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Abstract
The aim of this study is to determine the impact of the antecedents of social entrepreneurship intention in Higher Education Institution (HEI) in Malaysia. Total of 127 secondary data was collected for further analysis. The study was conducted with the reliability test of 0.89 Cronbach Alpha. In Spearman two-tailed correlation analysis, it was shown that all of the variables have positively and significantly correlate towards each other. Nevertheless, it was revealed that self-efficacy is the only contributing factor towards social entrepreneurship with (β = 0.310, t-value = 2.87 and p-value 0.05). It can be concluded that more effort should be put towards the insignificant variables (empathy and moral obligation) as it was empirically proven by previous researchers the essentiality of the variables in determining social entrepreneurship intention. Further studies could contribute by adding more variables or using different method or approaches so that it would contribute more towards social entrepreneurship intention in higher education institution in Malaysia.
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INTRODUCTION
The terminology of social entrepreneurship covers a wide range such as organisational form and structures and individual initiatives (Roper and Cheney, 2005). It is one of the types in entrepreneurship. The perspective of social entrepreneurship is not an isolated phenomenon but it is a part of the social system and it has evolved within a complex framework of economics, politics and social (Mair, 2010; Mair, 2008; light, 2006; Harding, 2006; Seelos and Mair, 2005). In the past, the study of social entrepreneurship towards academic area was very lacking and got indifferent treatment by academician (Sundaramurthy et al., 2013; Weerawardena and Mort, 2012; Santos, 2012; Urban, 2008). But, in the past decade it started to become mainstream and gain a plethora of attention from philanthropists, board of directors, non-profit entrepreneurs, consultants, academicians, practitioners, non-profit sector, private and even the public (Mair, 2010; Urbano et al., 2010; Toledano et al., 2009; Austin et al., 2006; Urban, 2008; Urbano and Toledano 2008; Anderson et al. 2006; Adid 2005; Dey, 2001; Lerner and Haber 2001). At present, it can be stated that social entrepreneurship is experiencing an emerging excitement (Hirsch and Levin 1999). This is mainly because of its importance as an economic phenomenon globally (Urbano et al., 2010; Mair, 2010; Mair and Marti, 2006) and it is a current issue nowadays for academician (Andrea Rey-Martia et al., 2016; Corner and Ho, 2010; Nichols, 2010; Urbano et al., 2010; Defourney, 2000). Social entrepreneurship has been stated as a crucial source of social, economic, cultural and environmental wealth (Leadbeater, 2007; Shaw and Carter, 2007; Spear, 2006). It was added by Mair (2010) that social entrepreneurship is also representing tonnes of opportunities for researchers to explore and learn on the driving social mechanism and economic development. In addition, it was added that the shortfall and deteriorated social problem shown that the government and philanthropy’s endeavour has failed to meet the expectation (Santos, 2012; Urbano et al., 2010; Urban, 2008). Tiwari et al. (2017) stated that although it has been a long historical of endeavours between government, non-profit organisation and business to cure the social issues but it still cannot cease to exist loopholes especially in under-developed nation.

According to Sekluckiæne & Kisielius (2015), it is vital to take advantage and respond towards the social challenge when the public sector and market fail to do so (Urban, 2008). It was added that social entrepreneur would create solutions towards the social issues and problems which ultimately brought benefit for individual, communities and also society (Radin A Rahman et al., 2016). Other than that, Social entrepreneurship is the field where the entrepreneurs adjust their programs or activities to directly link with their ultimate goal which is to create social value towards society (Konaki, 2015; Abu-Saifan, 2012; Peredo and McLean, 2006; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006; Guchu et al., 2002, Thompson et al., 2000). Hence, social entrepreneurship is often acted with the intention of helping others without attaining much personal profit (Urbano et al, 2010; Zadek and Thake, 1997). Social entrepreneurship is an emerging area for academician and consequently, its underpinning theory is still not solid and there still lacks proper basic theory (Tiwari et al., 2017; Urbano et al., 2010; Austin et al, 2006; Mair and Marti, 2006) as this field will be better understood if there is thorough and sharper elaboration and well-bound with proper validated theories.

Moreover, the number of Higher Education Institution (HEI) in Malaysia has increased rapidly since the establishment of the very first university in Malaysia in 1949 which was University of Malaya (Ahsan and Alam, 2009; Noor, 2011). In 2013 only, there
were numerous HEIs in Malaysia either public or private and it kept on skyrocketing (Mustapha, 2013; Mustapha & Yu Ghee, 2013). Malaysia is facing a huge wall in bringing its economy towards a greater height at least levelling with other developing countries. Thus, there is a terrible need for the study of social entrepreneurship intention in Malaysia to fill in the gap in order to balance with the profit-oriented goal in our beloved country. The usage of social entrepreneur term may be new, but its phenomenon is not (Urban, 2008). Most of the striking social entrepreneurship activities were from developed countries (Seelos and Mair, 2005). Yet, the development and establishment of social entrepreneurship in the European continent and globally was only begun in this century (Bikse et al., 2015). There were a lot of other researchers in social entrepreneurship in other countries that also found the slow-growing and babyhood of social entrepreneurship such as Latvia (Bikse et al., 2015), Catalonia, Spain (Urbanbo et al., 2010), India (Tiwari et al., 2017; Ghan et al., 2013) and Africa (Urban, 2008).

In addition, the implementation of social entrepreneurship in Malaysia is also still in its infancy (Radin A Rahman et al., 2016). Also, the study of social entrepreneurship can be considered as an emergent (Austin et al., 2006) and still as new lifeblood circulating in the whole entrepreneurship vein (Salamzadeh, Azimi, & Kirby, 2013; Afagunow, 2014). In addition, the Ministry of Education (MOE) Malaysia was also highlighted and emphasized on the cultivation of social entrepreneurship towards public or private HEI in Malaysia (Radin A Rahman et al., 2016). As Malaysia is still a developed country; Chell (2007) narrated that social entrepreneurship is necessary and important in a developed country as there exist gap between social development and economic discrimination. Apart from that, most of studies on social entrepreneurship were focussing on individual cases and disregarded the antecedents and factors of social entrepreneurship which is vital to emulate social entrepreneurship (Koe et al., 2010; Mair and Marti, 2006). In order to nurture and encourage social entrepreneurship intention in enterprise; therefore, it is crucial to study and learn the factors that influence the thinking of individuals in order to catalyst their attention towards social entrepreneurship intention. Grounded by these limitations, there is a dire need for the study that determines the nature of social entrepreneurship is justified especially within non-western context as per aforementioned reasons (Urban, 2008).

Therefore, it is a compulsory and prospect to study the social entrepreneurship intention in Malaysia as it would bring a huge positive impact on society throughout Malaysia. It can be inferred that there are HEIs in all of the states in Malaysia. Thus, the effects or impacts of the study would be affected massively throughout the country and it is also a critical study to improve social life. The purpose of this paper is to provide empirical evidence of the factors that are necessary and significant to the increment of Social Entrepreneurship intention among student in a Malaysian Public University. This exploration study would expand and develop new insight on social entrepreneurship and further expanding on this topic so that future researchers could elaborate more on it in a more technical and details manner. The paper is built based on the literature extracted into hypotheses statement. The objectives of this research are to find out the relationship of the empathy, moral obligation and self-efficacy towards social entrepreneurship intention in HEI. Thus, the research questions are what are the effects between empathy, moral obligation and self-efficacy towards social entrepreneurship intention. The result of this paper would provide a better insight towards Social Entrepreneurship in HEI in Malaysia.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Social entrepreneurship definition might vary from one researcher from the others as this topic is still haven’t got a solid or established definition (Bikse et al., 2015; Konakli, 2015; Mair, 2010). Drucker (1979) was the one who introduced and pioneered the social enterprise concept. It was also advocated by him that there is a need for social sector as an added value to the private business sector and government sector to fulfil the social needs and nurture a sense of giving back to the country and society. Spear (2004) as cited in Urban (2008) questioned whether it is about building a social enterprise or it is about entrepreneurship that encapsulated with a social dimension. Austin et al. (2006) pointed out the definitions of social entrepreneurship is ranging from broad to narrow. Primarily, it is conceptualised as the process that creating values (Abu-Saifan, 2012). In addition, social entrepreneurship can also be defined as a real-world problem solving with powerful ideas that having a vision and target to change the society (Borainstein, 1998), meeting social needs (Prieto, 2014) or making use of the opportunities in producing social values (Konakli, 2015). Mair (2010) defined social entrepreneurship as a process that caters the locally-existing basic needs that had not been done by traditional organisations with the objective to amend and ameliorate the social/economic arrangements. Next, Dees & Anderson (2003) defined social entrepreneurship as an innovative activity with a target for gaining profit to provide a systemic solution in order to achieve a sustainable social objective such as social-purpose commercial ventures, or non-profit sector. In addition, social entrepreneurship can also mean as the game changer towards the economy, environment, social, education and politics locally and globally (Radin A Rahman et al., 2016). This is mainly because of social entrepreneurship is providing opportunities by meeting social needs, hence culminate in social changes (Konakli, 2015; Prieto, 2014). Thus, the initiatives taken in exploring social entrepreneurship has heightened the living of communities and society without taking profit as the main objectives (Radin A Rahman et al., 2016; Bikse et al., 2015). Austin et al. (2006) stated that social entrepreneurship is an entrepreneur with an embedded social mission or purposes. They further defined it as an inventively creating a social values activity that occurs within or across government, business or non-profit sectors.

Therefore, social entrepreneurship can also be known as a process in attaining a new product and services. Narrowly, social entrepreneurship is defined as the phenomenon where entrepreneurs applying their business expertise and market-based skills by developing innovative approaches to earn income in a non-profit sector or organisation (Stimms, 2009; Thompson, 2002).

Moreover, there are common definitions of social entrepreneurship which is to establish social values rather than for personal benefits and the activities done were somewhat of something new rather than recycle, repeating or replicating of what has been done before by another organisation. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) report defined social entrepreneurship as any activity attempt in a new social entrepreneurship or new enterprise or a new development from existing social enterprise (individual, teams, established enterprise) with a mission and foundation to contributing to either social or community where the entrepreneurship profit is invested in another social activity rather than reimbursed it back to investors (Harding, 2006). Weerawardena and Mort (2006) came with a theoretical conclusion of social entrepreneurship which may be generalized as:

(a) Social entrepreneurship is stated as an enormous array of either welfare, social activities or any diverse activities
(b) Social entrepreneurship can be generalising as a lot of concepts such as public sector, private sector, Non-governmental organisation and charities.

(c) Social entrepreneurship is being distinguished from other entrepreneurship from its role as doing community work.

Harding (2006) also created a concept or definition either an enterprise has the features of Social entrepreneurship. First, the target and project have a social goal rather than profit-oriented organisational mission (Oxelhell and Chalkley, 2007). Second, the profit or revenue would be used for future activities rather than giving it back to the shareholders. Bikse (2011) developed a theory for entrepreneurial competence so that entrepreneurs can sustain in their business. It was concluded that all entrepreneurs either commercial or social should have a well-developed entrepreneurial competence. This is because they need knowledge and skills in order to be competent enough to handle a business. In elaboration, the knowledge and skills are management competence (planning, decision making, ready to carry responsibility and a problem identifier and solver), personal competence (Self-confidence, motivation, flexibility and critical), entrepreneurial qualities (ready to take risk, creative and ready to take initiative) and social competent (Cooperate, networking and working in team). Therefore, it can be stated that social competence is crucially important although for the entrepreneurial competence. Moreover, the main driver of social entrepreneurship is to manage the social problem and forming a social organisation in deciding on how to properly use the resources to address the problems (Bikse et al., 2015; Santos, 2012; Austin et al., 2006). In addition, there are many central themes of social entrepreneurship such as job creation for the people, building utilisation, support from volunteer and everything is for helping the underserved (Thompson et al., 2000). Additionally, Mair (2010) described that the way resources being used and combined to create new desired changes and values by creative and innovative thinking for the sake of social purposes is a novel way of doing things (Shaw and Carter, 2007). Social entrepreneurs provide innovative procedures to make change by reconceptualising and revamp the enterprise mission so that it would provide value (Brown and Wyatt, 2015). In the end, profit and customer satisfaction are not significant but the gauge for the value creation is the impact of the social values in the social entrepreneurship (Santos, 2012; Urban, 2008; Peredo and McLean, 2006). The social entrepreneurs are not only motivated by their perception on social need or empathy but they are having a greater image on how to improve and they are resolute to achieve their vision (Dees, 2001; Bornstein, 1998).

It is based on the foundation that a social entrepreneur sees the opportunities that cannot be seen by others, and realising something that is never ever once been thought by others and finding multitudinous solutions towards problems in a different way and also by apprehending new approaches (Seelos and Mair, 2005). In addition, social entrepreneur is a combination of passion, intuition, bravery, innovation (Austin et al., 2006; Kramer, 2005; Drucker, 1999; Leadbeater, 1997), and determination in order to serve their social mission (Bikse et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2012; Mair and Marti, 2006; Dees & Anderson, 2003; Fowler, 2000; Borzaga and Defourny, 2001; Schumpeter, 1934). As mentioned above, Bikse et al. (2015) narrated the same as the aforementioned sentence before and insisting that social entrepreneurs should deal with problems not only from macro level but also in micro level. Thompson (2002) pointed out that social entrepreneur is an individual with qualities and associated with helping others than making money. In addition, Shaw and Carter (2007) defined social entrepreneur as an individual with enterprise with a main objective to meet social change and also without thinking about making financial profit.

This is supported by Dees (2001) that stated social entrepreneurship is playing the role of a changing agent in the social sector. Brouard and Larvet (2010) studied various authors work from 1991 to 2008 and summarised that social entrepreneurs are certain individuals who resolve with an entrepreneurial spirit and personality, acting as changing agent and as a leader to convoy social problems by applying new opportunities and act innovatively and their main vision is to create social value rather than going for financial profit. Social entrepreneurs are persistently pursuing new opportunities in order to achieve the mission and create social values with the process of continuous innovation and learning. They are also performed with a lot of resources and held great accountability towards the outcomes envisioned. This resonates with Bikse et al. (2015) that narrated social entrepreneur is someone that is active and responsible who carry the responsibility to deal with social issues in the. Hence, the pioneer of social entrepreneur is someone with leadership traits and abilities that saw through the problems that plague the society and willingly wanted to metamorphose it (Urban, 2008; Austin et al., 2006; Bornstein, 1998; Dees, 1998; Schumpeter, 1934; Hussain et al., 2018). It was narrated by Urban (2008) that the driving motivation for social entrepreneurs are politics (the dissemination of social function from higher level to local level and also public to private sector), economy (lessen the fund spent from the public purse) and social (increasing of social complexity problems). On the other hand, social entrepreneurship is individual with a mission and vision who utilize a set of entrepreneurial behaviours to create and deliver social values towards the less privilege through entrepreneurial entities that are independent and have a stable financial (Abu-Saifan, 2012; Urbano et al., 2010). In addition, a social entrepreneur differs as compared to a normal entrepreneur as they are mission-driven people who are dedicated to providing social value to those underserved. Normally, they are from a non-profit organisation which intended to execute an income by delivering social values while remain making profit from it. Additionally, social entrepreneurship is not operated as charity but it is professed as a mission-based business (Urban, 2008). Social entrepreneurs are seeking to create a systemic and sustainable transformation, and they risked their organisations on behalf of the folks they aided (Brinckerhoff, 2000). Their effort would nurture and instil other organisations, politicians and entrepreneurs around the world to also create changes. Even though they are running locally, yet, it is undeniable that their efforts and action could excite and spark global developments in myriad fields such as in education, environment, health care, economy or any other social field (Dees, 1998).

Furthermore, social entrepreneurial intention can be briefly defined as the decision made by an entrepreneur to create a new business in creating social changes. In addition, it is also meant as a state of mind such as a desire, a wish and a hope that steers the endeavour of entrepreneur towards new business concepts (Peng et al., 2012). This is in agreement with Tran and Von Korfflesch (2016) that summarised social entrepreneurship intention as a rooted belief, catalyst, desire, determination and engagement for an entrepreneur or a person to assemble a social enterprise. Therefore, it can be stated that the entrepreneurs were already having a strong and solid conviction on the future of their new business via a road unlikely taken by others in order to make changes towards the societies.

Moreover, commercial and social entrepreneurship are not dichotomous with each other. It can be inferred that they are of continuum where one is pure social and another one is purely for profit helping others that are commercially and economically. Austin et al. (2006) in their study highlighted many disparities between both of it. First, social entrepreneurship emphasises on innovative and sustainable approaches as well as providing basic needs while commercial
entrepreneurship is focusing on breakthrough and new needs. Secondly, both of it either social or commercial entrepreneurship are having different missions and performance measurement system. Third, the resources for both of them are different. This is resonated with Thompson et al. (2000) that differentiating between social and commercial entrepreneurship. It was stated that the former is a non-profit while the latter focused on profit (Abu-Saifan, 2012; Hussain et al., 2016). Other than that, it is also about collective wisdom and personal skill for the latter. To boot, social entrepreneurship is about long term capacity while commercial is about short-term financial profit. The managerial between both of the entrepreneurship is different as they are aiming for different purposes (Bikse et al., 2015). The ultimate goal for social entrepreneurs is to fulfil their social mission and commercial entrepreneurs want to create economic wealth (Abu-Saifan, 2012).

PROPOSED MODEL
Mair and Noboa (2006) was the among the earliest researchers to develop a social entrepreneurial intention model. In the model, they suggested that social entrepreneurial intention developed from perceived desirability (Empathy and Moral judgment) and perceived feasibility (Mair and Marti, 2006). Thus, it can be stated that without proper education and knowledge on social entrepreneurship, it will be impossible for them to have the intention on starting up a social enterprise. In addition, there was also a research that tried to validate Mair and Noboa (2006) theory. For example, Hockerts (2015) did a direct relationship study by removing the mediator. Thus, his research was testing direct relationship between empathy, moral obligation and self-efficacy towards social entrepreneurial intention. It was found some positive relationship between the variables. In addition, this study is also removing the mediators of perceived desirability (empathy and moral obligation) and perceived feasibility (Self-efficacy). Therefore, the final hypothesized model is as per Figure 1.

Relationship between empathy towards social entrepreneurial intention
Empathy can be defined as an individual who put himself or herself in the place of others. Seddon et al. (2014) stated that empathy brought positive impacts on the governance of entities so that it can flourish. It can also be inferred that empathy can influence one’s behaviours in enterprises to helping others. Many social enterprises were established because of social entrepreneurs empathise the people and willing to help. Hence, it is proposed:
H_0: There is a positive impact of empathy towards social entrepreneurship intention

Relationship between moral obligations towards social entrepreneurial intention
It is stated that morality in an entity can foster an environment that is necessary for social enterprise to flourish (Seddon et al., 2014). Other than that, it was also found that moral obligation is among the predictors of the intention for social entrepreneurship (Tiwari et al., 2017; Beurgre, 2016; Mair and Noboa, 2006). Hence, it can be hypothesised:
H_0: There is a positive impact of moral obligation towards social entrepreneurship intention

Relationship between self-efficacy towards social entrepreneurial intention
Self-efficacy is defined as the belief individuals have upon his or her capabilities to organise or execute an action in managing a situation (Saraibah et al., 2017). It was added that Self-efficacy has the capacity to instil motivation towards student entrepreneurial intention as it is an aspiration for them to be a social entrepreneur (Radin A Rahman et al., 2016). Therefore, it can also relate that self-efficacy can affect social entrepreneurship intention. Other than that, it was also found that self-efficacy has a direct relationship with the intention of entrepreneurial behaviour (Konakli, 2015). Therefore, it can be stated:
H_0: There is a positive relationship between self-efficacy and social entrepreneurship intention

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
This study was conducted in Universiti Malaysia Kelantan. Total of 127 secondary data obtained with 70.1% (89) was female and only 29.9% (38) were male students. Other than that, most of the students were undergraduate students with 86.6% (106) and only 16.5% (21) were postgraduate students. The questionnaire consists of 3 variables which are empathy, moral obligation and self-efficacy with 5-point Likert Scale. SPSS 23 was used in the data analysis process.

RESULT
With the Cronbach Alpha of 0.89, the questionnaire was more than valid and reliable for further analysis (Hair et al., 2014). The analyses done were the Correlation analysis and Multiple Linear Regression and the results as in the table below.

In Table 1, it was showing the two-tailed Spearman Rho
Correlation Analysis of each of the variables studied which are empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy and social entrepreneurship intention. From the table, empathy has the highest positive correlation with moral obligation with $r = 0.719, p = 0.00$. Secondly, it was illustrated that empathy also has $r = 0.641, p = 0.00$ which was a positive correlation towards self-efficacy. Other than that, it was also well shown that all of the variables studied which are empathy, moral obligation and also self-efficacy have positive and significant correlation towards the social entrepreneurship.

Table I. Spearman Rho Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Moral obligation</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>empathy</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral obligation</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.719**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.641**</td>
<td>0.625**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.287**</td>
<td>0.283**</td>
<td>0.369**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table II. Result of regression analysis on the Social entrepreneurship intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Obligation</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P< 0.05 significant

According to Table 2, it can be inferred that self-efficacy have a positive impact towards social entrepreneurship with ($\beta = 0.310$, t-value = 2.87 and p-value<= 0.05). On the other hand, other variables which are empathy and Moral obligation fail to show any significant impact on the intention of social entrepreneurship in the university.

CONCLUSION

In summary, this study was carried out in order to examine the impact of empathy, moral obligation and self-efficacy on social entrepreneurship in public university in Malaysia. In correlation analysis, it was found that all variables have positive correlation towards social entrepreneurship. Therefore, it can be said that the antecedents are important in determining social entrepreneurship. On the other hand, it was found that only self-efficacy is the only contributors towards social entrepreneurship intention in the university. This result is in alignment with previous scholar who also found the positive correlation between self-efficacy and social entrepreneurship intention (Konakli, 2015). Sadly, there is no impact of empathy and moral obligation towards social entrepreneurship intention. This is because there is lack of comprehension and knowledge on social entrepreneurship. Additionally, Malaysia education system that focuses on neither educating nor practising for social entrepreneurs is making student deviated from learning that social entrepreneurship is a noble effort in helping the societies and communities. Aside from that, there is lack of program in the university that instilling student towards the intention of helping the underserved. It can also be stated that Universiti Malaysia Kelantan emphasises on how to develop its student to be successful commercial entrepreneurship solely. Then, it is crucial for the respective university to create a framework for social entrepreneurship in the studies syllabus for the students. This is because learning a social subject is not only effective for social entrepreneurs but it can also nurture student to be more caring and empathize towards others.

Other than that, lack of financial support from government or state own organisation. It can also be stated that the sampling and population are University Malaysia Kelantan students from Faculty of Business and Entrepreneurship; thus, they are having financial difficulty to execute business as they are still in the learning phase in the university. In addition, majority of them are in a loan debt as to pay their tuition fees. Thereby, it is understandable that it is difficult for them to carry out even business and let alone it be for them to be a social entrepreneur. It is hoped that the awareness of social entrepreneurship can be developed in the near future. Hence, university, NGOs and government could plan a program or campaign that can create awareness towards the social entrepreneurship in HEI in Malaysia. Further studies should add more variables or using different approaches to enhance the comprehension of social entrepreneurship in HEI in Malaysia.

In conclusion, social entrepreneurship is supplying positive energy to catalyse economic development and especially building up a sustainable foundation for future entrepreneurs to follow. In addition, the study is not without limitations. First, the study only consists of three variables (empathy, moral obligation and self-efficacy) and thus there are lots of other antecedents of social entrepreneurship in the literature that can be explored by the future researcher. Secondly, the result was conducted in a Malaysia public university and therefore the result cannot be generalized throughout the university in Malaysia. Therefore, future researcher could do a comparatives study between two universities or more; thus, the result could be generalized throughout Malaysia. Thirdly, this study was done by students from Faculty of Business and Entrepreneurship using convenient sampling. Hence, future researcher could have done the sampling using purposive sampling where the students that own a business and let alone it be for them to be a social entrepreneur.
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