauziah & Norliza, 2018). Since then, the growth has increased number of social-based intermediaries such as myHarapan, iM4U, Impact Hub, Tandemic, Social Enterprise Alliance, Enactus Foundation and local HLIs which are actively generating consciousness of social enterprise and assisting their communities with numerous SE activities (Malaysia Global Innovation & Creativity Center, 2015).

Although SE is a newly evolving, but it has a great potential to help Malaysia Education Blueprint-Higher Education (2015-2025) to produce more balanced, holistic and entrepreneurial graduates (Hariyaty, 2014; Norasmah *et al.*, 2006). Alongside, the government has designed and developed entrepreneurial-based program at university level to ensure every student possess entrepreneurial skills to prepare them with real-work reality. Indirectly, if the entrepreneurial skills are nurtured among university students, the country would not have to worry because SE can single-handedly eradicate unemployment and poverty.

## Demographic Characteristic of a Social Entrepreneur

Past literature have confirmed demographic factors influenced on se (Hariyaty, 2014). Therefore, this study tested the se demographic characteristic (i.e., gender, category of institutions and duration of being active in any social program). These characteristics were chosen as the demographic factors of the study because they were empirically proven to be closely related to entrepreneurial intention. testing these profiling characteristics is in line with previous studies by Hariyaty (2014) and Radin Siti Aishah *et al.* (2016).

### Gender

Gender gives many perceptions. For example, the responsibility to families and the pressures of society makes it difficult for the women to be successful in social or commercial entrepreneurship. As a result, negative influences by gender (women) are commonly found in the literature (Rambe & Ndofirepi, 2016; Davidsson & Honig, 2003). However, there are empirical evidences that entrepreneurship among women is on the rise (Chinomona & Maziriri, 2015; Serino & Buccino, 2019). In SE context, women participation in social-based activities is higher than the men (Hariyaty, 2014). Women are more likely to be social entrepreneurs, whilst, men are more likely to be commercial entrepreneurs (Ndofirepi *et al.*, 2018). In separate development, Camelo-Ordaz, Diáñez-González & Ruiz-Navarro (2016) has ascertained that entrepreneurship provides an equal opportunity for anyone regardless of gender. This is because whether a man or woman has greater passion and higher aspiration in entrepreneurial field, they can be successful. In similar fashion, Ab Aziz's (2003) assertion that the number of entrepreneurs is uprising and encouraging regardless of gender. Therefore, the proposed hypothesis is developed:

*H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant different between gender and intention to be a social entrepreneur*

### Age

According to Gielnik *et al.* (2012), business owners' age always overlooked by many scholars in entrepreneurship research. In separate study, Lévesque & Minniti (2006) confirmed that age has an effect on entrepreneurial intention and concluded that the intention reduces when an individual becomes older. Furthermore, Reynolds *et al.* (2002) find that younger people tend to be more active in new firm creation than older people. Zissimopoulos & Karoly (2007) believe that age is one of the "consistently strong determinants with higher propensities for self-employment among men, older workers, those who are more educated, and those who are married". Krueger & Brazeal (1994) find that age has both a direct and an indirect effect on an individual's entrepreneurial. In SE context, Chipeta *et al.* (2016) evidently found that younger students are less likely to engage in SE activities compared to their older counterparts. Consistent with the finding of Zissimopoulos & Karoly (2007) as age increases, the probability of self-employment also increases. In contrast, Chaudhary (2017) does not support age is inversely related to entrepreneurial inclination. Based on the preceding discussion, the proposed hypothesis as follow:

*H<sub>2</sub>: There is a significant different between age and intention to be a social entrepreneur*

### Category of institutions

Category or type of institution is referring to the public and private institution. Athayde (2012) proven that the type of institutions influences entrepreneurial intention. He found that students from private institutions were more likely to be self-employed as compared to students who were in public institutions. On the other hand, in Malaysian context, Norasmah *et al.* (2012) concluded that public university students in Malaysia have good entrepreneurial readiness in terms of desire and ability. In SE context, Mohd Izham *et al.* (2011) stated that 365 private institution students in

Malaysia have negative perceptions of SE. The student blames the entrepreneurial skills did not help them to compete in the job market compared to other skills. They also acknowledge that the level of entrepreneurial knowledge is at a moderate and weak level. Those students also make the entrepreneurial is the last resort for career option. With that regard, the proposed hypothesis as follow:

*H<sub>3</sub>: There is a significant different between category of institutions and intention to be a social entrepreneur*

#### **Duration of involving in social-based program**

The concept of student involvement or engagement states that students who are actively involved are dedicated to learning, spending a lot of time on campus, actively participating in student organizations and interacting regularly with faculty members and other students. On the other hand, students who are not actively involved often neglect their studies, spend less time on campus, less involve in co-curricular activities and do not interact regularly with other faculty members and fellow students (Astin, 1999). In SE context, Hariyaty (2014) stated that engagement is referring to the extent an individual is interested in, identifying and engaging with a job compared to other. It is believes, the more time student involves in social program, the higher intention to becoming a social entrepreneur. In contrast, the shorter student engages in SE program, less interest of start-up social enterprise. Thus, the proposed hypothesis as follow:

*H<sub>4</sub>: There is a significant different between duration of involving in social-based program and intention to be a social entrepreneur*

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study's population consists of active Enactus students from 17 institutions who participated in the 2018 Malaysia Enactus program. The respondents are students pursuing bachelor's degree program and participating in the Enactus program. Traditionally, the selection of undergraduate students is considered as one step before entering the self-employment (Politis et al., 2016), which is the primary reason why they are used as a sample population in research investigation of SE intention. In a similar vein, past research has also examined SE intention from undergraduate students' perspectives (Noorseha et al., 2013; Norasmah et al., 2012; Nga & Shamuganathan, 2010).

Stratified sampling technique has been applied, where the sample is divided into two strata, namely; (a) Public institution and (b) Private institution. In terms of sample size, there are few guidelines that have been suggested by previous researchers. After considering their suggestions, the authors have considered 500 samples. The demographic variables, such as gender, age, category of institutions and duration of being involve in social program are all collected in this study. The items for SE intention are borrowed and improvised from Linan & Chen (2009). Altogether, there are six SE intention items using 7-Likert scale ranging from 1 (Completely Disagree) to 7 (Completely Agree) which are used to measure the items.

In this study, the authors used Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 for data analysis. As for preliminary analysis, we used descriptive analysis to obtain the demographic profiles; as portray in Table 2. In addition, we also performed One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Independent Sample T-Test to investigate whether there were any significant differences among studied variables on SE intentions among university students.

### **RESEARCH RESULT**

### Reliability Analysis

Cronbach Alpha is a well-known estimation of internal consistency for the social sciences studies. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha is required to be more than 0.70, in indicating the reliable measures of their respective constructs (Hair et al., 2018). Thus, the higher the obtained value of coefficient, the more reliable is the measuring instrument. The result of Cronbach Alpha for SE intention construct as presented in Table 1 show all items are highly reliable.

Table 1: Reliability Analysis

SE intention items	Cronbach Alpha
I am willing to do anything to be a social entrepreneur	0.930
I will make every effort to start my own social enterprise	0.923
My professional goal is to become a social entrepreneur	0.915
I am determined to create a social enterprise in the future	0.916
I have a strong intention to start a social enterprise	0.917

### Demographic Analysis

Table 2 shows the demographic profile for those students who responded to the questionnaire. The 419 students who took part in this survey were 60.9% (N=255) female and 39.1 percent (N=164) male. Most students were 24 years old (15.5%, N=65), followed by 20 years old (14.8%, N=62), and 25 years old (14.3%, N=60). The information on the institution of students revealed that 81.1% (N=340) attended a public institution, while 18.9% (N = 79) attended a private institution. Last but not least, a majority of the students (37.7%, N=158) had been involve in SE-based program for 1 to 2 years, 24.1% (N=101) for less than a year (N=101), 19.3% (N=81) for 3 to 4 years, and 18.9% (N=79) for more than 5 years.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristic

Variable		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	164	60.9
	Female	255	39.1
Age	18	27	6.4
	19	48	11.5
	20	62	14.8
	21	37	8.8
	22	31	7.4
	23	50	11.9
	24	65	15.5
	25	60	14.3
Category of institution	Public	340	81.1
	Private	79	18.9
Duration of involving in social-based program	Less than a year	101	24.1
	1-2 years	158	37.7
	3-4 years	81	19.3
	More than 5 years	79	18.9

Independent sample T-Test Analysis

To analyze H<sub>1</sub> and H<sub>3</sub>, we performed independent sample t-test. In Table 3, given that Levene’s test was not significant and so the equal variance estimates are interpreted. Consulting t-value, df and two-tail significance, again no significant differences are apparent (p>.05). Therefore, we accept null hypothesis and reject the H<sub>1</sub> hypothesis. That mean, there is no difference in intention to be social entrepreneur between male and female, t (417) = -.408, p>.05.

Table 3: Independent Sample T-Test Result (Gender)

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SEI	Male	164	4.89	.892	.070
	Female	255	4.93	.874	.055

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SEI	Equal variances assumed	.369	.544	-.408	417	.684	-.036	.088	-.209	.137
	Equal variances not assumed			-.406	342.562	.685	-.036	.089	-.210	.138

In Table 4, given that Levene’s test was significant and so the equal variance estimates are interpreted. Consulting t-value, df and two-tail significance, again no significant differences are apparent (p<.05). Therefore, we accept H<sub>3</sub> and reject the null hypothesis. That mean, there is a significance difference in intention to be social entrepreneur between public and private students, t (417) = .024, p<.05.

Table 4: Independent Sample T-Test Result (Institution)

Group Statistics					
	Institution	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SEI	Public	340	4.87	.910	.049
	Private	79	5.09	.714	.080

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SEI	Equal variances assumed	5.151	.024	-1.958	417	.050	-.214	.110	-.430	.001
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.274	143.228	.024	-.214	.094	-.401	-.028

One-Way ANOVA Analysis

To analyze H<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>4</sub>, we performed one-way ANOVA test. In Table 5, the given F-value was not significant (p>.05). Consulting the df, the F-ratio and the F-probability, again no significant differences are apparent (p>.05). Therefore, we accept null hypothesis and reject the H<sub>2</sub> hypothesis. That mean, there is no difference in intention to be social entrepreneur across age group, F (8, 410) = .403, p>.05.

Table 5: One-way ANOVA Result (Age)

SEI								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
18	27	4.86	.898	.173	4.50	5.21	3	7
19	48	4.90	.994	.144	4.61	5.18	2	7
20	62	4.84	.965	.123	4.59	5.08	2	7
21	37	4.81	.908	.149	4.51	5.11	3	7
22	31	5.05	.997	.179	4.68	5.41	2	7
23	50	4.84	.753	.107	4.62	5.05	3	6
24	65	5.01	.924	.115	4.78	5.24	3	7
25	60	4.95	.781	.101	4.74	5.15	3	7
26	39	4.98	.707	.113	4.76	5.21	3	7
Total	419	4.91	.880	.043	4.83	5.00	2	7

ANOVA					
SEI					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.528	8	.316	.403	.919
Within Groups	321.094	410	.783		
Total	323.621	418			

Similarly, Table 6 also portrayed no significant difference (p>.05). Reading the F-value, again no significant differences are apparent (p>.05). Therefore, we accept null hypothesis and reject the H<sub>4</sub> hypothesis. That mean, there is no difference in intention to be social entrepreneur across duration participating in social based program, F (3, 415) = 1.185, p>.05.

Table 6: One-way ANOVA Result (Duration involving in social-based program)

SEI								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than a year	101	5.04	.835	.083	4.87	5.20	3	7
1-2 years	158	4.83	.883	.070	4.69	4.97	2	7
3-4 years	81	4.93	.968	.108	4.71	5.14	2	7
More than 5 years	79	4.91	.831	.093	4.73	5.10	3	7
Total	419	4.91	.880	.043	4.83	5.00	2	7

ANOVA					
SEI					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.749	3	.916	1.185	.315
Within Groups	320.872	415	.773		
Total	323.621	418			

## DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY

### **H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant different between gender and intention to be a social entrepreneur**

This study found that there was no significant difference between se intention and gender who actively participating in the social program. this has proven that any social program is not gender-biased and it is suitable for both genders. This finding was supported by Camelo-Ordaz, Diáñez-González & Ruiz-Navarro (2016) and Hariyaty (2014) who found that gender factors do not influence entrepreneurship. On the other hand, the finding of this study is contradictory with the result from Suhaili & Azlan's (2006) study. They claimed there is significant differences on gender among 381 students of Universiti Malaya on entrepreneurial inclination. In their study, the muslim male students at the universiti malaya are more likely to be self-employed (venture into entrepreneurship) than female students who are more comfortable choosing to work in an organization.

At this point, male students are more dominant in entrepreneurial-based occupation, although female students are the majority group in the institutions (Mohd Nasir & Sakina, 2009). This scenario is consistent with what is happening in the South Africa, where according to (Ndofirepi et al., 2018) men are more likely to engage in business-related activities than women. Similarly, in West Sumatra Indonesia, the study of Isteti et al. (2011) also found men is more aggressive in terms of identifying entrepreneurial opportunities. This may be due to the personal characteristics of male students who are indeed more independent and 'adventurous'.

From the author's point of view, both male and female need to be motivated and have courage to involve in entrepreneurship-related activities. In fact, this study supports that male and female students need to have same levels of interest in SE to enable them to succeed in entrepreneurship realm. Participating in any social program helps to produce equitable results between gender. University has created a universal and not gender-specific programs that helps to eliminate social problems among societies. Every program that has a gender-bias needs to be re-structured and re-evaluated. This is to ensure; no gender discrimination happens. Therefore, this study supports the findings by Camelo-Ordaz, Diáñez-González & Ruiz-Navarro (2016) and Hariyaty (2014) who calling for no gender difference in dealing with SE-related program.

### **H<sub>2</sub>: There is a significant different between age and intention to be a social entrepreneur**

This study found that there was no significant difference between SE intention and age of student who actively participating in the social program. This has proven that any social program is not age-biased, and it is suitable across age group. This finding is inconsistent with many previous studies which confirm that age is negatively associated with entrepreneurial intention (Chipeta et al., 2016; Lévesque & Minniti, 2006; Reynolds et al., 2002). However, this result is supported by Chaudhary (2017) who claimed age is inversely related to entrepreneurial inclination.

From the author's point of view, in Malaysia context, age ranges do not affect SE intention. Meanwhile, some studies confirm that people mostly decide to establish their own social enterprise



at below 30 years old (Malaysian Global Innovation and Creativity, 2015). This fact calls for further research to investigate the impact of age on SE intention. It is still insufficient to conclude whether SE intention will decrease over time or other unknown factors actually decrease intention of old people. Therefore, this study supports the findings by Chaudhary (2017) who calling for no age difference in dealing with SE-related program.

**H<sub>3</sub>: There is a significant different between category of institutions and intention to be a social entrepreneur**

Category of institutions is another demographic profile that the author will be discussed. The idea of discussing this characteristic is in line with Athayde's (2012) suggestion that the category institutions involved is a factor that distinguishes entrepreneurial tendencies or students' starting a business. In this regard, the findings of this study indicate that there is a significant difference in SE between university students from public institutions and private institutions. The findings of this study support the results of the study of Norasmah et al. (2012) found that entrepreneurship readiness among 1000 students studying in public universities in Malaysia is high. Internal and external factors of public universities are seen to influence entrepreneurship readiness from a student perspective.

In the context of SE, the students from public institutions have higher SE than students from private institutions. One question raised on this matter: Why students from private institutions do not have the same level of SE as students from public institutions? Is it because the approach of a private institutions is synonymous with the motive for profit-making affects the SE level of its students? A study by Mohd Izham et al. (2011) reported on 365 private HLIs students in Malaysia have negative perceptions of entrepreneurship. These group of students claimed that entrepreneurial skills did not help them in the searching for job compared to other employment skills.

From the author's point of view, the current structure of Malaysia entrepreneurial education needs to be revised entirely to help entrepreneurship-driven education programs be implemented. As recommended by Syed Zamberi (2013), he stated all entrepreneurial education should be done not just with specific institutions (public or private) but has to go through all phases of education. In fact, the former Minister of Higher Education hopes that new initiatives that could boost the quality and quantity of higher education could be realized while making meaningful contributions to society. Therefore, this study fully supports the recommendation of Mohd Izham et al. (2011), Norasmah et al. (2012) and Syed Zamberi (2013) who calling for the need for improvement and reform in the areas of entrepreneurship skills in institutions to reduce the gap between public and private institutions. As entrepreneurial skills are enhanced, it can be used for SE purposes as well as entrepreneurial skills to solve community-related problems.

**H<sub>4</sub>: There is a significant different between duration of involving in social-based program and intention to be a social entrepreneur**

The duration of being active in SE-related program, revealed that the longer students active in the program, the better person would the student be. Obviously, the duration of engagement plays an important role in distinguishing student's characteristics of becoming a social entrepreneur. In this study, the findings indicate that there is no significant difference in SE in term of duration participate in social activities. Astin's (1999) states that to cultivate an entrepreneurialism trait, requires adequate involvement and engagement in the program. Astin suggested that the time period for student-focused engagement has an impact on the effectiveness of a program. This is supported by Mazura (2015) who studied the effectiveness of consultation-based learning among Polytechnic students and concluded that the duration of training or student involvement in a program should be in line with the program requirements. Long of time can be tedious while short periods of time can be difficult to understand and learn. In separate study, Rahmah et al. (2010) mentioned the

duration of involvement in a training program or study is also an important indicator of a person's level of employment. They found that 567 employees who attended the training in the last five years had 0.26 points higher compared to those who did not attend.

However, Bazionelos's (2004) study shared different findings. He claimed the Big Five personality traits among 279 white-collar electrical employees have weak relationship to work engagement or duration. Ironically, to nurture a personality trait certainly requires sufficient time, but the personality traits that is formed has nothing to do with work engagement. In SE context, being active in social activities such as for more than one year, there is a positive reaction on student's SE behavior (Astin, 1999). Therefore, the findings of this study revealed, there were no statistically significant differences between duration of involving in social related activities and SE intention.

### CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

This present study was driven by the gap in the literature on the relationship between demographic variables with SE intention. The literature for these variables showed few theoretical and empirical studies on the relationship between studied variables stimulating condition for SE intention. Empirical evidences on demographic profile and SE were limited, thus inclining us to study the relationship between these variables among students in the Malaysia context. Out of four hypotheses, only one hypothesis is supported. The summary of the hypotheses presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Summary of hypotheses

Hypotheses	Result
H <sub>1</sub> : There is a significant different between gender and intention to be a social entrepreneur	Not supported
H <sub>2</sub> : There is a significant different between age and intention to be a social entrepreneur	Not supported
H <sub>3</sub> : There is a significant different between category of institution and intention to be a social entrepreneur	Supported
H <sub>4</sub> : There is a significant different between duration of involving in social-based program and intention to be a social entrepreneur	Not supported

Although this study contributes more empirical results in the field, it also has some limitations, so it calls for further research on this field. The sample of this study only covered university students in Malaysia. In order to improve its generalizability, future research could expand the study to polytechnics and school to improve the generalizability of the study. Moreover, some findings from this study are inconsistent with many previous studies in other countries so it calls for further research to test the relationship between demographic factors (i.e., age, gender and duration participating in social activities) on SE intention. In this study, we employed quantitative methodology as it is dominant in the field of entrepreneurial research and this creates a significant limitation of research in this field since methodological paucity weakens the testing and development of theory beyond counting number of instances of an event which is business start-up or self-employment (Nguyen, 2018). Hence, future studies utilizing qualitative method or mixed method are expected to provide a holistic research methodology and a more comprehensive outlook of the antecedents and determinants that trigger SE behavior among students.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to extend deepest thank you Ministry of Education [Reference code: FRGS/1/2018/SS03/UITM/02/24] for providing the research funds.

### REFERENCES

- Abu Hanifah, A. (2017). Diversity, trust and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 1-12.
- 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.
- Astin, A.W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 1(1), 518-529.
- Athayde, R. (2012). The impact of enterprise education on attitudes to enterprise in young people: an evaluation study. *Education + Training* 54,(8/9), 709-726.
- 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.
- Bazonelos, N. (2004). The big five of personality and work involvement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(1), 69-81.
- Bosma, N., Schøtt, T., Terjesen, S., & Kew, P. (2016). Special topic report on social entrepreneurship. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitors*, 2015-2016.
- Camelo-Ordaz, C., Diáñez-González, J.P., & Ruiz-Navarro, J. (2016). The influence of gender on entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of perceptual factors. *Business Research Quarterly*, 19(4), 261-277.
- Chaudhary, R. (2017). Demographic factors, personality and entrepreneurial inclination: A study among Indian university students. *Education+ Training*, 59(2), 171-187.
- Chinchilla, A., & Garcia, M. (2017). Social entrepreneurship intention: Mindfulness towards a duality of objectives. *Humanist Management Journal*, 1(2), 205-214.
- Chipeta E.M., Koloba H.A., & Surujlal J. (2016). Influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurship intentions among university students in Gauteng Province, South Africa. *Gender & Behavior*, 14(1), 6885-6899.
- Chinomona, E., & Maziriri, E.T. (2015). Women in action: Challenges facing women entrepreneurs in the Gauteng Province of South Africa. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 14(6), 835-850.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 301-331.
- Gielnik, M. M., Zacher, H., & Frese, M. (2012). Focus on opportunities as a mediator of the relationships between business owners' age and venture growth. *Journal of Business*

*Venturing*, 27, 127-142.

- Hair, J.F, Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2018). *Multivariate data analysis*. 8th edition. Andover: Cengage Learning, EMEA.
- Hariyaty, A.W. (2014). *Keusahawanan sosial, daya tahan dan daya saing pelajar institusi pengajian tinggi di Malaysia*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practices*, 41(1), 105-130.
- Isteti, M., Nor Aishah, B., & Muhammad, H. (2011). Hubungan pemikiran dan tingkahlaku keusahawanan terhadap kesediaan mengenal peluang perniagaan pelajar IPT di Padang, Sumatera Barat Indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Penyelidikan Siswazah UKM*. pp.239-242.
- Krueger, N.F., & Brazeal, D.V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 91-104.
- Lévesque, M., & Minniti, M. (2006). The effect of aging on entrepreneurial behavior. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(2), 177- 194.
- 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.
- Medyanik, O., & Al-Jawni, F. (2017). An investigation of students' social entrepreneurial intentions in Syria: An empirical test. In. Marx Gómez J., Aboujaoude M., Feghali K. & Mahmoud T. (eds.). *Modernizing Academic Teaching and Research in Business and Economics: International Conference MATRE 2016, Beirut, Lebanon*, pp.85-114. Cham: Springer.
- Mohd Nasir, K., & Sakina, S.A.F. (2009). Isu-isu pengurusan sumber manusia dalam sektor pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Latihan*, 1(1), 1-21.
- Ndofirepi, T.M., Rambe, P., & Dzansi, D.Y. (2018). An exploratory study on the gender-based differences in entrepreneurial intention and its antecedents amongst students of a South African University of Technology. *Southern African Business Review*, 22 (4345), 1-28.
- Malaysian Global Innovation and Creativity (2015).
- Malaysia Education Blueprint (2015-2025) (Higher Education)
- Mazura, M. (2015). *Keberkesanan pembelajaran berasaskan konsultasi terhadap tekad keusahawanan pelajar politeknik*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Mohd Ali Bahari, A.K., & Suhaimi, M.S. (2016). Social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneur and social enterprise: A review of concepts, definitions and development in Malaysia. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Islamic Research* 4(2), 1-16.
- Mohd. Izham et al. (2011). Analisis Keperluan Majikan Terhadap Kemahiran Generik bagi Pembangunan Modal Insan. In Zamri, M., Jamalul Lail, A.B., & Mohamed Sani, I. (Edited). *Transformasi dan Inovasi dalam Penyelidikan*. Bangi: Penerbit UKM.

- Nga, J.K.H., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 259-282.
- Nguyen, C. (2018). Demographic factors, family background and prior self-employment on entrepreneurial intention - Vietnamese business students are different: Why? *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(10), 1-17.
- Noor Faizah, M.L., Hardy Loh, R., & Jamalunlaili, A. (2012). Social entrepreneurship at Universiti Teknologi MARA: The SIFE Model. *Proceedings of the ASEAN Entrepreneurship Conference 2012*, pp. 365-370.
- Noor Rizawati, N., & Mustafa Din, S. (2017). A Review of social innovation initiatives in Malaysia. *Journal of Science, Technology and Innovation Policy*, 3(1), 9-17.
- Noorseha, A., Yap, C.S., Dewi Amat, S., & Md Zabid, A.R. (2013). Social entrepreneurial intention among business undergraduates: An emerging economy perspective. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 15(3), 249-267.
- Norasmah, O., Halimah, H., Faridah, K., Zaidatol Akmaliah, L.P., & Nor Aishah, B. (2006). Pembentukan indeks tingkah laku keusahawanan golongan remaja Malaysia. Laporan akhir projek IRPA. Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Norasmah, O, Hariyaty, A.W., & Haliza, H. (2012). Resilience and Competitiveness among Students in the Free Enterprise (SIFE) program. *International Business Management*, 6(6), 652-659.
- 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.
- Radin Siti Aishah R.A.R., Norasmah, O., Zaidatol Akmaliah, L.P., & Hariyaty A.W. 2016. Entrepreneurial intention and social entrepreneurship among students in Malaysian higher education. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 10(1), 175-181.
- Rahmah, I., Ishak, Y., Abd. Hair, A., & Syahida, Z.A. (2010). Analisis status dan penentu daya saing pekerja dalam sektor pendidikan di Malaysia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Malaysia*, 44, 83-91.
- Rambe, P., & Ndofirepi, T.M. (2016). Gender differences in the perceptions of entrepreneurship hindrances: A case of vocational education students in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 8(6), 94-11.
- Raudah, M.A., Wan Fauziah, W.Y. & Norliza, G. (2018). The role of social entrepreneurship in Malaysia: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience*, 24(5), 3264-3269.
- Reynolds, P., Camp, M., & Hay, M. (2002). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report*. E.M. Kauffman Foundation, Kansas City, MO.
- Serino, L., & Buccino, G. (2019). Entrepreneurial Intentions among Italian Students: The Role of Gender. *International Journal of Academic Research Business and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 1309-1326.
- Siti Daleela, M.W., Wan Mohd Hirwani, W.H., & Abu Hanifah, A. (2018). The growing trend of social entrepreneurship among Malaysian undergraduate students. *International*

*Academic Research Journal of Social Science*, 8(9), 1034-1046.

- Suhaili, S., & Azlan, A. (2006). Keusahawanan di kalangan mahasiswa: kajian kecenderungan pelajar muslim di Universiti Malaya. *Jurnal Syariah*, 14(1), 93-109.
- Suhaimi, M.S., Yusof, I., & Abdullah, S. (2013). Creating wealth through social entrepreneurship: A case study from Malaysia. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(3), 345-353.
- Syed Zamberi, A. (2013). The need for inclusion of entrepreneurship education in Malaysia lower and higher learning institutions. *Education + Training*, 55(2), 191-203.
- Tran, A.T.P. (2017). Factors influencing social entrepreneurial intention: A theoretical model. *Proceedings of 89th ISERD International Conference*, pp. 51-57.
- Tran, L.Q., & Tran, Q.H.M. (2018). Do gender and age make a difference in entrepreneurial intention of Vietnamese adults? *Global Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(1), 10-16.
- Wan Mohd Hirwani, W.H., Mohd Nizam, A.R., Zinatul Ashiqin, Z., & Noor Inayah, Y.(2014). Mechanism and government initiatives promoting innovation and commercialization of university invention. *Pertanika Journal Social Science & Humanity*, 22(S), 131 - 148.
- Zissimopoulos, J., & Karoly, L. (2007). Transitions to self-employment at older ages: The role of wealth, health, health insurance and other factors. *Labor Economics*, 14, 269-295.