GENDER ROLES IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION TO SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS IN VIETNAM

Anh Lan Thuy Nguyen
Faculty of Business Administration, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

Bao Quoc Lam
Faculty of Business Administration, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

Anh Quynh Duong Nguyen
Faculty of Business Administration, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

Minh Pham
Faculty of Business Administration, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

ABSTRACT

Social enterprises help sustainably develop the national economy by focusing on social values. Social entrepreneurs contribute to significantly reducing unemployment, poverty, and social evils. Therefore, developing entrepreneurship education to increase the number of social entrepreneurs deserves the attention of many countries. Women are also part of society. However, female entrepreneurs make up only one-third of that of men. This study evaluated the differences between gender groups in the relationship between education and social entrepreneurship intention. Data collected from 811 Vietnamese students were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling to assess gender differences. The results show that there is a significant difference between women and men in the formation of social entrepreneurship intentions. Meanwhile, the impact of entrepreneurship education on gender is not clear.

Keywords: gender; education; social entrepreneurship; intention

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v10i5.1316

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is growing strongly and is increasingly attractive in many countries (Aparicio et al., 2022). With an important role in promoting innovation and productivity, entrepreneurship has even become a measure of the prosperity of an economy. However, the economic trend of sustainable development and focus on social values has led to the formation of social entrepreneurship (Al-Qudah et al., 2022). This form of entrepreneurship combines commercial goals and social value creation (Sahni & Chopra, 2022). This diversity makes social entrepreneurship a sustainable engine for the economy. Social entrepreneurship has significantly reduced unemployment, poverty, and social evils (Lukman et al., 2021). Therefore,

policymakers and educators in many countries focus on social entrepreneurship as an essential strategic form for parallel socio-economic development.

In the study of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial intention is an essential foundation for promoting entrepreneurial behaviour (Kolvereid & Isaksen, 2006). This prefix helps explain the most comprehensive entrepreneurial behaviour and results. Entrepreneurial intentions can be developed through education, not through the innate characteristics of the individual (Hyams-Ssekasi & Taheri, 2022). Many studies have shown the specific role of education in shaping and developing entrepreneurial intentions (Ip et al., 2017; Hassan et al., 2021). Some argue that entrepreneurship education helps maintain and develop startups more effectively (Kirby & Ibrahim, 2011).

Social entrepreneurship is a phenomenon of great interest to academia and a case of entrepreneurship (Tan et al., 2020; Forster & Grichnik, 2013). According to Lent et al. (1994), social cognitive career theory (SCCT) better explains social entrepreneurial intentions (SEI). Based on two core factors, self-efficacy and outcome expectation, SCCT comprehensively explains the process of forming SEI (Tuan & Pham, 2022). Compared with the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) or entrepreneurial event theory (Shapero & Sokol, 1982), SCCT also has an advantage when it comes to explaining the relationship between the individual and the environment (Tuan & Pham, 2022). Therefore, this study uses SCCT to explain the relationship between entrepreneurial education and SEI.

Entrepreneurship reports show that the proportion of female entrepreneurs is only ⅓ of that of men (GEM, 2022). Although feminist awareness gradually removes restrictions on women's abilities (Xu et al., 2018), entrepreneurship is still a significant barrier for them. At the same time, although the likelihood of successful entrepreneurship is similar between the two genders, men are still more popular and favoured in most countries (GEM, 2022). According to the statement of the Vietnam Ministry of Planning and Investment (December 2021), Vietnam has 857,511 operating enterprises. Besides, according to statistics from the Vietnam Association for Women Entrepreneurs, the number of Vietnamese enterprises owned by women has increased rapidly in recent years, from 4% in 2009 up to 21% in 2011 and reaching 25% in 2021, the highest in Southeast Asia. This situation shows the urgency of balancing the proportion of entrepreneurs in terms of gender. However, the growth of the number of entrepreneurs must be carefully planned for a long time. In particular, managing potential entrepreneurs effectively promotes social entrepreneurship (Tuan & Pham, 2022).

Consequently, this study focuses on testing the formation of SEI among university students. However, instead of considering only female students' entrepreneurial intentions (Rahman et al., 2022) or specific policies for female students' entrepreneurship (Westhead & Solesvik, 2016), this study analyzes multi-group analysis (MGA) to compare the difference between male and female social entrepreneurship intentions. Since gender differences make a huge difference to entrepreneurial intentions (Le & Lisovich, 2022), the multi-group analysis will help reveal more deeply the nature of relationships.

This article is structured into five sections. First, this section introduces the research issues. The following section presents the literature review and the research model development. The third part covers the research method, and the fourth is the results. Finally, the last section is the conclusion and managerial implications of promoting SEI among students.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social entrepreneurial intention (SEI)

Entrepreneurship is defined by Low and MacMillan (1988) as "the creation of new enterprise". The intention is a perception state towards a specific goal, expressing beliefs about behaviour, thereby shaping behaviour (Krueger et al., 2000). Entrepreneurs and academics also consider firm entrepreneurial intention a prerequisite for entrepreneurship (Liu et al., 2019). In academia, entrepreneurship has been defined in a variety of ways. The first understanding is the willingness to make "new combinations" (Schumpeter, 1934), which is understood as using new, creative ways and methods to solve pre-existing problems. The second interpretation is the willingness to create a "new enterprise" to solve existing problems (Low & Macmillan, 1988). SEI refers to the intention to establish a social enterprise (Mair &

Noboa, 2006) and is considered a branch in the study of entrepreneurial intention. More generally, Tan et al. (2021) define SEI as the belief and self-recognition of a person who intends to establish a new social venture. Tran and Von Korflesch (2016) say that SEI is an individual's "belief and desire to set up a social enterprise". In this study, SEI is defined as using innovative ideas to start an enterprise. This enterprise was established to solve society's unsolved problems and contribute directly to the community.

The first attempt to develop a theoretical model of SEI formation was made by Mair and Noboa (2006). Research on SEI has been proposed for a long time, but it was not until 2006 that Mair and Noboa pioneered the foundation for the development of later studies. Anwar et al. (2020) and many other researchers have argued that entrepreneurial intention is developed through training and exposure, not innate. Like other business fields, the intention of social entrepreneurship is formed through learning and evolving based on knowledge, problems, and social activities (Wardana et al., 2020). People with experience in working with social issues tend to have higher intentions to become social entrepreneurs (Hockerts, 2017). Therefore, SEI may be more likely to appear if exposed to many social issues.

Even though there has been steady growth in research into social entrepreneurship, little is known about the underlying motivations for SEI. Various conceptual papers have been published to propose premises for SEI (Mair & Noboa, 2003; Tukamushaba et al., 2011). For many scholars, social enterprises have provided innovative models for positively addressing society's problems and filling the gaps in national social welfare programs (Gupta et al., 2020). Because of this, SEI research is crucial because it sheds light on the existing literature on social entrepreneurship, especially studies on SEI from the perspective of emerging economies like Vietnam.

Social cognitive career theory

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT), developed by Lent et al., was officially published in 1994. SCCT focuses on several cognitive variables of individuals and how these variables interact with other aspects of the person and their environment to help shape career development (Lent & Brown, 2006). This theory is famously known as the most popular theory, used to explain the formation of interests in learning and career orientation, selection, and pursuit of related aspects of a future career. Not only that, SCCT was selected to explain performance and persistence in the education and occupational fields. SCCT was originally developed to address the role of baseline variables such as self-efficacy and outcome expectation in developing career interests, career choices, and job performance. Recently, it has been developed and extended to research for both job satisfaction and education (Lent & Brown, 2006; 2013). This theory is widely applied in studying the relationship between individuals and the environment in professional behaviour. In the context of SEI, the comprehensive role of SCCT has also been confirmed in many studies. According to SCCT, self-efficacy and outcome expectation influence an individual's behavioural intention (Lent et al., 1994).

Self-efficacy is "a person's confidence to successfully perform various responsibilities and tasks that come with becoming an entrepreneur" (Ramadani et al., 2022). According to Ukil (2022), self-efficacy refers to a person's ability to establish and maintain a business. Since social entrepreneurship comes with many risks, self-efficacy makes individuals more confident in the entrepreneurial process. At the same time, individuals are more likely to start a business if they possess the relevant skill set. According to Tuan and Pham (2022), self-efficacy helps to limit psychological barriers when forming SEI. Hockerts (2017) also suggests that self-efficacy helps to reinforce SEI better.

H1: Self-efficacy has a positive effect on SEI

Outcome expectations significantly predicts overall business intention (Blaese et al., 2021). SCCT develops outcome expectations to complement traditional entrepreneurial models such as Shapero and Sokol (1982) or Ajzen (1991). Outcome expectation is an individual's belief or visualisation of a possible outcome after performing a behaviour (Lent & Brown, 2008). In the context of SEI, high outcome expectations make individuals try harder and more persistent with their entrepreneurial intentions (Guerrero et al., 2008; Zeffane, 2013). At the same time, the outcome expectation also helps the orientation process for entrepreneurial purposes more effectively (Liguori et al., 2018). Blaese et al.

(2021) also support the positive impact of outcome expectations on SEI.

H2: Outcome expectation has a positive effect on SEI

Entrepreneurial education

Equipping entrepreneurship skills is extremely important for startup students. Many scientists consider entrepreneurial education is decisive in forming students' entrepreneurial intentions (Utomo et al., 2022). Many universities have strongly developed and implemented entrepreneurial education programs.

Moving away from notions of entrepreneurship as a traditional academic structure, Sarasvathy and Venkataraman (2011) conceptualize entrepreneurship as a "powerful social force" and imply that entrepreneurship is for everyone, not just aspiring enterprise owners. Entrepreneurial education is defined by Alberti et al. (2004) as: "The structured formal conveyance of entrepreneurial competencies". As for Engle et al. (2010), entrepreneurial education is "to let students know of the skills necessary to successfully start a business and help build their confidence in being able to perform those activities". "Learning to recognize and act on opportunities and interacting socially to initiate, organize and manage new ventures" is how Rae (2005) used to describe entrepreneurial education. These concepts of entrepreneurial education are presented from the perspective of knowledge tolerance and learning.

Looking at enterprise and entrepreneurship from the perspective of contributing to their creativity, entrepreneurial education is "learners developing the skills and mindset to be able to turn creative ideas into entrepreneurial action", according to EC definition (2014). Finally, most concisely and completely, entrepreneurial education emphasizes imagination, creativity, and risk-taking in business (Porter, 1994).

Combined from both perspectives, entrepreneurial education is understood as a combination of education and teaching management, organizational skills. In addition, it is to increase and consolidate creativity, and strategies to deal with risks in the business process. This educational program aims to enhance and comprehensively develop students' entrepreneurial abilities (Higgins et al., 2013). Specifically, entrepreneurial education develops an entrepreneur's strategic resources and capabilities and helps discover and realise business opportunities (Liu et al., 2019). At the same time, entrepreneurial education is also seen as an effective form of social support for social entrepreneurship (Hockerts, 2018).

The intensity of self-efficacy is positively correlated with the competence possessed by the individual. In other words, entrepreneurial education makes individuals more confident in starting a business (Hassan et al., 2021). When students create a company, entrepreneurial education builds ambition, motivation, and risk tolerance (Liu et al., 2019). Besides, practicing simulation skills throughout the training process also helps students effectively assess their self-efficacy (Jensen, 2014). These activities give students a theoretical background in the concept of entrepreneurship and behaviour and thinking of an entrepreneur (Wardana et al., 2020).

H3: Entrepreneurial education has a positive effect on self-efficacy

Entrepreneurial education is not only the fostering of entrepreneurial skills but also the process of helping students realize business opportunities. The training program contributes to systematising the possible results when starting up and communicating them to students. Positive perceptions of achievements, benefits, and other expectations motivate students to start a business. Wardana et al. (2020) suggest that participating in entrepreneurial education also helps guide expectations of better outcomes. Entrepreneurial education helps to define goals and orientations and motivates outcome expectations (Liguori & Winkler, 2020).

H4: Entrepreneurial education has a positive effect on outcome expectation

The role of gender

Men and women possess significantly different characteristics, especially in entrepreneurship (Malach-Pines & Schwartz, 2008). When approaching entrepreneurship from the perspective of career choice, the two gender groups possess distinct personalities and psychology, and their social pressures on their career choices are also different (Thébaud, 2010). In particular, the various mechanisms of entrepreneurship intention formation will

change the nature of entrepreneurial behaviour (Yukongdi & Lopa, 2017).

Studies combining gender and entrepreneurship have concluded that entrepreneurship is gender-driven (Ahl 2006; Henry et al., 2016). In addition, Welter (2020) encourages researchers to look more deeply at gender in the context of exploratory research on entrepreneurship. In accepting gender as a prism, academia and entrepreneurship have moved away from the stale framed studies. Gender was used as a variable to examine the differences between male and female entrepreneurs and to explore how gender influences behavior and entrepreneurship (Marlow & Martinez Dy, 2018).

Research by Haus et al. (2013) shows that men's social roles make them focus on entrepreneurship because they need to achieve it. In contrast, women start businesses to support their families or serve society (Laguía et al., 2022). Yamini et al. (2022) show that women possess more motivation to start a business to solve social problems. For student studies, Díaz-García and Jiménez-Moreno (2010) revealed that men are likelier to perceive business opportunities and help male students stimulate entrepreneurial intentions through the expectation of positive results.

Meanwhile, Paray and Kumar (2019) place more importance on female students' knowledge of entrepreneurial education. Accordingly, female students tend to prepare more thoroughly for entrepreneurship skills than male students. Dabic et al. (2012), and Pelegrini and Moraes (2022) also confirmed the difference in the formation mechanism of entrepreneurial intention between men and women. So, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

H5a: There is a difference between men and women in the relationship between outcome expectation and SEI

H5b: There is a difference between men and women in the relationship between self-efficacy and SEI

H5c: There is a difference between men and women in the relationship between entrepreneurial education and outcome expectation

H5d: There is a difference between men and women in the relationship between entrepreneurial education and self-efficacy

METHODOLOGY

The survey subjects of this study are students studying at universities in Vietnam. Respondents rate the level of agreement with the questions on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 beings wholly disagree and 5 beings completely agree. The questionnaire is built on the Google Form platform and collects data through social networks. This survey method helps to limit the missing values, increase the efficiency of the response and save costs. The concept measures in the survey were built in combination with many previous studies. The scale of entrepreneurial education uses five observed variables from the study of Mu et al. (2020). Next, the concept of outcome expectation is measured by five questions in the study of Ip et al. (2021). The scale of self-efficacy (7 items) is a combination of the scale of Wardana et al. (2020) and Hockert (2017). Finally, four items measure the SEI inherited from the studies of Ip et al. (2021) and Hockert (2017). All the measures are adjusted to be compatible with the research context in Vietnam.

The convenience sampling method was applied in this study. The person conducting the survey questionnaire is a 3rd and 4th-year and above student or higher because in the filtered information, A questionnaire was designed to confirm "whether or not you were enrolled in a course on entrepreneurship," and the survey was terminated if the student had not taken the course on entrepreneurship. At universities in Vietnam, knowledge about entrepreneurship only begins to be taught in the third year of a bachelor's degree. This is why 1st-year and 2nd-year students do not conduct this survey. Only 3rd and 4th-year and above students and above can have formal exposure to the entrepreneurship education program. These students have enough knowledge and information as well as a certain recognition of social issues of particular concern that need to be addressed. It made them understand the meaning of the scales in the questionnaire, thereby choosing the most objective outcome. After collecting 811 valid responses, the data were analysed by partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. Hair et al. (2019) state that PLS-SEM helps minimise errors when evaluating complex models. At the same time, this technique is suitable for analysing small sample sizes. The

description of the survey sample is shown in Table 1.

This study has 40 observed variables, the minimum number of observations to be collected is determined by the 10/1 sampling method, and the required number of samples is 400. Tabachnick et al. (2013) also made an association between observation size and study results with specific numbers 300 is good, 500 is very good, and 1000 is excellent. The 811 students surveyed for this study were in the very good range suggested by Tabachnick et al. (2013). Besides, the data of this study is processed by PLS-SEM. This method helps minimize errors when evaluating complex models. At the same time, this technique is suitable for analyzing small sample sizes. The description of the survey sample is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Category		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	331	40.82%
	Female	480	59.18%
Academic year	3rd	473	58.32%
	4th and above	338	41.68%
Majors	Technology	109	13.44%
	Humanities and social sciences	175	21.57%
	Economics	527	64.99%

Source: author's work.

RESULTS

Measurement model assessment

Table 2: Reliability and convergent validity

Variables	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Outer loadings
Entrepreneurial Education	0.811	0.811	0.571	0.710 - 0.800
Outcome Expectation	0.887	0.889	0.689	0.799 – 0.859
Self-Efficacy	0.855	0.858	0.535	0.708 – 0.759
SEI	0.890	0.892	0.752	0.846 – 0.880

Source: author's work.

Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability express the scale reliability. These two indexes must be above 0.7 for the scale to satisfy their reliability (Hair et al., 2014). Next, the average variance extracted (AVE) must explain more than 50% of the data variability. Therefore, AVE greater than 0.5 is satisfactory (Hair et al., 2014). On the other hand, the outer loadings indicate the contribution of each observed variable to the research concept. This coefficient needs at least 0.7 to match the criteria of Hair et al. (2019). The results in Table 2 show that the above conditions are satisfied.

Table 3: Fornell-Larcker criterion

Variables	Entrepreneurial Education	Outcome Expectation	Self-Efficacy	SEI
Entrepreneurial Education	0.756			
Outcome Expectation	0.498	0.830		
Self-Efficacy	0.529	0.539	0.732	
SEI	0.498	0.469	0.576	0.867

Source: author's work.

Next, the discriminant validity is tested with Fornell and Larcker's (1981) criteria. The square root AVE of each structure must be greater than the correlation coefficient of the others. However, Henseler et al. (2015) suggested using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio of Correlations (HTMT) when assessing the discriminant. The HTMT index requires the cross-correlation coefficient in the matrix to be less than 0.85. Accordingly, the article combines both indicators to ensure the objectivity of the results. So, the Fornell-Larcker criterion (table 3) and HTMT (Table 4) are both satisfactory.

Table 4: HTMT criterion

Variables	Entrepreneurial Education	Outcome Expectation	Self-Efficacy
Outcome Expectation	0.587		
Self-Efficacy	0.629	0.617	
SEI	0.582	0.526	0.651

Source: author's work.

Structural model assessment

Table 5: Power explanation

Variables	R^2 adjusted	Q^2predict
Outcome Expectation	0.248	0.244
Self-Efficacy	0.280	0.276
Social Entrepreneurial Intention	0.367	0.226

Source: author's work.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) represents the explanatory level of the model. According to the values in Table 5, the model explains 36.6% of SEI formation. It can be seen that the model reaches the average explanatory level. Next, Q^2 represents the predictive strength of the model. The results show that the Q^2 value fluctuates between 0.226 and 0.276. Next, hypothesis testing was performed with bootstrap (N=5000). The results show that hypotheses H1, H2, H3, and H4 are supported because all p-values are below 0.05 (See Table 6).

Table 6: Hypothesis testing with bootstrap

Relationships	β	Std. Dev.	T-value	P-value
Entrepreneurial education → Outcome expectation	0.498	0.032	15.775	0.000
Entrepreneurial education → Self-efficacy	0.529	0.028	18.805	0.000
Outcome Expectation → SEI	0.224	0.040	5.654	0.000
Self-Efficacy → SEI	0.455	0.036	12.630	0.000

Source: author's work.

Multi-group analysis

To evaluate the difference between male and female students, multi-group analysis (MGA) was applied. The MGA results showed that the outcome expectation impact on the SEI of females (β female = 0.101, p-value = 0.028) was weaker than that of male students (β male = 0.439, p-value = 0.000). The difference between females and males is also statistically significant (β female – male = -0.337, p-value < 0.05). Accordingly, the role of outcome expectation for male students is more critical than for female students. In contrast, self-efficacy was more important for female students (β female = 0.520, p-value = 0.000; β male = 0.336, p-value = 0.000).

The difference between women and men is also statistically significant (β female – male = 0.183, p-value = 0.010). Therefore, hypotheses H5a and H5b are accepted. Finally, entrepreneurial education positively affects outcome expectations and self-efficacy in both gender groups (p-value = 0.000). However, the MGA results indicated no difference between females and males in these relationships (p-value> 0.05). Thus, hypotheses H5c and H5d are rejected. The MGA results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: MGA results

Relationships	Female		Male		Difference	
	β	p-value	β	p-value	β	p-value
Entrepreneurial education → Outcome expectation	0.550	0.000	0.451	0.000	0.099	0.110
Entrepreneurial education → Self-efficacy	0.555	0.000	0.493	0.000	0.062	0.281
Outcome expectation → SEI	0.101	0.028	0.439	0.000	-0.337	0.000
Self-Efficacy → SEI	0.520	0.000	0.336	0.000	0.183	0.010

Source: author's work.

DISCUSSION

Research results show that self-efficacy has a positive impact on SEI. This result is similar to the study of Tuan and Pham (2022). Students' confidence in their abilities can be seen to develop and strengthen SEI. At the same time, SEI will be oriented depending on the type of capacity that the individual possesses. Another outcome is that outcome expectations also govern the formation of SEI. This positive relationship is also shown in Luc's study (2020). This result implies that building outcome expectations is extremely important for social entrepreneurship. It motivates students to be more persistent with their social entrepreneurship goals (Zeffane, 2013). Although both factors in SCCT positively affect the intention of social entrepreneurship, the relationship strength of outcome expectation for SEI is lower than for self-efficacy. This result is quite surprising compared with Aure et al. (2019) findings, with the direct impact of self-efficacy on SEI relatively small; therefore, self-efficacy is not considered the most reliable factor (Aure et al., 2019). It can be explained that social entrepreneurship is still a new concept in Vietnam. Because Southeast Asian cultures have low-risk tolerance (Hofstede, 1993), the outcome expectations of social entrepreneurship may be constrained by psychological barriers.

An interesting finding of this paper is that self-efficacy governs the SEI of female students more strongly than that of male students. The empirical study of Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2022) indicates that women tend to invest more heavily in entrepreneurship ability than men. This preparation relates to the startup process's long-term vision and sustainable development. On the other hand, female students participating in this study also have relatively low expectations about the results of social entrepreneurship. This level of expectation is even lower than the general model. This result can be explained from the point of view of Brush et al. (2009), that it took longer for women to overcome their fear of failure. Especially when the successful precedent of social entrepreneurship is minimal in Vietnam, the risk-averse status makes female students more pessimistic when assessing the outcome expectations. In contrast, the SEI of male students seems to be highly dependent on outcome expectations. Their exploratory nature makes their fear of failure insignificant (Camelo-Ordaz et al., 2016).

Education impacts forming students' career choices (Adha et al., 2022). In this article, entrepreneurial education plays a vital role in self-efficacy. This result is similar to Wardana et al. (2020) and Hassan et al. (2021). Entrepreneurship education in universities contributes to building a solid foundation for students. It allows students to acquire theoretical knowledge to build understanding and strongly influence the attitudes, thinking, and behavior of students, thereby motivating them to choose to

become social entrepreneurs (Wardana et al., 2020; Hassan et al., 2021). Therefore, the positive influence of entrepreneurship education on SEI is also confirmed. Research by Rakicevic et al. (2023) has supported this statement. The authors assert that entrepreneurship education plays an essential role that must be considered within the framework of SEI factors. Thus, the knowledge and skills that individuals acquire through education will encourage the development of SEI. Besides, education also strongly influences the formation of outcome expectations. This result is quite similar to the studies of Pfeifer et al. (2016). Notably, the above relationships have no difference between men and women. In other words, males and females have the same skills and knowledge to form high self-efficacy. They are also trained to build their respective social entrepreneurship expectations. It can be seen that the advantage of entrepreneurial education in Vietnam is the promotion of equal development for all students. However, entrepreneurship is a highly personalised behaviour (Morrison, 2000). Applying a standard educational formula for all students will limit the ability of each individual to develop. Especially when there is a considerable difference between men and women in entrepreneurial psychology (Brush et al., 2009), traits and values (Malach-Pines & Schwartz, 2008). The model entrepreneurship training program also makes the entrepreneurial orientation less flexible and creative. It can hinder or even suppress SEI.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on SCCT, this study tests the role of entrepreneurial education, self-efficacy and outcome expectation on social entrepreneurship intention. With the hypotheses supported, the study once again confirms the critical role of SCCT as a classic theory in the study of entrepreneurial intention in general. On the other hand, this is one of the few studies that compare gender differences in entrepreneurial intention formation, especially social entrepreneurship. The findings in the research results are an essential contribution to the theoretical knowledge and simultaneously create a new perspective on social entrepreneurship in an emerging economy.

Based on the results, it can be seen that equipping the right entrepreneurial skills increases the success rate of doing business (Kirby & Ibrahim, 2011). At the same time, building a positive outcome expectation also helps individuals persevere in pursuing their social entrepreneurship goals. Therefore, universities must build training programs closer to reality, creating opportunities for students to practice and develop entrepreneurial abilities.

The research results also show the reality of using the same training form for male and female students with limited personal development ability. For female students, universities need to focus on the psychological barriers when doing business is required. Universities need to focus on this because social entrepreneurship is a new field in entrepreneurship in general, with much emphasis on solutions and creativity. Women often face psychological barriers such as fear of failure and wanting to feel secure (Cacciotti & Hayton, 2015; Verheul & Thurik, 2001). These two things are the reasons that prevent female students from focusing on starting an enterprise. Although men deal with fewer psychological barriers than women, they need to focus more on the necessary skills in enterprise and management to ensure their social entrepreneurship. It helps men have a clear, calculated, and precisely planned route.

Universities need to focus on the characteristics of each gender to come up with appropriate methods and strategies for entrepreneurship curricula in general and social entrepreneurship in particular. First, instead of having students do the same exercise, lecturers need to have appropriate exercises for genders based on the outstanding characteristics of each group of male and female students. It is necessary so that through the exercise, the lecturer can see the characteristics and differences between the sexes and how male and female students solve problems. In addition, instead of conducting the same training program for both women and men, startup training programs should synthesize and develop new programs with appropriate knowledge and information on common characteristics for both males and females. Besides, methods should be devised to combine the strengths of both male and female students. It is to create a program that is best suited for all students. Universities should also develop courses, activities, and issues about entrepreneurship for both male and female students to solve. From there, each student has a lesson and experience, and lecturers can observe

the difference between genders. Through this, Universities and lecturers be possible to improve the training program to improve efficiency.

Despite the contributions, this study also encountered certain limitations. First, although the sample size is rated good according to Tabachnick et al. (2013), the convenient sampling method leads to a rather significant disparity between the proportions of men and women. This may cause the dataset not to reflect the results thoroughly. Second, cross-sectional studies may only show the mechanism of SEI for a short period. This limitation implies extending the longitudinal research direction to observe SEI formation closely. Next, expanding the scope of the study to a cultural, geographical or policy perspective is also an idea to help build a more exciting research model.

REFERENCES

Adha, M. A., Wibowo, A., Faslah, R., Ariyanti, N. S., & Lutfia, A. (2022). Students' ideal career in the 4.0 Industrial. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, *9*(4), 651-664. https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v9i4.928

Ahl, H. (2006). Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, *30*(5), 595-621. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00138.x

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *50*(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Alberti, F., Sciascia, S., & Poli, A. (2004, July). Entrepreneurship education: notes on an ongoing debate. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual IntEnt Conference, University of Napoli Federico II, Italy* (Vol. 4, No. 7).

Al-Qudah, A. A., Al-Okaily, M., & Alqudah, H. (2022). The relationship between social entrepreneurship and sustainable development from economic growth perspective: 15 'RCEP'countries. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, *12*(1), 44-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2021.1880219

Anwar, I., Saleem, I., Islam, K. B., Thoudam, P., & Khan, R. (2020). Entrepreneurial intention among female university students: examining the moderating role of entrepreneurial education. *Journal for International Business and Entrepreneurship Development*, *12*(4), 217-234. https://doi.org/10.1504/JIBED.2020.110254

Aparicio, S., Audretsch, D., Noguera, M., & Urbano, D. (2022). Can female entrepreneurs boost social mobility in developing countries? An institutional analysis. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *175*, 121401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121401

Aure, P. A. P., Dui, R. P., Jimenez, S. V., Daradar, D. D., Gutierrez, A. N. A., Blasa, A. C., & Sy-Changco, J. (2019). Understanding social entrepreneurial intention through social cognitive career theory: A partial least squares structural equation modelling approach. *Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies*, *10*(1), 92-110. https://doi.org/10.15388/omee.2019.10.00005

Blaese, R., Noemi, S., & Brigitte, L. (2021). Should I Stay, or Should I Go? Job satisfaction as a moderating factor between outcome expectations and entrepreneurial intention among academics. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *17*(3), 1357-1386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-021-00744-8

Brush, C. G., de Bruin, A., & Welter, F. (2009). A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, *1*(1), 8-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/17566260910942318

Cacciotti, G., & Hayton, J. C. (2015). Fear and entrepreneurship: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *17*(2), 165-190. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12052

Camelo-Ordaz, C., Diánez-González, J. P., & Ruiz-Navarro, J. (2016). The Influence of Gender on Entrepreneurial Intention: The Mediating Role of Perceptual Factors. *BRQ business research quarterly*, *19*(4), 261-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2016.03.001

Dabic, M., Daim, T., Bayraktaroglu, E., Novak, I., & Basic, M. (2012). Exploring gender differences in attitudes of university students towards entrepreneurship: An international survey. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, *4*(3), 316-336. https://doi.org/10.1108/17566261211264172

Díaz-García, M. C., & Jiménez-Moreno, J. (2010). Entrepreneurial intention: the role of gender. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, *6*(3), 261-283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-008-0103-2

EC (2014), "Final report of the thematic working group on entrepreneurship education", Brussels, November. Retrieved April 27, 2023 from: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/archive/documents/entrepreneurship-report-2014_en.pdf.

Engle, R. L., He, X., Dimitriadi, N., Gavidia, J. V., Schlaegel, C., Wolff, B., ... & Buame, S. (2010). Entrepreneurial intent: A twelve-country evaluation of Ajzen's model of planned behavior. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *16*(1-2), 35-57. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552551011020063

Figueroa-Domecq, C., Kimbu, A., de Jong, A., & Williams, A. M. (2022). Sustainability through the tourism entrepreneurship journey: A gender perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *30*(7), 1562-1585. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1831001

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, *18*(1), 39-50. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312

Forster, F., & Grichnik, D. (2013). Social entrepreneurial intention formation of corporate volunteers. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *4*(2), 153-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2013.777358

GEM (2022). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2021/22 women's entrepreneurship report: From crisis to opportunity.* London: GEM. Retrieved April 24, 2023 from: https://www.gemconsortium.org/report/gem-202122-womens-entrepreneurship-report-from-crisis-to-opportunity

Guerrero, M., Rialp, J., & Urbano, D. (2008). The impact of desirability and feasibility on entrepreneurial intentions: A structural equation model. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *4*, 35-50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-006-0032-x

Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J., & Jaiswal, M. P. (2020). Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of business research*, *113*, 209-229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.032

Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Business Review*, *26*(2), 106-121. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European business review*, *31*(1), 2-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Hassan, A., Anwar, I., Saleem, I., Islam, K. B., & Hussain, S. A. (2021). Individual entrepreneurial orientation, entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of entrepreneurial motivations. *Industry and Higher Education*, *35*(4), 403-418. https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222211007051

Haus, I., Steinmetz, H., Isidor, R., & Kabst, R. (2013). Gender effects on entrepreneurial intention: a meta-analytical structural equation model. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, *5*(2), 130-156. https://doi.org/10.1108/17566261311328828

Henry, C., Foss, L., & Ahl, H. (2016). Gender and entrepreneurship research: A review of methodological approaches. *International Small Business Journal*, *34*(3), 217-241. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242614549779

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *1*(43), 115-135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Higgins, D., Smith, K., & Mirza, M. (2013). Entrepreneurial education: Reflexive approaches to entrepreneurial learning in practice. *The Journal of*

Entrepreneurship, *22*(2), 135-160. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971355713490619

Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, *41*(1), 105-130. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12171

Hockerts, K. (2018). The effect of experiential social entrepreneurship education on intention formation in students. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *9*(3), 234-256. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1498377

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *7*(1), 81-94. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/ame.1993.9409142061

Hyams-Ssekasi, D., & Taheri, F. (2022). Re-assessing Entrepreneurship Education and Gamification as a Learning Process. In *Technology and Entrepreneurship Education: Adopting Creative Digital Approaches to Learning and Teaching* (pp. 3-23). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Ip, C. Y., Liang, C., Lai, H. J., & Chang, Y. J. (2021). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intention: An alternative model based on social cognitive career theory. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *31*(4), 737-760. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21453

Ip, C. Y., Wu, S. C., Liu, H. C., & Liang, C. (2017). Revisiting the antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, *6*(3), 301-323. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijep.2017.2835

Jensen, T. L. (2014). A holistic person perspective in measuring entrepreneurship education impact–Social entrepreneurship education at the Humanities. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *12*(3), 349-364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2014.07.002

Kirby, D. A., & Ibrahim, N. (2011). The Case for (Social) Entrepreneurship Education in Egyptian Universities. *Education & Training*, *53*(5), 403-415. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911111147712

Kolvereid, L., & Isaksen, E. (2006). New business startup and subsequent entry into self-employment. *Journal of business venturing*, *21*(6), 866-885. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.06.008

Krueger Jr, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of business venturing*, *15*(5-6), 411-432. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(98)00033-0

Laguía, A., Wach, D., Garcia-Ael, C., & Moriano, J. A. (2022). "Think entrepreneur–think male": the effect of reduced gender stereotype threat on women's entrepreneurial intention and opportunity motivation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *28*(4), 1001-1025. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-04-2021-0312

Le, Q. V., & Lisovich, M. N. (2022). Explaining gender differences in entrepreneurship: the impact of motivations, success factors and business training on the performance of microenterprises in central Vietnam. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *45*(3), 355-375. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2022.122025

Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2006). On conceptualizing and assessing social cognitive constructs in career research: A measurement guide. *Journal of career assessment*, *14*(1), 12-35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072705281364

Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2008). Social cognitive career theory and subjective well-being in the context of work. *Journal of career assessment*, *16*(1), 6-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305769

Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2013). Social cognitive model of career self-management: toward a unifying view of adaptive career behavior across the life span. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *60*(4), 557. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0033446

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *45*(1), 79-122. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027

Liguori, E. W., Bendickson, J. S., & McDowell, W.

C. (2018). Revisiting entrepreneurial intentions: a social cognitive career theory approach. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *14*(1), 67-78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-017-0462-7

Liguori, E., & Winkler, C. (2020). From offline to online: Challenges and opportunities for entrepreneurship education following the COVID-19 pandemic. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, *3*(4), 346-351. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420916738

Liu, J., Zhu, Y., Serapio, M. G., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2019). The new generation of millennial entrepreneurs: A review and call for research. *International Business Review*, *28*(5), 101581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.05.001

Low, M. B., & MacMillan, I. C. (1988). Entrepreneurship: Past research and future challenges. *Journal of management*, *14*(2), 139-161. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638801400202

Luc, P. T. (2020). Outcome expectations and social entrepreneurial intention: Integration of planned behavior and social cognitive career theory. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *7*(6), 399-407. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no6.399

Lukman, S., Bao, P. X., Kweku-Lugu, B., Arkorful, V. E., Latif, A., Gadabu, A., ... & Sadiq, M. A. (2021). Diasporan students social entrepreneurship intention: The moderating role of institutional support. *Journal of Public Affairs*, *21*(1), e2108. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2108

Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2003). *Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social enterprise get formed* (No. D/521). IESE Business School. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.462283

Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. In *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 121-135). Palgrave Macmillan.

Malach-Pines, A., & Schwartz, D. (2008). Now you see them, now you don't: gender differences in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*(7), 811-832. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810896358

Marlow, S., & Martinez Dy, A. (2018). Annual review article: Is it time to rethink the gender agenda in entrepreneurship research?. *International Small Business Journal*, *36*(1), 3-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242617738321

Morrison, A. (2000). Entrepreneurship: what triggers it?. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *6*(2), 59-71. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550010335976

Mu, K., Shi, Q., Ma, Y., & Tan, J. (2020). Exploration of Entrepreneurship Education by Linear Regression and Psychological Factor Analysis. *Frontiers in psychology*, *11*, 2045. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02045

Nguyễn Hòa (2021). *Số doanh nghiệp do nữ làm chủ không ngừng tăng lên*. Vietnam ECONOMIC NEWS. Retrieved April 24, 2023 from: https://congthuong.vn/so-doanh-nghiep-do-nu-lam-chu-khong-ngung-tang-len-165882.html

Paray, Z. A., & Kumar, S. (2019). Does entrepreneurship education influence entrepreneurial intention among students in HEI's?: The role of age, gender and degree background. *Journal of International Education in Business*, *13*(1), 55-72. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-02-2019-0009

Pelegrini, G. C., & Moraes, G. H. S. M. D. (2022). Does gender matter? A university ecosystem, self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention analysis in Brazilian universities. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, *37*(2), 271-286. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-01-2021-0007

Pfeifer, S., Šarlija, N., & Zekić Sušac, M. (2016). Shaping the entrepreneurial mindset: Entrepreneurial intentions of business students in Croatia. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *54*(1), 102-117. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12133

Porter, L. W. (1994). The relation of entrepreneurship education to business education. *Simulation & Gaming*, *25*(3), 416-419. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878194253008

Rae, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptual model. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, *12*(3), 323-335. https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000510612259

Rahman, M., Salamzadeh, A., & Tabash, M. I. (2022). Antecedents of Entrepreneurial Intentions of Female Undergraduate Students in Bangladesh: A Covariance-Based Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Journal of Women's Entrepreneurship & Education*, (1-2), 137-153.

Rakicevic, Z., Njegic, K., Cogoljevic, M., & Rakicevic, J. (2023). Mediated Effect of Entrepreneurial Education on Students' Intention to Engage in Social Entrepreneurial Projects. *Sustainability*, *15(5)*, 4606. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054606

Ramadani, V., Rahman, M. M., Salamzadeh, A., Rahaman, M. S., & Abazi-Alili, H. (2022). Entrepreneurship education and graduates' entrepreneurial intentions: Does gender matter? A multi-group analysis using AMOS. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *180*, 121693. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121693

Sahni, H., & Chopra, N. (2022). Value Creation in Social Enterprises through SDGs Integration and the Way Forward in Post-COVID times. In *Social Entrepreneurs* (Vol. 18, pp. 127-156). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2043-052320220000018007

Sarasvathy, S. D., & Venkataraman, S. (2011). Entrepreneurship as method: Open questions for an entrepreneurial future. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, *35*(1), 113-135. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00425.x

Schumpeter, J. (1934). The theory of economic development (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).

Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship*.

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (Vol. 6, pp. 497-516). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tan, L. P., Le, A. N. H., & Xuan, L. P. (2020). A systematic literature review on social entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *11*(3), 241-256. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2019.1640770

Thébaud, S. (2010). Gender and entrepreneurship as a career choice: do self-assessments of ability matter?. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *73*(3), 288-304. https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272510377882

Tran, A. T., & Von Korflesch, H. (2016). A conceptual model of social entrepreneurial intention based on the social cognitive career theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *10*(1), 17-38. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-12-2016-007

Tuan, A. B. N., & Pham, M. (2022). The role of mindfulness and perceived social support in promoting students' social entrepreneurial intention. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *10*(1), 145-160. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2022.100110

Tukamushaba, E. K., Orobia, L., & George, B. P. (2011). Development of a conceptual model to understand international social entrepreneurship and its application in the Ugandan context. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, *9*, 282-298. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-011-0079-9

Ukil, M. I. (2022). Entrepreneurial anxiety: an empirical investigation in Bangladesh. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, (ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-05-2022-0143

Utomo, S. H., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Ali, A., & Sahid, S. (2022). Social capital and entrepreneurial intention among Indonesia rural community. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, *9*(4), 665-679. https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v9i4.927

Verheul, I., & Thurik, R. (2001). Startup capital:" does gender matter?". *Small business economics*, *16*, 329-346. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011178629240

Vietnam Ministry of Planning and Investment. (2022). Retrieved April 24, 2023, from https://www.mpi.gov.vn/Pages/tinbai.aspx?idTin=47515

Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Mahendra, A. M., Wibowo, N. A., Harwida, G., & Rohman, A. N. (2020). The impact of

entrepreneurship education and students' entrepreneurial mindset: the mediating role of attitude and self-efficacy. *Heliyon*, *6*(9), e04922. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04922

Welter, F. (2020). Contexts and gender–looking back and thinking forward. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, *12*(1), 27-38. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJGE-04-2019-0082

Westhead, P., & Solesvik, M. Z. (2016). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: Do female students benefit?. *International small business journal*, *34*(8), 979-1003. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615612534

Xu, H., Wang, C., Wu, J., Liang, Y., Jiao, Y., & Nazneen, S. (2018). Human poverty alleviation through rural women's tourism entrepreneurship. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, *14*(4), 445-460. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2018.1507860

Yamini, R., Soloveva, D., & Peng, X. (2022). What inspires social entrepreneurship? The role of prosocial motivation, intrinsic motivation, and gender in forming social entrepreneurial intention. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, *12*(2), 71-105. https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2019-0129

Yukongdi, V., & Lopa, N. Z. (2017). Entrepreneurial intention: a study of individual, situational and gender differences. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *24*(2), 333-352. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-10-2016-0168

Zeffane, R. (2013). Need for achievement, personality and entrepreneurial potential: A study of young adults in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, *21*(01), 75-105. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218495813500040

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Anh Lan Thuy Nguyen, email: 1954082002anh@ou.edu.vn

Ms. Anh Lan Thuy Nguyen is a scientific assistant at the Department of Business Administration at Ho Chi Minh City Open University Vietnam. Her research interests are entrepreneurship, higher education, and marketing.

Mr. Bao Quoc Lam is a researcher, and student research manager at the Office of Cooperation and Research Management, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam. His research focuses on career behaviors and entrepreneurship.

Ms. Anh Quynh Duong Nguyen is a researcher and student at the Faculty of Business Administration, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam. Her research subjects revolve around business administration.

Dr. Minh Pham is Vice Head of the Administration Department at Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam.