

## Impact of entrepreneurship environmental support factors to university students' entrepreneurship self-efficacy

Thuy Thu Nguyen<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>National Economics University, Hanoi, Vietnam

CHRONICLE

ABSTRACT

*Article history:*

Received: October 25, 2019  
Received in revised format: November 20 2019  
Accepted: November 22, 2019  
Available online:  
November 22, 2019

*Keywords:*

*Entrepreneurship self-efficacy*  
*Financial supports*  
*Perceived environment supports*  
*Social norm*  
*University students*

Policy-makers generally consider entrepreneurship to be instrumental for economic growth and technological progress. The entrepreneurship process is shaped by the presence of entrepreneurship environment. Since entrepreneurship self-efficacy perceptions are also vital to new venture creation and its performance, entrepreneurship self-efficacy literature has generated interesting insights, the research on impact of environment on entrepreneurship self-efficacy is still less evident. This study tests the influence of some environmental cognitive support elements on the entrepreneurship self-efficacy. A cross-sectional research design in Vietnamese students with quantitative questionnaire approach was conducted. The sample consists of 350 students in 6 business and economics universities in Hanoi. The result of the multiple regression analysis reveals that environments' support-factors including perceived financial and non-financial supports, and social supports are significantly related to perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy of students. The study findings highlight some implications for government to reinforce policies encouraging entrepreneurship in university students.

© 2020 by the authors; licensee Growing Science, Canada

### 1. Introduction

Entrepreneurial activities are regarded as an engine for economic development, a driving force for innovation (Carree, 2003). It is recognized that entrepreneurship is the creation of new venture that will solve a particular human being problem, improve the living standard and lead to the creation of a new wealth. Entrepreneurship activities have a great influence on the wealth of economy and also upgrade quality of life to the nations' citizen. Since then, fostering entrepreneurship has become a topic of the highest interest in management and economics over the last decade (Linan, 2009; Nasurdin et al., 2009). Entrepreneurship cannot be fully understood without considering the social, political, and economic environments in which it arises and develops. Bird (1988) indicated that social, institutional, local and cultural environments create the context for entrepreneurship development, beside the individual variables. The presence of local, financial, social encouragements and other additional elements those are available in the environment shape entrepreneurship process (Gnyawali & Fogel, 1994). The environment where the potential entrepreneur lives affects the new venture creation decision-making process of them. Since researchers think that entrepreneurship is a process involving social, cultural, and economic contexts, a special topic has arisen in entrepreneurship field of studies, it focuses on the contextual factors that affect one's entrepreneurship cognition to start a venture. Although considerable researches have interested in understanding impact of environmental factors on entrepreneurship intention and their antecedents in intention models, there is still a gap in our knowledge of *perceived* entrepreneurship self-efficacy (Newman et.al., 2019). Despite the fact that self-efficacy concept is important and robustness at predicting both

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [thuyntqkd@neu.edu.vn](mailto:thuyntqkd@neu.edu.vn) (T.T. Nguyen)

general and specific behaviors, it is ignored in entrepreneurship researches (Krueger et al., 2000; Hsu et al., 2007; Florin et al., 2007), only a limited number of studies have focused on the *perceived* entrepreneurship self-efficacy among students (Newman et al., 2019). Previous studies that focused on the analysis of demographic and personal characteristics factors (age, gender, location, individual characteristics) and self-efficacy studies suggest that entrepreneurship mindset is not the result of institutional or social factors separately (Newman et al., 2019). On the contrary, recent empirical evidences imply that the interaction between social and institutional perspectives more accurately explains entrepreneurship intention and entrepreneurship activity (Krueger et al., 2000; El-Khasawneh, 2008).

This research's objectives are testing the model and hypothesis on the relationship between proposed perceived environmental supports: entrepreneurial financial supports, social support, perceived non-financial supports to entrepreneurship self-efficacy in Vietnamese emerging economics context, which have never been quantitative tested in previous researches. The research includes 5 main sections: the first section includes theoretical background and a review of relevant literature on entrepreneurship self-efficacy. We develop in second section the model and hypothesis to explore the impact of environmental support factors on entrepreneurship self-efficacy on the basis of literature review findings. The following section is the research methodology. All the study findings are in section 4. The final section presents the discussion and implications of the findings. The research results confirm the positive impacts of environmental determinants to students' entrepreneurship self-efficacy. The findings contribute to the literature of contextual factors and entrepreneurship and have wider implications for governmental policy makers.

## 2. Theoretical background

### 2.1 Concept

#### *Entrepreneurship*

Entrepreneurship is “*the capacity and willingness to develop, organize and manage a business venture along with any of its risks in order to make a profit*” (Begley and Tan, 2001). Boyd and Vozikis (1994) illustrate the entrepreneur as “an innovator who seeks opportunities and makes a profit of them by combining different resources in a new production function”. According to Ajzen (1991), entrepreneurship is a dynamic process of creating wealth by individuals or groups of individuals. Liñán and Chen (2009) define “entrepreneurship as the process of conceptualizing, organizing, launching and through innovation, nurturing a business opportunity into a potentially high growth venture in a complex and unstable environment”.

#### *Entrepreneurship self-efficacy*

Bandura's social cognitive theory describes “self-efficacy as a future-oriented belief of the level of competence that is expected from a person during a given situation or for solving a particular task”. Self-efficacy is a person's belief in his ability to organize and implement the actions necessary to achieve certain performances, self-efficacy shows a belief in one's abilities to perform a specific task. Generally, self-efficacy has been seen as strong forecaster of behavior in human actions (Bandura, 1997). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy is defined as a process of increasing a person's entrepreneurial capability, so that he has belief and readiness to realize a career as an entrepreneur, which is based on perceived self-capability in discovering and exploring business opportunities, capability to find the new things, capability in managing a business, capability in building and developing business partner, mental maturity as an entrepreneur (Bandura, 1997). Entrepreneurship self-efficacy indicates an individual feel whether they can easily engage in entrepreneurial venture. Bandura's concept of entrepreneurial self-efficacy beliefs is a different construct with the perceived behavioral control and perceived feasibility in intention models, distinguished by many researches (Ajzen, 1991; Krueger et al., 2000) but they are overlap since all reflects individuals' confidence in the ability to perform entrepreneurial prospective behaviors (Krueger et al., 2000). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy beliefs are considered as individual's belief in terms of perceived entrepreneurial competence to create ventures, the presence of factors that are able to help in carrying out a behavior. Perceived behavioral control consists of not only being able to have the essential skills to run a business and achieve success, but also whether an individual perceives carrying out a specific task very easily or with difficulty and perception about controllability of the behavior (Liñán & Chen, 2009). Bandura (1997) suggested in his research that perceived personal efficacy measures people's sense of behavioral control. Entrepreneurship self-efficacy and *perceived feasibility* have been also been referred as two overlap concepts because *perceived feasibility* reflects an individual's personal judgment of their ability to perform a series of entrepreneurial tasks, based on the evaluation of one's self-efficacy and controllability during entrepreneurship development process (Krueger et al., 2000; Ghulam & Liñán, 2011).

### 2.2 Significant of entrepreneurship self-efficacy in entrepreneurship study

Self-efficacy is a motivational construct that has been shown to influence an individual's choice of activities, goal levels, persistence, and performance in a range of contexts (Bandura 1986). Krueger et al. (2000) found that a person's positive perceived self-capability increases chance for new venture opportunities recognition. Individuals, who are sensitive to opportunities, and able to take advantage of entrepreneurial opportunities, are usually expected to perceive themselves as entrepreneurially capable. Opportunity recognition depends on controllability and self-efficacy perceptions of entrepreneurs (Krueger & Dickson, 1994). Also, the entrepreneurship self-efficacy perception of an individual about his/her knowledge, skills, and

experiences *competencies* plays an important role in determining the readiness to create an enterprise and start entrepreneurial activities (Ajzen, 1991). Hisrich and Bowen (1986) claim that a lack of self-confidence is a major obstacle in the development of potential innovation start up (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994). Liñan and Chen (2009) suggest that those individuals who think that they are confident of having high level of entrepreneurial capabilities will be more likely to create a firm. Furthermore, self-efficacy are also vital to new venture creation and intentions and its performance (Krueger et al., 2000). Costa et al. (2016) highlighted that entrepreneurial self-efficacy competencies provide the ability to perform entrepreneurship activities successfully. Self-efficacy has been also associated with risk-taking under uncertainty, as well as career choice (Bandura, 1986). Several researches have highlighted that entrepreneurship self-efficacy was the “single best predictor in the entire array of variables” for entrepreneurial intention, behaviors, new venture performance and entrepreneur’s satisfaction (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994).

Self-efficacy is linked to initiating and persisting entrepreneurship intention and behavior, setting higher goals, and reducing threat-rigidity (Bandura, 1986). Krueger et al. (2000) indicated that differences in self-efficacy make the differences in career preferences between different gender and ethnic group. In addition, role models affect entrepreneurial intentions only if they affect self-efficacy (Krueger et al., 2000). Therefore, to encourage economic development by a means of new enterprise creations we must first make a reference to perceptions entrepreneurship self-efficacy. Policy initiatives will increase business formations if those initiatives positively influence entrepreneurship self-efficacy and then influence intentions (Zhao et al., 2005). Encouraging entrepreneurship activities should proceed from fostering entrepreneurship self-efficacy.

### 3. Literature review and hypothesis development

#### 3.1 Entrepreneurial environment support impact to entrepreneurship self-efficacy

The contextual factors of entrepreneurship – the entrepreneurial environment consist of social, structural, cultural and economic variables such as government deregulation, changes in markets, and local context supports mechanism (Bird, 1988). Gnyawali and Fogel (1994) classified entrepreneurial environment in 6 components: policy and programs of the government, entrepreneurial skills, socio-economic conditions, financial and non-financial support. There is a growing acceptance that entrepreneurial environment supports are the critical factors for the development of entrepreneurship mindset (Gnyawali & Fogel, 1994). Bandura 1991’s highlighted in process driven theory that external environment influences thoughts. Bandura (1986) notes that physiological/ emotional arousal built a mechanism for influencing efficacy judgments. Self-efficacy judgments and the process through which these judgments are formed can be influenced through the judgments of one’s own physiological states of surrounding environment (Bandura, 1986). Business-behaviors are learned and the human mind is a blank slate that can be shaped by environment. Shapero and Sokol’s (1982) in their entrepreneurial event theory also claimed that life path changes impact on individual perceptions of entrepreneurial feasibility. Human beings are rational and make systematic use of information available to them. An individual, who perceives the founding conditions as very favorable (trigger effect), will perceive himself as entrepreneurially capable. Inversely, a negative perception of salient factors in the environment will make them fill incapable for entrepreneurial activities (Krueger et al., 2000). Schwarz et al. (2009) clarified entrepreneurial environment condition into environment supports, entrepreneurial environment barrier. Fini et al. (2011) emphasized that individual perceived environmental supports which from characteristics of the local context (such as availability of logistic infrastructure, financial investors, and competition) government policies (such as legal framework, support program) influence entrepreneurship activities and intention. Governmental interference includes tax policies, funding schemes and other support mechanisms aimed at promoting entrepreneurship. Environmental supports can be clarified in to financial support, non-financial support (Gnyawali & Fogel, 1994). Baughn et al. (2006) agree that social support is also important factor in the entrepreneurship environment. Based upon the existing literature, it appears promising to integrate both contextual support factors and social support factor into a theoretical model of entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

#### 3.2. Hypothesis

##### *Financial support and entrepreneurship self-efficacy*

Financial support including venture capital availability, support of capital industry from local government policies and bank has been identified as leading factors in the support of entrepreneurship (Fini, 2011). Financial supports can come from gifts, family aids, family loans, friend loans, or loans from financial institutions (Fini, 2009). Financial capital is needed to start a new venture, to cope with the risks associated with the new venture and to develop and grow their new enterprise and reach their business objectives. Potential entrepreneurs hardly finance a new business completely by themselves, they need to raise capital from other places (Kwong & Evans, 2012). Previous studies found that that an individual’s perceive lack of access to finance from people outside their circle of family and friends significantly increases the barrier in starting a business (Luthi & Frank). Finance is probably the most supportive measure of the entrepreneurship development but at the same time, it is also the biggest barrier among potential entrepreneurs when considering to start a new venture (Schwarz et al., 2009)

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Financial support is positively related to entrepreneurship self-efficacy.

*Non-financial support and entrepreneurship self-efficacy*

Non-financial environmental supports have an impact on the enactment of entrepreneurship process. Researchers have proposed the impact of government, local context, and university support mechanisms to the entrepreneurial thought and behaviors (Fini et al., 2009). Governments, with support schemes and tax policies; local contexts with physical infrastructure and business environment factors like legal rules, competitions are important factors influencing individual's entrepreneurship (Gnyawali & Fogel, 1994). Shapero and Sokol (1982) indicate that environment factor is an adjusting variable, which impacts individual's entrepreneurial intentions by the interaction with individual's attitudes and perception of behavior control. According to Lucky et al. (2015) contextual elements as background factors influence self-efficacy (feasibility) and the entrepreneurial intention through so that contextual element will also affect the self-efficacy.

**H<sub>2</sub>:** Non-financial support is positively related to entrepreneurship self-efficacy.

*Social norm and entrepreneurship self-efficacy*

Supportive social norm involves the acceptance of the entrepreneurship career, encouragement of entrepreneurship in general, and promoting entrepreneurship from the significant others (Baughn et al., 2006). Social norm is a function of the perceived normative beliefs of significant others including family, friends, and co-workers, weighted by the individual's motive to comply with each normative belief (Ajzen, 2001). The influence of social persuasion and perceived physiological wellbeing on the development of self-efficacy beliefs still has a gap in the entrepreneurial research. We propose to use social support theory as a theoretical foundation for examining the social determinants of self-efficacy beliefs. Social support theory suggests that the support received from interpersonal relationships has a positive effect on how a person copes with stress or life change. Individuals rely on close relationships like family, friends, close relatives, close relations to fill needed information, assurance, and instrumental supports. By providing positive affect, social norm directly changes overall personal perception (Begley & Tan, 2001). Thus, social persuasion may be viewed as a form of social norm that enhances self-efficacy beliefs. Furthermore, verbal persuasion in the form of positive encouragement on entrepreneurial career may influence entrepreneurial self-efficacy. If social persuasion is from people that potential entrepreneur trust or form the successful role model to the individual, verbal persuasion may exert an even more profound influence on the development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Baughn, 2006). Hopp and Stephan (2012) indicated that the social factors could enter into the formation of entrepreneurial events by directly influence the formation of individual value systems. In a social system that admire entrepreneurs, more individuals will choose the path to become entrepreneurs. Therefore, we propose:

**H<sub>3</sub>:** Social norm will be positively related to entrepreneurship self-efficacy.

The research uses gender (women or men), previous entrepreneurial experiences (ever start a business or not) and parents' occupations (business related jobs or others) as control variables.

### 3. Research methodology

To examine the hypotheses, data was gathered from a self-administered questionnaire conducted among university students in Hanoi, Vietnam. The participation in this study was final year students studying business and economics at 6 public and private universities. Questionnaires were randomly distributed to target respondents with control of sex, major and universities. The questionnaire was adapted from various sources. The questionnaire is in Vietnamese and includes 20 questions. The research questionnaire was designed by borrowing measures from previous researches with adaptation for Vietnamese context. Before using the questionnaire for survey, qualitative study has been done to test the question, adopt and make it easier to use in Vietnamese context. Two pages questionnaire consisted of three parts: demographic and family background, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and perceived environment supports. The scales used in the questionnaire was 5-point Likert scale with 1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - neutral, 4 - agree, 5 - strongly agree for each question. Financial support measure with 3 items borrowed from Israr and Saleem (2018) asking their perception of ability to access to finance when starting new venture. Non-financial support measure with 6 items adopted from Lüthje and Franke (2004), this construct has been used and tested in Schwarz (2009) research. For social norm we have used Linan and Chen's (2009) measures with 3 items asking about opinions about being entrepreneurs of students' family, friend and important people. The measure of entrepreneurial self-efficacy is from Begley and Tan (2001) research which includes 7 items asking the respondents of their confidence in implementing 7 entrepreneurship tasks. Prior to conducting the main study, the author implemented an additional exploratory study to improve the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, and confirm the research model. 5 in - depth interviews were conducted with final year students in National Economics University during August 2017 to confirm that the appropriate of research model and survey instruments. After finishing data collection, the data were checked to ensure that the sample consists of the research designed subjects, eliminate questionnaires with bias answers or missing important information (8 questionnaires). Finally, the final dataset included 385 final year students. SPSS software version 22 was used for analyzing data to examine the validity and reliability of measures, test the research hypotheses and model. Descriptive analysis, factor analysis with varimax rotation, Cronbach alpha were used to test measure, and then and hierarchical multiple regression were performed to examine the hypothesized propositions.

## 4. The results

### 4.1. Sample description

Total 385 responses have been used for analyses. Gender: Out of 385 students in the research, 199 (51,7%) are women, 178 (46,2%) are men.

**Table 1**

The results of the survey

|                               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| National Economics University | 159       | 41.3    | 41.3          | 41.3               |
| Commercial University         | 66        | 17.1    | 17.1          | 58.4               |
| Foreign Trade University      | 41        | 10.6    | 10.6          | 69.1               |
| Trade Union University        | 22        | 5.7     | 5.7           | 74.8               |
| FPT                           | 27        | 7.0     | 7.0           | 81.8               |
| Phuongdong University         | 70        | 18.2    | 18.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                         | 385       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

(Source: author' research)

Family business background: 60.8 % of the students' parents are not involved in business activities or business owners and 49,2 % of students' parents are developing business related carrier. Entrepreneurship experience: 12% of respondents have involved in entrepreneurship activities or invested in new ventures.

### 4.2. Measurement assessment

EFA analysis with varimax rotation was conducted for 23 items of 4 variables at the same time. 23 items loaded in 4 factors. Social norm, financial support and entrepreneurship self-efficacy items are loading with factor loading in all cases above 0.5. All items are loading in original factors. One item of non- financial support scale NFS6 are loading in wrong factor, the other factors are loading in the original one with factor loading in all cases above 0.5. Then, cronbach's Alpha analysis was conducted. "Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted" of NFS6 is higher than its Cronbach's Alpha. After considering, NFS6 is eliminated from the non-financial scale. EFA analysis is conducted again (Table 2). Cronbach's Alpha analysis was conducted for all scales. Cronbach's Alpha analysis for dependent and independent variables shows that all variables' Cronbach's Alpha are at minimum 0.718. All the value of "Corrected item total correlation" are bigger than 0.3. All the study's items have "Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted" are lower than total variable Cronbach's Alpha.

**Table 2**

The results of EFA analysis

|      | Component |      |      |      |
|------|-----------|------|------|------|
|      | 1         | 2    | 3    | 4    |
| SE7  | .769      |      |      |      |
| SE6  | .762      |      |      |      |
| SE5  | .759      |      |      |      |
| SE3  | .724      |      |      |      |
| SE1  | .713      |      |      |      |
| SE4  | .653      |      |      |      |
| SE2  | .559      |      |      |      |
| NFS1 |           | .739 |      |      |
| NFS2 |           | .735 |      |      |
| NFS3 |           | .719 |      |      |
| NFS4 |           | .696 |      |      |
| NFS5 |           | .668 |      |      |
| FS2  |           |      | .825 |      |
| FS3  |           |      | .808 |      |
| FS1  |           |      | .804 |      |
| SN2  |           |      |      | .791 |
| SN3  |           |      |      | .790 |
| SN1  |           |      |      | .773 |

Source: author' research

Therefore, all variables are internally consistent scales. They are validity and reliability for using in the next analysis.

**Table 3**

Variables' measurements

| Variables                                | No of items | Cronbach's alpha |
|--|-------------|------------------|
| Social norm                              | 3 items     | 0.718            |
| Financial supports                       | 3 items     | 0.787            |
| Non-financial environment supports       | 5 items     | 0.779            |
| Perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy | 7 items     | 0.849            |

Source: author' research

### 4.3. Results of hypotheses testing

Before using regression to test the research hypothesis, we tested the normal distribution of the indexes for all variables. The correlation matrix has been used to examine the bivariate correlation between all factors and the regression assumptions are checked (Table 4).

**Table 4**  
The results of the implementation of the Pearson correlation test

|     |                     | SE     | SN     | FS     | NFS    |
|-----|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| SE  | Pearson Correlation | 1      | .339** | .288** | .289** |
|     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | .000   | .000   | .000   |
|     | N                   | 385    | 385    | 385    | 385    |
| SN  | Pearson Correlation | .339** | 1      | .202** | .141** |
|     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   |        | .000   | .000   |
|     | N                   | 385    | 385    | 385    | 385    |
| FS  | Pearson Correlation | .288** | .202** | 1      | .322** |
|     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   | .000   |        | .000   |
|     | N                   | 385    | 385    | 385    | 385    |
| NFS | Pearson Correlation | .289** | .141** | .322** | 1      |
|     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   | .000   | .000   |        |
|     | N                   | 385    | 385    | 385    | 385    |

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
(Source: author' research)

Then, hierarchical regression analysis has been used to test the relationship between 3 environment determinants with perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy. In the first regression model -the control model- the dependent variable is perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy with 3 control variables, the model is not significant ( $F = 7.762$ , adjusted  $R^2 = 0.051$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The second model with three control variables and three environmental independent variables were tested. The model is significant with research data ( $F = 18.247$ , adjusted  $R^2 = 0.192$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy have significant relationship with prior entrepreneurship activities but it is not the case for the other two control variables. Gender and parents' business occupations have not got significant relationship with perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy. All three independent variables have positive significant relations with perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy. Supportive social norm, financial and non-financial environment supports relate positively and significantly with perceived entrepreneurship self-efficacy ( $P < .05$ ).

**Table 4**  
The results of regression analysis

| Model |                                   | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                                   | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t      |      |
| 1     | (Constant)                        | 3.213                       | .102       |                           | 31.651 | .000 |
|       | Family business background        | .113                        | .065       | .086                      | 1.725  | .085 |
|       | Gender                            | -.022                       | .059       | -.019                     | -.377  | .707 |
|       | Prior entrepreneurship activities | .392                        | .088       | .225                      | 4.467  | .000 |
|       |                                   |                             |            |                           |        |      |
| 2     | (Constant)                        | 1.490                       | .228       |                           | 6.550  | .000 |
|       | Family business background        | .074                        | .061       | .057                      | 1.218  | .224 |
|       | Gender                            | -.005                       | .058       | -.005                     | -.095  | .925 |
|       | Prior entrepreneurship activities | .329                        | .082       | .189                      | 4.026  | .000 |
|       | Non-financial supports            | .146                        | .046       | .160                      | 3.180  | .002 |
|       | Social norm                       | .220                        | .041       | .253                      | 5.390  | .000 |
|       | Financial supports                | .142                        | .041       | .170                      | 3.442  | .001 |

a. Dependent Variable: meanSE

Source: author' research

All hypotheses H1, H2, H3 are supported with the research data. After all, test for (multi-) collinearity. The tolerance and VIF statistics indicate high tolerance values of  $>0.924$  and low VIF.

## 5. Discussion and conclusion

The research findings have shown that entrepreneurs who have start up experiences tend to believe themselves capable of doing entrepreneurship tasks. Having parents self-employed have not much meaning for entrepreneurial self-efficacy of students. This is in line with the other researches of Bowen and Hisrich (1986), Nguyen (2017), Schereret et al. (1989) and Shapero and Sokol (1982). The study provides evidence that the perceived contextual environment support factors play a significant role for the students' perception of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. This supports the contextual theory of entrepreneurship. Also, it is consistent with findings from studies by Fini et al. (2009), Hopp and Stephan (2012) and affirmed that environment support substitute with social supports predicts entrepreneurial self-efficacy apart from attitude and individual characteristics.

The study recommends public policy makers several meanings and methods to intensify their activities and design programs on fostering entrepreneurship. Such programs have to remove the adverse perceived environmental condition, provide financial as well as structure and institutional supports for starting a company. Furthermore, the social persuasion of entrepreneurship as graduates' career choice should be improved. Our findings suggest that educators and policy makers need to consider the role of family, cultural attitudes and social personal perceptions when seeking to promote entrepreneurial actions of college students through policies or educational programs. Entrepreneurship image, role and success stories should be educated to families, public and social communities, so that they have a positive and favorable attitude toward entrepreneurship. The social encouragement and positive thinking of entrepreneurship as a career will promote student entrepreneurship competence cognition. The study results confirmed that perceived environmental supports impact positively to students' entrepreneurship entrepreneurial self-efficacy. The study has several limitations. The analysis was limited only to the regression analysis in order to understand the influence of environmental supports on the entrepreneurial self-efficacy among final year students. Also, the study only focused on two major environmental factors, which are environmental and social supports without consideration to other environmental barrier factors such as government and university policies, individual factors. These factors are believed that would have the potential to influence the entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Some additional areas for future exploration emerged. Future study should replicate this study using other foreign students, or different contexts to validate and increase the generalization of the finding obtained in this study. Another method of data analysis also needed to accurately explain the relationship between environmental supports and entrepreneurial self-efficacy. This calls for more researches in the interaction between different environment determinants that operate at different levels of analysis: national level (governmental laws, institutional and local aspect) and the universities level (education, social life) and individual level (knowledge, characteristics). Future researches should discover the relationship between entrepreneurship potential, entrepreneurship intention and entrepreneurship decisions - the actions can occur after a long time lag in process.

## References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Macmillan.
- Baughn, C. C., Cao, J. S., Le, L. T. M., Lim, V. A., & Neupert, K. E. (2006). Normative, social and cognitive predictors of entrepreneurial interest in China, Vietnam and the Philippines. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 11(01), 57-77.
- Begley, T. M., & Tan, W. L. (2001). The socio-cultural environment for entrepreneurship: A comparison between East Asian and Anglo-Saxon countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 537-553.
- Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *Academy of management Review*, 13(3), 442-453.
- Boyd, N. G., & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 18(4), 63-77.
- Carree, M. A., & Thurik, A. R. (2003). The impact of entrepreneurship on economics growth. *The handbook of entrepreneurship research*, 145-156.
- Hsu, D. H., Roberts, E. B., & Eesley, C. E. (2007). Entrepreneurs from technology-based universities: Evidence from MIT. *Research Policy*, 36(5), 768-788.
- El-Khasawneh, B. S. (2008). Entrepreneurship promotion at educational institutions: a model suitable for emerging economies. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 2(5), 27-35.
- Fini, R., Grimaldi, R., & Sobrero, M. (2009). Factors fostering academics to start up new ventures: an assessment of Italian founders' incentives. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 34(4), 380-402.
- Fini, R., Grimaldi, R., Santoni, S., & Sobrero, M. (2011). Complements or substitutes? The role of universities and local context in supporting the creation of academic spin-offs. *Research Policy*, 40(8), 1113-1127.
- Florin, J., Karri, R., & Rossiter, N. (2007). Fostering entrepreneurial drive in business education: An attitudinal approach. *Journal of Management Education*, 31(1), 17-42.
- Ghulam, N., & Liñán, F. (2011). Graduate entrepreneurship in the developing world: intentions, education and development. *Education and Training*, 53(5).
- Gnyawali, D. R., & Fogel, D. S. (1994). Environments for entrepreneurship development: key dimensions and research implications. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 43-62.
- Hopp, C., & Stephan, U. (2012). The influence of socio-cultural environments on the performance of nascent entrepreneurs: Community culture, motivation, self-efficacy and start-up success. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(9-10), 917-945.
- Israr, M., & Saleem, M. (2018). Entrepreneurial intentions among university students in Italy. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(1), 20.
- Kristiansen, S., & Indarti, N. (2004). Entrepreneurial intention among Indonesian and Norwegian students. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 12(01), 55-78.
- 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.

- Kwong, C., Jones-Evans, D., & Thompson, P. (2012). Differences in perceptions of access to finance between potential male and female entrepreneurs: Evidence from the UK. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 18(1), 75-97.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(3), 593-617.
- Lüthje, C., & Franke, N. (2003). The 'making' of an entrepreneur: testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT. *R&d Management*, 33(2), 135-147.
- Lucky, E. O. I., & Ibrahim, N. A. (2015). Environmental factors and entrepreneurial intention among Nigerian students in UUM. *Sains Humanika*, 5(2).
- Franke, N., & Lüthje, C. (2004). Entrepreneurial intentions of business students—A benchmarking study. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 1(03), 269-288.
- Nasurdin, A. M., Ahmad, N. H., & Lin, C. E. (2009). Examining a model of entrepreneurial intention among Malaysians using SEM procedure. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 33(2), 365-373.
- Newman, A., Obschonka, M., Schwarz, S., Cohen, M., & Nielsen, I. (2019). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: A systematic review of the literature on its theoretical foundations, measurement, antecedents, and outcomes, and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 110, 403-419.
- Nguyen, T. (2017). Impacts of educational factors to entrepreneurship intention in university students, *VNU Journal of Science: Economics and Business*, 33(5E), 76-88.
- Schwarz, E. J., Wdowiak, M. A., Almer-Jarz, D. A., & Breitenecker, R. J. (2009). The effects of attitudes and perceived environment conditions on students' entrepreneurial intent: An Austrian perspective. *Education+ Training*, 51(4), 272-291.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(6), 1265.



© 2020 by the authors; licensee Growing Science, Canada. This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).