



**IMPACTS OF SOCIOPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR
ON THE COMMUNITY OF DAIRY COOPERATIVE LEADERS
AND DAIRY SMALLHOLDER FARMERS IN INDONESIA**

By

MUHAMMAD IQBAL AR RASYID

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia, in
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

October 2023

SPE 2023 27

All materials contained within this thesis, including without limitation of text, logos, icons, photographs, and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of material contained within the non-commercial thesis purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of the material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**IMPACTS OF SOCIOPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR
ON THE COMMUNITY OF DAIRY COOPERATIVE LEADERS
AND DAIRY SMALLHOLDER FARMERS IN INDONESIA**

By

MUHAMMAD IQBAL AR RASYID

October 2023

Chair : Shafie bin Sidek, DBA
School : Business and Economics

The dairy farming industry in Indonesia is 90% dominated by smallholder farmers who face issues such as lack of capital, low productivity, insufficient profitability, and stagnant herd size growth. As smallholders, those farmers rely on dairy cooperatives for their farming activities. The Indonesian government initiated dairy cooperatives to connect farmers with milk processing companies (MPC) and other stakeholders to provide services and input. Besides, the government also deployed a "Blueprint Strategy for Dairy Sectors 2013 – 2025". Meanwhile, studies on the dairy farming business in Indonesia that involve dairy cooperatives have focused on the dairy supply chain. In contrast, the attention to the core business of dairy cooperatives as a social enterprise is overlooked. Thus, more empirical evidence is required from the sociopreneurship perspective to understand the behavior of dairy cooperative leaders. These leaders perform sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB), which can be understood as specific behavior conducted by individuals that produce tangible outcomes for society.

However, most prior research on SEB formation is halted at sociopreneurial intention (SEI) as the dependent variable. Besides, they overlooked the role of external factors in the SEI and SEB relationship. Moreover, previous studies on the outcome of SEB focus on the wealth creation of its actors, which means the main impact on the community has yet to be verified. Therefore, this research aims to investigate the formation of SEB through the dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia and the impact of the conducted behaviour on the smallholder dairy farmers' community and the leaders themselves. Thus, this thesis involves two characteristics of respondents: dairy cooperative leaders and smallholder dairy farmers. This study underpinned the theory of planned behaviour (TPB), the entrepreneurial event model (EEM), and the social entrepreneurial intention model (SEIM). Hardcopy questionnaires were distributed through a face-to-face approach. A purposive sampling collected valid responses from 112 dairy cooperative leaders and 364 smallholder dairy farmers in the East, Central and West Java provinces,

Indonesia. Partial least squares-structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) is adopted in testing the hypotheses.

The result supported the model by confirming that empathy (EM), perceived social responsibility (PSR), and self-efficacy (SEFF) are significant predictors of SEI. Facilitating events (FE) significantly strengthens the conversion of SEI to SEB of dairy cooperative leaders. Finally, besides SEB significantly impacting community improvement (CIM) and individual farm performance (IFP), CIM also partially mediated the relationship between SEB and IFP. This thesis is significant for three main parties. For the literature, this thesis has validated the role of external factors in supporting the SEI conversion to SEB and confirming the impact of SEB according to the objective of sociopreneurship defined by academicians. For dairy cooperative leaders, this research provides guidelines for creating social business programs that benefit smallholder dairy farmers' community, themselves, and dairy cooperatives as institutions. This study provides empirical evidence for the government to evaluate the dairy sector's strategy related to dairy cooperatives' capacity. This research has limitations because it did not count the dairy cooperative leaders who are not smallholder dairy farmers themselves.

Keywords: Sociopreneurship, Sociopreneurial Behaviour, Facilitating Events, Dairy Cooperatives, Dairy Smallholder Farmers

SDG: GOAL 8; Decent Work and Economic Growth

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**IMPAK TINGKAH LAKU KEUSAHAWANAN SOSIAL
TERHADAP KOMUNITI PEMIMPIN KOPERASI TENUSU
DAN PETANI KECIL TENUSU DI INDONESIA**

Oleh

MUHAMMAD IQBAL AR RASYID

Oktober 2023

Pengerusi : Shafie bin Sidek, DBA
Sekolah : Perniagaan dan Ekonomi

Industri penternakan tenusu di Indonesia 90% didominasi oleh petani kecil yang menghadapi masalah seperti kekurangan modal, produktiviti rendah, keuntungan tidak mencukupi, dan pertumbuhan saiz ternakan yang tidak stabil. Sebagai petani kecil, mereka bergantung kepada koperasi tenusu untuk aktiviti pertanian mereka. Kerajaan Indonesia memulakan koperasi tenusu untuk menghubungkan petani dengan syarikat pemprosesan susu (MPC) dan pihak berkepentingan lain untuk menyediakan perkhidmatan dan input. Selain itu, kerajaan juga menggunakan "Strategi Pelan Tindakan Sektor Tenusu 2013 – 2025". Manakala kajian mengenai perniagaan penternakan tenusu di Indonesia yang melibatkan koperasi tenusu tertumpu kepada rantai bekalan tenusu. Sebaliknya, perhatian terhadap perniagaan teras koperasi tenusu sebagai perusahaan sosial diabaikan. Oleh itu, lebih banyak bukti empirikal diperlukan dari perspektif sosiusahawan untuk memahami tingkah laku pemimpin koperasi tenusu. Pemimpin ini melakukan tingkah laku sosiopreneurial (SEB), yang boleh difahami sebagai tingkah laku khusus yang dijalankan oleh individu yang menghasilkan hasil yang ketara untuk masyarakat.

Walau bagaimanapun, kebanyakan penyelidikan terdahulu mengenai pembentukan SEB dihentikan pada niat sosiopreneurial (SEI) sebagai pembolehubah bersandar. Selain itu, mereka terlepas pandang peranan faktor luaran dalam hubungan SEI dan SEB. Selain itu, kajian terdahulu mengenai hasil SEB memfokuskan kepada penciptaan kekayaan pelakornya, yang bermakna kesan utama kepada masyarakat masih belum dapat disahkan. Oleh itu, penyelidikan ini bertujuan untuk menyiasat pembentukan SEB melalui pemimpin koperasi tenusu di Indonesia dan kesan tingkah laku yang dijalankan terhadap komuniti petani tenusu kecil dan pemimpin itu sendiri. Justeru, tesis ini melibatkan dua ciri responden: ketua koperasi tenusu dan petani kecil tenusu. Kajian ini menyokong theory of planned behaviour (TPB), the entrepreneurial event model (EEM), dan the social entrepreneurial intention model (SEIM). Soal selidik salinan keras telah diedarkan melalui pendekatan bersemuka. Persampelan bertujuan mengumpul maklum

balas yang sah daripada 112 ketua koperasi tenusu dan 364 petani tenusu pekebun kecil di wilayah Jawa Timur, Tengah dan Barat, Indonesia. Partial least squares-structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) diguna pakai dalam menguji hipotesis.

Hasilnya menyokong model dengan mengesahkan bahawa empati (EM), tanggungjawab sosial yang dirasakan (PSR), dan efikasi sendiri (SEFF) adalah peramal penting SEI. Acara pemudahcara (FE) secara signifikan mengukuhkan penukaran SEI kepada SEB pemimpin koperasi tenusu. Akhir sekali, selain SEB memberi kesan ketara kepada peningkatan komuniti (CIM) dan prestasi ladang individu (IFP), CIM juga sebahagiannya menjadi pengantara hubungan antara SEB dan IFP. Tesis ini penting untuk tiga pihak utama. Untuk literatur, tesis ini telah mengesahkan peranan faktor luaran dalam menyokong penukaran SEI kepada SEB dan mengesahkan kesan SEB mengikut objektif sosiousahawan yang ditakrifkan oleh ahli akademik. Bagi pemimpin koperasi tenusu, penyelidikan ini menyediakan garis panduan untuk mewujudkan program perniagaan sosial yang memberi manfaat kepada komuniti petani tenusu pekebun kecil, diri mereka sendiri dan koperasi tenusu sebagai institusi. Kajian ini memberikan bukti empirikal kepada kerajaan untuk menilai strategi sektor tenusu berkaitan kapasiti koperasi tenusu. Penyelidikan ini mempunyai batasan kerana tidak mengira ketua koperasi tenusu yang bukan pekebun kecil tenusu sendiri.

Kata Kunci: Keusahawanan Sosial, Tingkah Laku Keusahawanan Sosial, Acara Pemudahcara, Koperasi Tenu, Petani Kecil Tenu

SDG: GOAL 8; Kerja Layak dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This PhD journey has been a remarkable experience in my life. I have never imagined that I could have reached this stage. I definitely can't do this on my own.

First and foremost, I would like to say, Alhamdulillahirobbil'alamin, may ALLAH the Almighty accept my humble gratitude and submission to ALLAH and only ALLAH. I want to express my profound gratitude to my parents and parents-in-law for their continuous prayers and support for me throughout this challenging endeavor. To my wife, I can not think of any words to describe your unthinkable contribution to me; ALLAH moves you so you can do what you did to help me out most of the time.

I am very grateful that ALLAH put me under Dr Shafie Sidek's supervision in this venture. Thank you so much, Dr, for your guidance and patience. You guided me point by point, showed me how to do it right and motivated me when I was making mistakes, even the most basic oversight. You are more than just a supervisor to me. May ALLAH bless you and your family.

To Dr Noor Azlin Ismail, thank you so much, Datin, for your guidance and for your check and balance on all the work that I have done. It has been a very great help for me. Thank you to Mr Sanfrandy Tanu, Mr Aun Gunawan, and Dr Khusnul Khotimah for your recommendation and connection to all Dairy Cooperatives and Farmers across Indonesia. Without you and all of the respondents, this research will not go anywhere.

Thank you to all my Indonesian housemates and friends for sharing the joy and tears. You make this journey more than just an exam to be passed. I will remember all the memories we have been through with a smile. Congratulations to you who have completed this phase. For those who haven't, we support each other; we pray for each other; you'll get there soon, too, InshaAllah.

Last but not least, Thank you to all my lovely Malaysian neighbors. Thank you for accepting me as one of yours. Our bond is more than just "Sembang Kosong". Thank you for making Serdang feels like home for me.

Barakallahu fii kum to all of you.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Shafie bin Sidek, DBA

Senior Lecturer
School of Business and Economics
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Noor Azlin binti Ismail, PhD

Senior Lecturer
School of Business and Economics
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 11 July 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	Page
ABSTRAK	i
ACKNOWLEDEgements	iii
APPROVAL	v
DECLARATION	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
	xvii
 CHAPTER	
 1 INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Background of Study	2
1.2.1 Issues Faced by Smallholder Dairy Farmers	3
1.2.2 Welfare and Support for Smallholder Dairy Farmers	4
1.2.3 Government Strategies & Policies for Dairy Sector	7
1.2.4 Target and Achievement	8
1.3 Problem Statement	9
1.4 Research Questions	12
1.5 Research Objectives	12
1.6 Scope of Study	13
1.7 Significance of Study	14
1.7.1 Theoretical Significance	15
1.7.2 Practical Significance	16
1.8 Definition of Terms	17
1.9 Organization of Thesis	18
1.10 Chapter Summary	18
 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	 19
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Social Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurs	19
2.2.1 The Concept of Cooperatives	20
2.2.2 Cooperatives in Indonesia	21
2.2.3 Cooperatives as a Form of Social Entrepreneurship	22
2.3 Underpinning Theories	22
2.3.1 Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)	23
2.3.2 Entrepreneurial Event Model (EEM)	24
2.3.3 Social Entrepreneurial Intention Model (SEIM)	25
2.4 Theoretical Framework	26
2.4.1 The Antecedents	26

	2.4.1.1 Attitude Towards the Behaviour – Empathy (EM)	27
	2.4.1.2 Subjective Norm – Perceived Social Responsibility (PSR)	28
	2.4.1.3 Perceived Behavioural Control Self-Efficacy (SEFF)	30
	2.4.2 Conversion of Sociopreneurial Intention to Behaviour	31
	2.4.2.1 Sociopreneurial Intention	31
	2.4.2.2 Sociopreneurial Behaviour	32
	2.4.2.3 Facilitating Event	33
	2.4.3 The Impact of Sociopreneurial Behaviour	34
	2.4.3.1 Community Improvement	35
	2.4.3.2 Individual Farm Performance	36
	2.5 Chapter Summary	36
3	HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT	38
	3.1 Introduction	38
	3.2 Proposed Conceptual Framework	38
	3.3 Hypotheses Development	39
	3.3.1 The Antecedents	39
	3.3.1.1 Empathy Towards Sociopreneurial Intention	45
	3.3.1.2 Perceived Social Responsibility Towards Sociopreneurial Intention	45
	3.3.1.3 Self-Efficacy Towards Sociopreneurial Intention	54
	3.3.2 Conversion of Sociopreneurial Intention to Behaviour	54
	3.3.2.1 Sociopreneurial Intention Towards Sociopreneurial Behaviour	55
	3.3.2.2 The Moderating Role of Facilitating Event	55
	3.3.3 The Impact of Sociopreneurial Behaviour	56
	3.3.3.1 Sociopreneurial Behaviour Towards Community Improvement	58
	3.3.3.2 Sociopreneurial Behaviour Towards Individual Farm Performance	58
	3.3.3.3 Community Improvement Towards Individual Farm Performance	59
	3.4 Overall Hypotheses	59
	3.5 Chapter Summary	60

4	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	61
4.1	Introduction	61
4.2	Research Philosophy	61
4.3	Research Design	62
4.4	Population of Study	63
4.5	Sample Size	64
4.6	Sampling Technique	64
4.7	Data Collection Method	66
4.8	Research Instrument	66
	4.8.1 Development of Questions	69
	4.8.2 Demographic Questions	69
	4.8.3 Measurement Scales of Constructs	69
4.9	Research Preparation (Pre-Test and Pilot Test)	72
4.10	Data Assessment Using PLS-SEM	73
	4.10.1 Data Analysis Using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	73
	4.10.2 Data Assessment Using PLS-SEM	75
4.11	Chapter Summary	77
5	DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	78
5.1	Introduction	78
5.2	Research Preparation (Pilot Test)	78
	5.2.1 Assessing Validity of Measurement Items	78
	5.2.2 Constructs Reliability Test	80
5.3	Data Preparation	81
	5.3.1 Data Cleaning	81
	5.3.2 Samples Arrangement	82
	5.3.3 Common Method Variance (CMV)	82
5.4	Respondent Profile	82
	5.4.1 The First Respondent (Cooperative Management Personnel)	82
	5.4.2 Second Respondent (Smallholder Dairy Farmers)	86
5.5	Assessment of Reflective Measurement (Measurement Model)	86
	5.5.1 Assessing Composite Reliability and Convergent Validity	88
	5.5.2 Discriminant Validity	91
5.6	Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation & Normality)	92
5.7	Structural Model	95
	5.7.1 Assessing Structural Model for Collinearity Issues	95
	5.7.2 Path Coefficient of Direct Relationship Assessment	96
	5.7.3 Co-efficient of Determination (R ²)	96
	5.7.4 Assessment of Effect Size (f ²)	97
	5.7.5 Assessment of Predictive Relevance (Q ²)	98
	5.7.6 Assessing the Moderation Effect of Facilitating Event	99

5.7.7	Assessment of Mediating Effect of Community Improvement	101
5.8	Summary of The Hypotheses Test Result	106
5.9	Chapter Summary	107
6	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	108
6.1	Introduction	108
6.2	Discussion	108
6.2.1	The Psychological Antecedents of Sociopreneurial Behaviour	109
6.2.2	The Conversion of Sociopreneurial Intention to Behaviour	111
6.2.3	The Impact of Sociopreneurial Behaviour	113
6.2.4	More Insights from The Respondents	116
6.3	Implication of The Study	119
6.3.1	Theoretical Implication	120
6.3.2	Practical Implication	121
6.4	Limitation and Future Research Approach	123
6.5	Conclusion	124
	REFERENCES	125
	APPENDICES	150
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	165
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	166

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1.1 Dairy Cows Population by Province (Heads)	2
1.2 Blueprint Strategy for The Dairy Sector 2013–2025	7
1.3 Target of Blueprint Strategy for The Dairy Sector 2013–2025	9
1.4 Milk Production by Province (Ton)	9
1.5 Definition Of Terms	17
3.1 Attitude Towards the Behaviour and Empathy	41
3.2 Subjective Norm and Perceived Social Responsibility	47
3.3 Perceived Behavioural Control and Self-Efficacy	50
3.4 Previous Studies of Social Entrepreneurial Behaviour	57
3.5 List of Hypotheses	60
4.1 Respondent Criteria	66
4.2 Sample of Measurement Items of SEI from Prior Studies	68
4.3 Sample of Measurement Items of SEB from Prior Studies	69
4.4 Measurement Items	70
4.5 Guidelines For Selecting Suitable Measurement Model	75
4.6 Hypotheses Based on the Proposed Research Framework	76
5.1 Result of Questionnaires Validity Test	79
5.2 Result of Constructs Reliability Test	81
5.3 Distribution of The First Respondent Profiling (N=112)	83
5.4 The First Respondent Profiling Based on Age & Education Level	84
5.5 The First Respondent Profiling Based on Organization (N=112)	85
5.6 Distribution of The Second Respondent Profiling (N=364)	87

5.7	Assessment of Reflective Measurement Model	89
5.8	Discriminant Validity Using Fornell & Larcker (1981)	91
5.9	Discriminant Validity - Heterotrait-Monotrait Criterion (2015)	92
5.10	Descriptive Statistics	93
5.11	The Lateral Collinearity Assessment	95
5.12	Path Coefficient Assessment of Direct Relationship	96
5.13	Co-Efficient of Determination (R^2)	97
5.14	Assessment of The Effect Size (F^2)	98
5.15	Assessment of Predictive Relevance (Q^2)	98
5.16	Assessment of Moderation Effect	100
5.17	Assessing Mediating Effect	102
5.18	Table 5.18: Summary of The Hypotheses Test Result	106

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1.1 Smallholder Dairy Farmers Profile	4
1.2 Dairy Cooperatives in East, Central & West Java Provinces	5
1.3 Milk Collection Point – Cooling Storage Facilities	6
1.4 Activities at Milk Collection Point	6
2.1 Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)	23
2.2 Entrepreneurial Event Model (EEM)	24
2.3 Social Entrepreneurial Intention Model (SEIM)	26
2.4 Theoretical Framework	37
3.1 Proposed Conceptual Framework	40
4.1 Population Map	63
4.2 Differences Between Reflective and Formative Construct	74
5.1 Reflective Measurement Model	94
5.2 Structural Model Using Bootstrapping Technique	99
5.3 Plot Diagram for Moderation Effect	101
5.4 Assessing the Moderation Effect	101
5.5 Assessing the Mediating Effect	103
5.6 Structural Model with Moderation and Mediation Effect	104
5.7 Research Framework with Significance	105

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AVE	Average Variance Extract
CIM	Community Improvement
CMV	Common Method Variance
CR	Composite Reliability
EEM	Entrepreneurial Event Model
EM	Empathy
FE	Facilitating Event
HTMT	Heterotrait-Monotrait
IFP	Individual Farm Performance
MCP	Milk Collection Point
MPC	Milk Processing Companies
PLS	Partial Least Square
PSR	Perceived Social Responsibility
SEFF	Self-Efficacy
SEI	Sociopreneurial Intention/Social Entrepreneurial Intention
SEIM	Social Entrepreneurial Intention Model
SEB	Sociopreneurial Behaviour/Social Entrepreneurial Behaviour
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
TPB	Theory of Planned Behaviour
TRA	Theory of Reasoned Action
VIF	Variance Inflation Factor

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The concept of entrepreneurship is growing dynamically. One of the subsections of entrepreneurship is social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship or sociopreneurship is an innovative and social activity within the nonprofit, business, or government sectors (Austin et al., 2006; Permatasari et al., 2020). Over recent years, numerous policymakers from different countries have calculated and considered the impacts of sociopreneurship on socio-economic development and its implication for the nations (Tiwari et al., 2017a; Gandhi & Raina, 2018). Social business is a growing field of research in which people with a vision and enthusiasm for supporting and serving society are involved in social transformation rather than profit maximization (Thompson, 2002; Roberts & Woods, 2005; Ghalwash et al., 2017; Hasan, 2020).

Social entrepreneurial behaviour (SEB) plays a crucial economic and social role in the communities in which they are initiated. Governments worldwide recognize sociopreneurial behaviour for their contribution to economic well-being in terms of social innovations, job creation and economic growth and development (Nsereko, 2021). However, most prior studies of SEB formation are halted at social entrepreneurial intention (SEI) partly due to the notion that intention is enough to predict the actual behaviour (Akter et al., 2020). Several theories and models have been validated in the previous SEI & SEB research, such as the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1985; 1991), the entrepreneurial event model (Shapero, 1982; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993), and the social entrepreneurial intention model (Mair & Noboa, 2006).

In Indonesia, 55% of sociopreneurship happens in agriculture (Angel Investment Network Indonesia report, 2016; Pratama, 2017; Maulinda, 2018). One form of social business is cooperatives (Novkovic, 2008), dairy cooperatives in particular. In general, smallholder dairy farmers in Indonesia depend on their farming activities to local dairy cooperatives. On the other hand, dairy cooperatives also need farmers to supply a sufficient amount of good quality milk to grow and continue serving the community. Therefore, it is not too much to say that dairy cooperatives and dairy farmers share the common idea of "go further together", which is inspired and adapted from a famous African proverb which says *"If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far go together"* (www.quotespedia.org).

Hence, the present study aims to validate the formation of sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB) through the local dairy cooperative management personnel known as leaders and the impact of the conducted behaviour on the smallholder dairy farmers' community as well as for the leaders themselves. The formation of SEB contains two sections: the psychological antecedents and the conversion of SEI into SEB with the presence of

external support as a moderator. The concept of "go further together" works when the conducted SEB significantly improves both communities and leaders.

1.2. Background of Study

Milk is an important food commodity because it has a good source of protein to fulfil nutritional needs. For Indonesia, milk and dairy products are considered strategic commodities (Priyanti & Sudjana, 2015). Unfortunately, the national dairy industry in Indonesia is currently unstable in facing complicated problems that affect the national milk consumption cycle (Putri, 2017). In addition to low community milk consumption, there is a reluctance at the milk processing company (MPC) level to buy domestic fresh milk because of the low or inconsistent quality produced by farmers (Putri, 2017).

Based on data compiled from the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health Service, Ministry of Agriculture recorded in the 2022 book, it is known that the population of dairy cows in Indonesia is as follows:

Table 1.1: Dairy Cows Population by Province (Heads)

Provinces	Dairy Cows Population (Heads)		
	2019	2020	2021
West Java	122,505	118,434	119,915
Central Java	140,520	141,395	142,124
East Java	287,196	293,556	301,780
Other Provinces	14,780	14,615	14,760
Total Indonesia	565,001	568,000	578,579

(Source: Indonesian Central Statistical Bureau, 2022)

The above statistic shows that the dairy cows population growth is not significant. At the end of 2021, the total dairy cow population was 578,579 heads. Of that number, as many as 98.42% are on Java Island. Meanwhile Indonesia has 269.6 million people in 2020. (Indonesian Central Statistical Bureau, 2022). Compared to New Zealand, with a population of 4.693 million, it has 6.5 million dairy cows (Putri, 2017). On the other hand, the level of national milk consumption is still the lowest among other ASEAN countries. As known, Indonesian milk consumption is about 14.3 litres per capita, while Malaysia has 50.9 litres, followed by Thailand at 33.7 litres, and The Philippines is around 22.1 litres (Wright & Darmawan, 2016; Susanty et al., 2019).

USDA Foreign Agricultural Service reported in October 2021 that during the Covid-19 pandemic, Indonesian consumers generated a positive perception of dairy products, which assisted in increasing liquid milk sales by 13.1% in 2020 and are expected to continue growing by 9.7% in 2021. Whole dairy consumption in 2021 is expected to increase by 3.9% to 4.19 billion litres or 4.31 million tons. Approximately 60% (2.51 billion litres or 2.59 million tons) of dairy product consumption is liquid fresh pasteurized

milk, UHT milk, flavoured/fermented milk, and evaporated/condensed milk. The remaining 40% of consumption includes powdered milk, cheese, and food service uses. Post estimates that total dairy consumption will increase by 7.4% in 2022 based on continuing high retail demand and the easing of social distancing measures (Darmawan & Santella, 2021).

Initially, before the covid-19 pandemic happened, Indonesia's milk consumption growth was 5% per year. Meanwhile, domestic fresh milk (SSDN) production growth is only a maximum of 2% per year. As much as 81% of fresh milk raw material for national production needs must be imported from other countries because domestic fresh milk production can only supply 19% of the total demand (Duteurtre et al., 2018; Susanty et al., 2020). Of those 19% contributions, 90% are supplied by smallholder dairy farmers; in total, there are 192,162 or thereabouts dairy farmers in Indonesia who are primarily smallholders and owners of most dairy cows (Morey, 2011; Susanty et al., 2020).

The government and the Indonesian Dairy Farmers Association (APSI) also invite breeders to implement good husbandry practices to raise local capacity to meet the decreasing national milk needs. APSI noted that the domestic demand for fresh materials for processed milk is currently around 3.8 million tons per year (Sari, 2016). Nevertheless, with this production performance, domestic fresh milk can only supply 19% of national needs (Duteurtre et al., 2018; Susanty et al., 2020).

1.2.1. Issues Faced by Smallholder Dairy Farmers

The cause of the inability to increase national milk production is suspected to occur because of the lack of capital owned by the farmers (Susanty et al., 2020), which opens up several other problems, including; First, a small number of productive cattle owned by farmers, only two to three cattle per farmer. According to modern dairy cattle management, economies of scale can be achieved by owning 10 to 12 productive cows per dairy farmer (Daryanto, 2007; Susanty et al., 2019). Secondly, each dairy farmer has a limited land size. Third, most of them need help to afford good quality animal feed since the prices are high. Last is the raising technique. The majority of local breeders use simple techniques in caring for dairy cows so that milk production is only around 10 -12 litres a day per head (Rossa & Nodia, 2018).

This condition is different from the modern techniques used by dairy farmers abroad. According to Dedi Setiadi, Head of North Bandung Dairy Farmers Cooperative (KPSBU), cattle farmers in other countries generally use modern techniques with automatic cow milking facilities and large enclosure areas. This treatment makes cows comfortable, so they produce more milk (Rossa & Nodia, 2018). The abovementioned situation is worsened because the milk price is still too low while the production cost is high. Therefore, the profit is insufficient to create welfare for smallholder dairy farmers (Susandijani, 2018).

A study by Firman et al. (2019) reveals that most dairy farmers are uneducated, 73.17% are from Elementary School, and 80.49% are 40 years old and above. It explains why most of those dairy farmers are not progressive people because the combination of the age of above 40 and low-level education can influence the level of mind thinking and innovation adoption. (Sari, 2007; Muzzafak, 2013; Firman et al., 2016; Firman et al., 2019). When studying small businesses, Wulandari et al. (2007) found a need for more awareness and motivation from entrepreneurs to develop a more professional business. They have had enough if the product is sold (Utomo, 2012).

Furthermore, Firman et al. (2019) reveal that dairy farms are inherited from generation to generation. Most respondents in their study are second or third-generation smallholder dairy farmers. However, most of the younger generation in the dairy farm areas sees the dairy farm business as the last option to work or business field to choose because of some perceptions such as dirty, complicated, and highly intense of time and effort (Firman et al., 2019). Although, there are still some of those young generations who see dairy farming as a profitable business in the future (Firman et al., 2019).

Meanwhile, in the last 20 years, national fresh milk production performance has been stagnant, and no significant development has occurred (Laoli, 2020). Whereas the development of primary milk production urgently needs to be done to meet the needs of the large domestic market. With the above circumstances, smallholder dairy farming still needs to be expected to contribute to the national economy or meet the need for fresh milk as a source of animal protein (Laoli, 2020).



Figure 1.1: Smallholder Dairy Farmers Profile
(Source: Google.com)

1.2.2 Welfare and Support for Smallholder Dairy Farmers

The government initiated local dairy cooperatives to connect milk producers with other actors in the dairy industry and other stakeholders within the areas to provide farmers with services and supplies (Susanty et al., 2020). Therefore, cooperatives have an essential role for smallholder dairy farmers. Most milk production from dairy farmers is marketed through local dairy cooperatives and sold to milk processing companies (Susanty et al., 2017). Besides, the dairy farmers or cooperatives sometimes also sell a small amount of fresh milk to small home industries, food hawkers or street vendors and

directly to local end consumers (Sebayang, 2013). Milk processing companies (MPC) will never buy a small amount of fresh milk directly from dairy farmers. Therefore, smallholder dairy farmers will need help to survive independently. They need local dairy cooperatives as their safeguard.

The local dairy cooperative is an organisation that farmers expect to improve their welfare (Sebayang, 2013). This organisation is run by social entrepreneurs who are mostly part of smallholder dairy farmers' communities. They perform sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB) by creating social business program innovation to support their members (Light, 2006). Dairy cooperative management personnel, known as leaders, are entrusted to run the cooperatives by the smallholder dairy farmers' community because they are perceived to have exceptional capacity compared to others (Susanty et al., 2017).

The dairy cooperatives provide a wide range of supports, such as milk collection from farmers' doorstep, then storing them in the cooling facilities before selling them to the processing companies. Cooperatives also provide the dairy farmers animal feeds on instalments and loans with low interest. Besides, the cooperative provides other essential services like animal health monitoring and free artificial insemination to grow the herd size (Susanty et al., 2019). A dairy cooperative is an excellent form of social enterprise or dairy farming practice because of its direct relation to farmers and their abilities to link with other recourses (Morey, 2011; Wright & Meylinah, 2014).



Figure 1.2 : Dairy Cooperatives in East, Central & West Java Provinces

The recent development shows that some dairy farming areas have higher milk productivity rates and better milk quality; consequently, farmers have better welfare. Those are dairy farming areas where the partnership program initiated by local dairy cooperatives with MPC such as Ultrajaya, Greenfields, Nestle and Frisian Flag runs appropriately. The IPS provides training and mentoring on how to produce more milk

with higher quality and how to manage the farm. They also buy milk the farmers produce at a fair price (Catriona & Movanita, 2021; Dyah, 2021; Fauzan, 2021).



Figure 1.3: Milk Collection Point – Cooling Storage Facilities



Figure 1.4: Activities at Milk Collection Point

However, this good practice still needs to happen in all dairy farming areas, although the numbers, interest, strength & capacity among institutions that support smallholder dairy farmers are not equal among areas (Susanty et al., 2017). Figure 1.3 comprises pictures of cooling storage facilities owned by two cooperatives. The left picture is a digital machine maintained in a good design factory standard facility. At the same time, the right image is an analogue in a more rundown facility which most cooperatives have. Figure 1.4 portrays daily activities at a milk collection point (MCP), displaying the different conditions in two cooperatives.

1.2.3 Government Strategies & Policies for the Dairy Sector

There are criticisms that the government needs to pay more serious attention to the development of national fresh milk production (Laoli, 2020). The Indonesian government has also played the role of helping smallholder dairy farmers and eventually overcoming the low growth of national milk production by deploying a dairy development strategy called “Blueprint Strategy for The Dairy Sector 2013–2025”, which was followed by policies in implementing this strategy (Susanty et al., 2019, 2020).

In order to support dairy cooperatives, the government focus on the "Institutional strengthening and capacity building through mentoring both local governments and partnership activities" strategy, which is followed by "Increasing partnerships that are mutually beneficial and Increase the capacity of human resources and institutional dairy cooperatives" policies (Table 1.2). This strategy and policies are expected to provide direction in improving dairy cooperatives' capacity supported by mutual benefits partners such as IPS, local government, financial institutions and other potential partners (The Coordinating Ministry for The Economic Affairs Of The Republic Of Indonesia, Deputy For Food And Agriculture Coordination, 2018).

Table 1.2: Blueprint Strategy for The Dairy Sector 2013–2025

Strategies	Policies
1. Strengthening coordination and synergy across sectors.	1. Increasing the dairy cow population. Encourages middle farm and big farm investment by up to 40%
2. Strengthening the legality aspect as a legal umbrella for developing the Indonesian dairy sector.	2. Genetic enhancement of dairy cows. Progeny test and imported frozen semen
3. Development of milk production areas for various dairy livestock is supported by adequate infrastructure, information systems and incentives	3. Increase in milk production. Improve feed quality and management of maintenance
4. Increasing quality milk production by paying attention to environmental balance.	4. Improved milk quality. Improved facilities and post-harvest management.
5. Increase community milk consumption through promotion and school drinking milk programs.	5. Increase in milk consumption. Promotion and movement of drinking milk in schools.
6. Development of the milk processing industry.	6. Increasing partnerships that are mutually beneficial

Table 1.2: Continued

Strategies	Policies
7. Developing markets and structuring the milk and dairy cattle trading system.	7. Increase the capacity of human resources and institutional dairy cooperatives.
8. Economic development of underdeveloped areas and border areas	8. Increase in milk prices. Encourage milk production with milk quality according to SNI
9. Institutional strengthening and capacity building through mentoring both local governments and partnership activities.	9. Improved IPS for raw materials for processing milk. Milk powder, UHT, Ice Cream, Yogurt, Cheese and other processed industries.
10. Increase new investment in dairy farming, processing industry, distribution and logistics.	
11. Increase new investment in dairy farming, processing industry, distribution and logistics.	

(Source: The Coordinating Ministry for The Economic Affairs of The Republic Of Indonesia, Deputy For Food And Agriculture Coordination, 2018)

1.2.4 Target and Achievement

The government has set the target of the Blueprint strategy for the Dairy Sector 2013 – 2025 which divided into two. The realistic target for 2020 and optimistic target for 2025 which displayed in Table 1.3.

From the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health Service, the Ministry of Agriculture recorded in the 2022 book, it is known that the national milk production in Indonesia is as depicted in Table 1.4. According to Indonesian Central Statistical Bureau (2022), at the end of 2021, the national milk production is only 962,677 tonnes per year (Table 1.4), and the number of dairy cows is 579,579 heads (Table 1.1). These numbers show that the government Blueprint Strategy and Policy targets in 2020 have not been achieved (Table 1.3). Based on the above statistics, it can be projected that targets in 2025 are unlikely to be achieved as well (Table 1.3).

Table 1.3: Target of Blueprint Strategy for The Dairy Sector 2013–2025

No.	Target
1	Production should achieve 2.75 million tonnes in 2020 and 5.32 million in 2025.
2	Number of dairy cows should reach 1.3 million heads in 2020 and 1.70 million in 2025.
3	Average milk production should reach 13.11 litres/head/day in 2020 and 19.67 in 2025.
4	Able to Supply 40% of total raw material in 2020
5	National self-sufficiency in 2025

(Source: Wright & Meylinah, 2014; Sari, 2016; Nurmayanti, 2016; Putri, 2017; Susanty et al., 2020)

Table 1.4: Milk Production by Province (on)

Provinces	Milk Production (Ton)		
	2019	2020	2021
West Java	300,337.16	281,198.94	283,361.18
Central Java	102,948.90	102,707.88	102,508.64
East Java	521,123.43	542,860.27	556,431.78
Other Provinces	20,127.59	20,145.72	20,375.06
Total Indonesia	944,537.08	946,912.81	962,676.66

(Source: Indonesian Central Statistical Bureau, 2022)

1.3 Problem Statement

The dairy farming industry in Indonesia is 90% dominated by smallholder farmers (Morey, 2011; Susanty et al., 2020) who face issues of lack of capital, low productivity, unstable quality, insufficient profitability, farming techniques, machinery, limited land size for shed and natural green forage, and stagnant herd size growth (Rossa & Nodia, 2018). As a result, domestic milk production can supply around 19% of the nation's production demand. That means the remaining 81% is imported from other countries (Duteurtre et al., 2018; Susanty et al., 2020). As smallholders, those farmers rely on dairy cooperatives for their farming activities (Susanty et al., 2017, 2019). The Indonesian government initiated dairy cooperatives to connect farmers with milk processing companies (MPC) and other stakeholders within the areas in order to provide services and input for dairy farmers (Raditya, 2020). In other words, this organisation stands as a safeguard.

Besides, the government also deployed a "Blueprint Strategy for Dairy Sectors 2013 – 2025". One strategy focuses on institutional strengthening and capacity building of dairy cooperatives, followed by the policy implementation of mutual benefits partnership (Table 1.2), and the target was set (Table 1.3). However, the statistics shows that it was far off target in 2020 and projected that target for 2025 is unlikely to be achieved as well (Table 1.1; 1.4). Hence, these strategies and policies need to be evaluated (David & David, 2017).

Since 2017, research on the dairy farming business in Indonesia, which involves dairy cooperatives, has been focusing on the dairy supply chain and performance (e.g. Susanty et al., 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020). However, the attention to the core business of dairy cooperatives as a social enterprise (Novkovic, 2008) seems to be overlooked, while in Indonesia, 55% of sociopreneurship happens in agriculture (Pratama, 2017; Maulinda, 2018). Therefore, the Indonesian government still need more empirical evidence to evaluate the blueprint strategies for the dairy sector from the social entrepreneurship perspective through understanding the behaviour of dairy cooperative leaders in particular.

As one category of social enterprise (Novkovic, 2008), dairy cooperatives are run by leaders who are part of the smallholder dairy farmers' community and elected by them with the hope of improving their marginal conditions (Susanty et al., 2017). The organisation's management personnel perform sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB), which can be understood as specific behaviour conducted by individuals that produce tangible outcomes for society (Mair & Noboa, 2006). SEB differentiates social entrepreneurs from commercial entrepreneurs. However, prior research on SEB formation is unable to provide the evidence needed to evaluate the mentioned strategy and policy because of the following theoretical gaps.

Firstly, most prior studies of sociopreneurial behaviour are halted at sociopreneurial intention (SEI) as an endogenous variable partly due to the notion that studying intention is enough to predict the behaviour (Akter et al., 2020). Secondly, not only were previous empirical studies on SEB scant, but they overlooked the role of external factors in the SEI and SEB relationship as acknowledged by the theory of planned behaviour or TPB (Ajzen, 1985) and the entrepreneurial event model or EEM (Shapero, 1982; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Therefore, apprehending the process of converting SEI into SEB is still challenging (Luc et al., 2019). Finally, this thesis recorded that only one study has validated the outcomes of individuals performing SEB (i.e. Rahim et al., 2015). However, the research focuses on the wealth creation of the SEB actors, which means the main impact on the community has yet to be verified.

The social entrepreneurial intention model (SEIM) is the first SEB model developed by Mair & Noboa (2006) based on the TPB (Ajzen, 1991) and the EEM (Shapero, 1982). This model conceptualises and proposes the construct of SEI and SEB (Figure 2.3). Besides, the explication of empathy (EM), perceived social responsibility (PSR) in the name of moral judgment and self-efficacy (SEFF) as antecedents of SEB are introduced by this model as well (Mair & Noboa, 2006). According to the model, EM corresponds to the attitude toward the behaviour (Mair & Noboa, 2006), while PSR is a proxy of the

subjective norm of the TPB (Mair & Noboa, 2006; Hockerts, 2015; Bazan et al., 2020). At the same researchers discuss the ongoing debate of whether SEFF is the same as the perceived behavioural control (PBC) of TPB (Tiwari et al., 2017b), replacing it (Krueger et al., 2000) or a subset of it (Ajzen, 2002).

Although EM has been used as a predictor of SEI in numerous empirical studies, the findings were inconsistent; it seems EM is a strong determiner of SEI in several contexts but insignificant in other cases (Lacap et al., 2018). PSR was also recognised under a few different names in the previous SEI/SEB studies, which are moral judgment (Mair & Noboa, 2006; Hockerts, 2015), moral obligation (Hockerts, 2015; Bazan et al., 2020) and prosocial motivation (Tiwari et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020). Interestingly, these constructs predict SEI significantly when using the name PSR instead of others (Ernst, 2011; Bazan et al., 2020; Luc, 2020). Meanwhile, despite the ongoing debate, SEFF has been proven to be the strongest predictor of career selection (Bandura, 1971) that affects the decision process (Tiwari et al., 2017c). This thesis supports the view that SEFF is a subset of PBC (Ajzen, 2002). Therefore, the present study intends to bridge these research gaps by first identifying the antecedents of SEB applying the TPB (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) and the SEIM (Mair & Noboa, 2006). Hence, the predictive ability of EM, PSR and SEFF to SEI, which were validated in previous empirical research, is tested in the context of this study.

Facilitating event (FE) was introduced by Krueger and Carsrud (1993), which adapts the concept of displacing or precipitating events from the EEM (Shapero, 1982; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). While displacing or precipitating is a hindrance that may prevent the entrepreneurial intention from transforming into behaviour, FE is a support factor that may accommodate that process (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Previous studies overlooked the role of this external factor in the conversion of SEI into SEB because the attention to this process was barely sufficient in the previous studies (Luc et al., 2019) since they mostly stopped at SEI (Aker et al., 2020). In order to bridge this gap, this thesis analyses the role of facilitating events (FE) in moderating the conversion of SEI into SEB through the context of a smallholder dairy farming business in Indonesia.

According to the definition defined by scholars, the objective of social entrepreneurs is to provide maximum benefits for the community by solving their problems while taking less personal return for themselves (Masseti, 2008; Zahra et al., 2009; Zaremohzzabieh et al., 2018;). Therefore, the impact of an individual performing SEB should bring improvement for the community but not forgetting himself/herself as well. Therefore, this thesis needs to extend the TPB (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) and the EEM (Shapero, 1982) by conceptualising the construct of community improvement (CIM) to measure the impact on community and individual farm performance (IFP) to measure the impact on dairy cooperative leaders as the representative of sociopreneurs in this research.

Based on the above-mentioned theoretical gaps, research variables of empathy (EM), perceived social responsibility (PSR), self-efficacy (SEFF), sociopreneurial intention (SEI), facilitating event (FE), sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB), community improvement (CIM) and individual farm performance (IFP) are placed into propose research framework based on the underpinning theory of TPB (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) and models of EEM (Shapero, 1982) and SEIM (Mair & Noboa, 2006). The findings of this

research are meant to provide empirical evidence that can be used as referenced by dairy cooperatives, milk processing companies (MPC) and Indonesian government institutions besides contributing to the body of knowledge.

1.4 Research Questions

In order to validate the formation of sociopreneurial behavior through the local dairy cooperative management personnel (leaders) and the impact of the conducted behavior on the smallholder dairy farmers' community as well as for the leaders themselves, this thesis conceptualized the following research questions.

1. Are the psychological determiners associated with the antecedents of TPB applicable in predicting the sociopreneurial intention of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia?
1. Could the external support (facilitating event) moderate the process of converting sociopreneurial intention into sociopreneurial behaviour of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia?
2. Could the sociopreneurial behaviour performed by dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia improve their smallholder dairy farmers' communities and get benefits for themselves in return?

1.5. Research Objectives

The general objective of this research is to investigate the formation of sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB) through the dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia and the impact of the conducted behaviour on the smallholder dairy farmers' community and the leaders themselves. Hence, as a response to the research questions, the objective is broken down into specific objectives as follows.

1. To examine the psychological determinants associated with the antecedents of TPB in predicting the sociopreneurial intention of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia.

Specifically:

RO1: To examine the predictive ability of empathy as a representative of attitude towards the behaviour on the sociopreneurial intention of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia.

RO2: To examine the predictive ability of perceived social responsibility as a proxy of subjective norms on the sociopreneurial intention of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia.

RO3: To examine the predictive ability of self-efficacy as a subset of perceived behavioural control on the sociopreneurial intention of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia.

2. To analyse the conversion of the sociopreneurial intention of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia into sociopreneurial behaviour and the role of facilitating events as a moderator in that process.

Specifically:

RO1: To analyse the conversion process of sociopreneurial intention into sociopreneurial behaviour of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia.

RO2: To analyse the role of facilitating events as a moderator in converting sociopreneurial intention into sociopreneurial behaviour of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia.

3. To determine the impact of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia performing sociopreneurial behaviour on their smallholder dairy farmers' communities and themselves according to the definition of social entrepreneurship.

Specifically:

RO1: To determine the impact of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia performing sociopreneurial behaviour on the improvement of their smallholder dairy farmers' community

RO2: To determine the impact of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia performing sociopreneurial behaviour on the improvement of their farm performance.

RO3: To determine the impact of smallholder dairy farmers' community improvement on the dairy cooperative leaders' farm performance

RO4: To determine the impact of dairy cooperative leaders in Indonesia performing sociopreneurial behaviour on their farm performance that is mediated by smallholder dairy farmers' community improvement.

1.6. Scope of Study

This section explains the research parameters, including the subject areas of investigation, the underpinning theories of the conceptual research framework, and the variables selected for the study. Moreover, the scope of the sample population for this research is also explained.

The conceptual research framework of this study applied the theory and models from the field of psychology and entrepreneurship. The general objective of this research is to investigate the formation of sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB) and the impact of the conducted behaviour on the community and sociopreneurs themselves. For this purpose, the theory of planned behaviour (TPB), the entrepreneurial event model (EEM) and the social entrepreneurial intention model (SEIM) are used in the research. Hardcopy questionnaires are distributed to the respondents face-to-face based on the research objectives and selected constructs. The justifications for applying the underpinned theory and models are elaborated in Chapters Two and Three, while the measurement tools used in the survey are explained in Chapter Four.

This study focuses on the formation and impact of sociopreneurial behaviour (SEB) in the Indonesian dairy farming industry for the following reasons. Firstly, SEB plays a crucial economic and social role in the communities in which they are initiated, which Governments worldwide recognise as their contribution to economic well-being in terms of social innovations, job creation and economic growth and development (Nsereko, 2021). Secondly, dairy farming in Indonesia is 90% dominated by smallholder farmers who rely on dairy cooperatives for most of their farming activities (Susanty et al., 2017). As a social business, the organisation (Novkovic, 2008) is managed by leaders who are part of smallholder dairy farmers communities that elected because of their capacity to solve the problems faced by their community (Susanty et al., 2017). Finally, from the theoretical point of view, the prior empirical studies on SEB formation are halted at sociopreneurial intention as a dependent variable (Akter et al., 2020), which makes the apprehension of converting sociopreneurial intention into behaviour still challenging (Luc et al., 2019). Eventually, attention to the impact of sociopreneurial behaviour will be less encouraging (Rahim et al., 2015).

This study involved psychological aspects of a person with the influence of external factors in determining behavioural actions to solve community problems. Therefore, two different characters of respondents are required to test the hypotheses. As the first respondent, dairy cooperative leaders are assessed to examine the relationship of empathy (EM), perceived social responsibility (PSR) and self-efficacy (SEFF) with sociopreneurial intention (SEI). Then, the relationship of SEI with SEB with facilitating event (FE) as a moderator variable. Next is SEB's relationship with their individual farm performance (IFP). Meanwhile, as the second respondent, smallholder dairy farmers need to answer the questions specifically on the relationship between SEB performed by dairy cooperative leaders and community improvement (CIM).

The samples were taken from the dairy farming areas of the West, Central and East Java provinces in Indonesia. According to the Indonesian Central Statistic Bureau (2022), those regions combined are home to 97,42% of the dairy cow population in the country (Table 1.1). Corresponding to that statistic, research on behaviour should involve respondents with experience conducting the targeted behaviour since behaviour is an actual action instead of perception or projection (Nsereko, 2020). Moreover, this study would like to determine the impact of behaviour on the performer and the community. Hence, dairy cooperative leaders are selected as the first and foremost respondents since they have relevant experience. In contrast, smallholder dairy farmers are chosen as the second respondent to determine the impact of behaviour on the community. That way, this research has minimised bias.

1.7. Significance of Study

This study extends the social entrepreneurial behaviour (SEB) research by involving the Indonesian smallholder dairy farmers' leaders and their communities as research participants. These leaders have the position of dairy cooperatives management personnel who look after their communities by performing SEB. Therefore, it has the potential to significantly contribute both theoretical and practical, which explains as follows.

1.7.1. Theoretical Significance

This study adds value to the body of knowledge in five correlated ways. First, one of the most widespread psychological theories, the theory of planned behaviour (TPB), is being extended to the smallholder dairy farming context, particularly in Indonesia. TPB (Ajzen, 1985; 1991) is an extension of the theory of reasoned action or TRA (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Both are theories that were specifically developed to study human behaviour. Therefore, the TPB is used to identify the psychological antecedents that form the social entrepreneurial intention (SEI) of local dairy cooperative management personnel or leaders of smallholder dairy farmers. The antecedent of this thesis are empathy (EM), which corresponds with the attitude towards the behaviour (Mair & Noboa, 2006), perceived social responsibility (PSR), which is a proxy of the subjective norm (Bazan et al., 2020), and self-efficacy (SEFF) which is a subset of perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1992; Mair & Noboa, 2006).

Second, TPB is a behavioural theory; meanwhile, most of the prior research in the social entrepreneurial behaviour (SEB) formation is halted at SEI (Table 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4) partly due to the notion that in the TPB model (Ajzen, 1991; Figure 2.1), an intention will automatically create behaviour (Akter et al., 2020). TPB recognised the role of external factors that may influence intention conversion to behaviour (Ajzen, 1985). However, acknowledging that external factors' role is not depicted in the TPB model (Ajzen, 1991; Figure 2.1). Nevertheless, it can be concluded that the process of transforming intention into behaviour is not automatic. This thesis is a behavioural study of dairy cooperative management personnel (leaders) and their smallholder dairy farmers' communities in the scope of social entrepreneurship, which continues beyond the intention. Thus, this present study utilised the TPB closer to its full potential.

Third, the entrepreneurial event model (EEM) concluded that entrepreneurial intention still requires a trigger to be converted to entrepreneurial behaviour (Shapero, 1982; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Hence, EEM introduces the concept of precipitating or displacing events that influence the entrepreneurial intention-behaviour relationship, depicted in the framework (Figure 2.2). This concept was later redefined as facilitating events to have more positive value by Krueger and Carsrud (1993). This thesis adapted this concept from both EEM and TPB in validating the process of converting SEI into SEB of smallholder dairy farmers leaders in Indonesia. Facilitating events from Krueger and Carsrud (1993) is introduced as a moderator variable of the SEI and SEB relationship (Figure 3.1). The empirical evidence of the facilitating event's role in the conversion process of SEI to SEB and the impact of SEB on the smallholder dairy farmers community and their leaders add significant value to the literature.

Fourth, the social entrepreneurial intention model (SEIM) is the first SEB model developed by Mair & Noboa (2006) based on the TPB (Ajzen, 1991) and the EEM (Shapero, 1982). This model conceptualises and proposes the construct of SEI and SEB (Figure 2.3). Besides, the explication of empathy, sense of social responsibility in the name of moral judgment and self-efficacy as antecedents of SEB are introduced by this model as well (Mair & Noboa, 2006). Therefore, this thesis has brought the concepts

those exogenous variables, SEI and SEB developed by the SEIM (Mair & Noboa, 2006) to the context of the smallholder dairy farming industry in Indonesia.

Finally, the present study also examines the impact of sociopreneurs performing SEB. Therefore, this study extends the TPB and the EEM into the sociopreneurial behaviour formation scope. This thesis conceptualises the impact of SEB according to the definition of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs. Academicians defined that sociopreneurs should bring maximum benefits to the community by solving societal problems while taking a little personal gain for the sociopreneurs themselves (Thake & Zadek, 1997; Thompson et al., 2000; Brinckerhoff, 2001; Massetti, 2008; Zahra et al., 2009; Zaremohzzabieh et al., 2018). Hence, community improvement (CIM) is introduced as a construct to describe the impact of SEB on the smallholder dairy farmers' community. At the same time, individual farm performance (IFP) is proposed as a personal gain of the leaders. Furthermore, CIM is also placed as a mediator variable of the SEB and IFP relationship (Figure 3.1).

1.7.2. Practical Significance

Dairy cooperatives play a central role in Indonesia's smallholder dairy farming industry (Susanty et al., 2017). They not only link the smallholder dairy farmers to the milk processing companies (IPS) but also act as a safeguard for their communities (Sebayang, 2013; Susanty et al., 2017; 2019). Indonesian government shows their concern by deploying institutional strengthening and capacity-building strategy for dairy cooperatives and their personnel (The Coordinating Ministry For The Economic Affairs Of The Republic Of Indonesia, Deputy For Food And Agriculture Coordination, 2018). From the same source, this strategy is breakdown into mutual benefit partnerships with any potential partners and human resources capacity development policies. Dairy cooperatives are managed by sociopreneurs who are smallholder dairy farmers' community leaders. Hence, it is essential to study the social entrepreneurial behaviour (SEB) formation among local dairy cooperatives management personnel or known as leaders and its impact on the smallholder dairy farmers' community and the leaders themselves. This study brings practical implications to Dairy Cooperatives, IPS and Indonesian Government.

This study provides insight into how much the leaders care about the issues faced by their smallholder dairy farmers' community, how deep they feel the pressure to bear the responsibility to act upon it and how strongly the leaders believe in themselves that they can do something to solve the problems and improve their community condition. As an institution, the dairy cooperative could consider the result of this study when they make the criteria for management personnel candidates, which are elected every certain period depending on the policy of each cooperative.

The present study reveals the role of facilitating events (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993) which moderate the relationship between sociopreneurial intention and sociopreneurial behaviour. Facilitating event (FE) is an external support where the government, IPS and other parties are directly involved as partners to dairy cooperatives. The research findings

would provide empirical evidence for the government to evaluate the current strategy and policies related to supporting dairy cooperatives. Besides, the IPS may also review their strategic partnership with the cooperatives to increase the mutual benefits for both parties. On the other hand, it may open up an idea for dairy cooperatives to get other partners or other kinds of support to benefit their smallholder dairy farmers' community. Finally, with the presence of external support from partners, this thesis disclosed the impact of dairy cooperative management personnel performing SEB on their community and themselves. The impact factors are not just answered by the leaders but also by their communities. Combining the empirical evidence of the SEB outcomes from this study with the statistic of the national dairy cow population and national milk productivity can be used as a consideration for dairy cooperative management personnel to conceptualise a new social innovation to overcome the unsolved problems faced by smallholder dairy farmers communities. Dairy cooperatives may propose the ideas to the government, IPS and any other potential partners to support the programs.

1.8. Definition of Terms

Eight constructs used in this thesis are specific to the present study. All of these variables refer to definitions stated by scholars in the published articles, as summarised in Table 1.5. Details of each construct conception will be explained further in Chapter 3.

Table 1.5: Definitions of Terms

Construct	Definitions	Source
Empathy (EM)	The ability to discern and vicariously experience the emotional state of another being. EM means a positive attitude toward a particular community that is less fortunate or socially complex	(Hockerts, 2015; Ip et al., 2017; Usman et al., 2021; Mair & Noboa, 2006)
Perceived Social Responsibility (PSR)	PSR is a feeling of wanting to help those in distress. It measures the level at which people sense that the population feels responsible for dealing with the issues of less fortunate communities as a repercussion of perceived social norms	(Ernst, 2011; Hockerts, 2015, 2017; Bazan et al., 2020; Luc, 2020)
Self-Efficacy (SEFF)	People's belief in their abilities to actuate the motivation, cognitive assets and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives. SEFF is a task specific oriented which calculates individual capability to perform a certain activity.	(Wood & Bandura, 1989; Azjen, 1992; Tiwary et al., 2017b ; Zhang et al., 2021)
Social Entrepreneurial Intention (SEI)	SEI is a person's belief and eagerness to create a social business. It captures motivational elements that affect people's behaviour and efforts to spend on social ventures	(Tran & Von Korflesch, 2016; Ip et al., 2017; Thomas et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2019)

Table 1.5: Continued

Construct	Definitions	Source
Social Entrepreneurial Behaviour (SEB)	Specific behaviour conducted by individuals that produce tangible outcomes for society. SEB measures actions that a respondent has carried out in solving the community problems	(Mair & Noboa, 2006; Gielnik et al., 2015; Nsereko, 2020)
Facilitating Event (FE)	An actual event which may facilitate the proses of entrepreneurial intention into behaviour since it is a complex relationship with longer time lags.	(Krueger & Carsrud, 1993)
Community Improvement (CIM)	CIM is a purposive strive to improve the community. It measures the impact of individual conducting SEB on the community.	(Vogl, 2009; Capece & Costa, 2013; Portela et al., 2015)
Individual Farm Performance (IFP)	The performance of dairy cooperative leaders' small dairy farms which measures by related key performance index.	(Moran, 2008)

1.9. Organization of Thesis

This thesis is organized into six chapters to facilitate the ease of reading. Chapter One contains the background of the study, problem statement, research question, research objectives, the significance of the study and scope of study related to the formation and impact of social entrepreneurial behaviour in the context of smallholder local dairy farming in Indonesia. Next, Chapter Two explains the literature support related to social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurial behaviour, dairy cooperatives and the underpinning theories used in this thesis. Subsequently, Chapter Three presents the proposed conceptual research framework and hypotheses development. Following that, Chapter Four describes the research methodology, philosophy, design, and analytical tools to be used as a guideline in conducting this research. Therefore, in Chapter Five, this thesis is able to display the data analysis and empirical findings following the guidelines designed in chapter four. Finally, findings, implications of both theoretical and practical, limitations of research and conclusion are discussed in Chapter Six.

1.10. Chapter Summary

This chapter provides a guideline for the present study for the following few chapters. The chapter started with an introduction to social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurial behaviour concepts in the context of smallholder dairy farming in Indonesia. Subsequently, it described the background of the study, highlighted the problem statements, listed the research questions and objectives, and discussed the scope and significance of the study. Moreover, the definition of the constructs used in this study is also summarised. The next chapter reviews the relevant literature used in underpinning the theory to build the theoretical framework and justify the research variables selections.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1985). *From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behaviour*. Action Control. From Cognition to Behaviour. Springer-Verlag. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Tokyo
- Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality, and behavior*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). *The Theory of Planned Behavior*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. (1993). Attitude Theory and The Attitude-Behavior Relation. *New Directions in Attitude Management* (pp. 41-57).
- Ajzen, I. (2001). *Nature And Operation Of Attitudes*.
- Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665-683.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior* (C. Englewood, Ed.). Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Agrina Online. (2022). *SAPI PERAH: Gandeng Universitas Brawijaya USDEC Edukasi Manajemen Atasi PMK*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.agrina-online.com/detail-berita/2022/09/04/10/8272/sapi-perah--gandeng-universitas-brawijaya-usdec-edukasi-manajemen-atasi-pmk>
- Anthony, R. N. (1965). *Management Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston
- Angel Investment Network Indonesia (ANGIN). (2016). *A Report Prepared for UNDP. Social Finance and Social Enterprises: A New Frontier for Development in Indonesia*. Jakarta : ANGIN.
- Alsos, G. A., Högskolan, I. J., Internationella, H. & Ihh, E. (2011). *The Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship in Agriculture and Rural Development*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham.
- Ambad, S. N. A., & Damit, D. H. D. A. (2016). Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intention Among Undergraduate Students in Malaysia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37, 108–114. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(16\)30100-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(16)30100-9)
- Akhter, A., Hossain, M. U., & Al-Asheq, A. (2020). Influential factors of social entrepreneurial intention in Bangladesh. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 645–651.

- Akter, A., Rana, S. M. S., & Ramli, A. J. (2020). Factors influencing social entrepreneurial behavior: evidence from a developing nation. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 36(4), 581–599.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Zimmer, C. (1986). Entrepreneurship through social networks. *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 3, Ballinger, Cambridge, MA, p. 23.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship: leadership that facilitates societal transformation. Working Paper, Center for Public Leadership. In John F. Kennedy School of Government.
- Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (1999). *Predictive Validity of the Theory of Planned Behaviour: The Role of Questionnaire Format and Social Desirability*.
- Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: a meta-analytic review, *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 471–499.
- Autio, E., H. Keeley, R., Klofsten, M., Parker, G., C. & Hay, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial Intent among Students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, 2(2), 145–160.
- Ayob, N., Seng, C., Sapuan, D. A., Zabid, M., & Rashid, A. (2013). Social Entrepreneurial Intention among Business Undergraduates: An Emerging Economy Perspective 1. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 15(3), 249–267.
- Babbie, E. R. (2017). *The Basics of Social Research*. (7th Ed). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Babbie, E. R., & Halley, F. (1995). *Adventures in Social Research: Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows/Book and Disk*. Pine Forge Press.
- Backman, E. V., & Smith, S. R. (2000). *Healthy Organizations, Unhealthy Communities?* *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 10(4).
- Bacq, S., & Alt, E. (2018). Feeling capable and valued: A prosocial perspective on the link between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(3), 333–350.
- Bahena-Álvarez, I. L., Cordon-Pozo, E., & Delgado-Cruz, A. (2019). Social entrepreneurship in the conduct of responsible innovation: Analysis cluster in Mexican SMEs. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133714>
- Baierl, R., Grichnik, D., Spörrle, M., & Welp, I. M. (2014). Antecedents of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions: The Role of an Individual's General Social Appraisal. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 123–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2013.871324>

- Bailey, J. E., & Pearson, S. W. (1983). Development of a tool for measuring and analyzing computer user satisfaction. *Management science*, 29(5), 530-545.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guide to constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. C. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs and adolescents* (Vol. 5, pp. 307-337). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Consideration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol.51, No. 6, 1173-1182
- Barton, D. (1989). Principles: in D. Cobia, ed., *Cooperatives in Agriculture*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Bazan, C., Gaultois, H., Shaikh, A., Gillespie, K., Frederick, S., Amjad, A., Yap, S., Finn, C., Rayner, J., & Belal, N. (2020). Effect of the university on the social entrepreneurial intention of students. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 23(1), 3–24.
- BBC News Indonesia, (2014). *Berobat Dengan Pembayaran Sampah*. [Online] Available at: https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/majalah/2014/01/140113_bisnis_sosial_klinik
- Beck, L., & Ajzen, I. (1991). Predicting dishonest actions using the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 285-301, available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(91\)90021-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(91)90021-H)
- Bloom, P. N., & Chatterji, A. K. (2009). Scaling Social Entrepreneurial Impact. In *Source: California Management Review* (Vol. 51, Issue 3).
- Bowden, A., Fox-Rushby, J. A., Nyandieka, L., & Wanjau, J. (2002). Methods for pre-testing and piloting survey questions: illustrations from the KENQOL survey of health-related quality of life. *Health policy and planning*, 17(3), 322-330.
- Brinckerhoff, P. (2001). Why you need to be more entrepreneurial, and how to get started. *Nonprofit World* 19 (6), 12–15.
- Brunjes, J., & Revilla, J. (2013). Recession push' and 'prosperity pull' entrepreneurship in a rural developing context. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 25 Nos 3-4, pp. 251-271
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research strategies*. Business research methods.

- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business Research Methods* (3rd ED). Oxford University Press, Inc, New York
- Bryman, E. B. (2015). *Business research methods* (4th Ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS* (2nd Ed., pp. 1–361). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological bulletin*, 56(2), 81.
- Capece, G., & Costa, R. (2013). The new neighbourhood in the internet era: network communities serving local communities. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 32(5), 438-448.
- Cathcart, R.S. & Samovar, L.A. (1984). *Small group communication: a reader*. , Madison, WI: Wm. C. Brown Publishing.
- Catriana, E., & Movanita, N. K. A. (2021). *Kerek Produksi Susu Segar, Frisian Flag Jalin Mitra 15 Koperasi Peternak Sapi Perah Lokal*. [Online] Available at: <https://money.kompas.com/read/2021/11/19/055023326/kerek-produksi-susu-segar-frisian-flag-jalin-mitra-15-koperasi-peternak-sapi?page=all>
- Cavazos-Arroyo, J., Puente-Díaz, R., & Agarwal, N. (2017). An examination of certain antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions among Mexico residents. *Review of Business Management*, 19(64), 180–199.
- Cepeda-Carrion, G. A., Roldan, J. L., & Nitzl, C. (2018). Mediation Analyses in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. *Guidelines and Empirical Examples*
- Chandra, Y., Man Lee, E. K., & Tjiptono, F. (2020). Public versus private interest in social entrepreneurship: Can one serve two masters? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 280.
- Chan-Serafin, S., Brief, A. P., & George, J. M. (2013). How does religion matter and why? Religion and the organizational sciences. *Organization Science*, 24(5), pp. 1585–1600.
- Cheah, J. H., Memon, A. M., Ting, H., Ramayah, T., & Chuah, F. (2017). Editorial - A Review of the Methodological Misconceptions and Guidelines Related to the Application of Structural Equation Modeling: A Malaysian Scenario. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, 1(1), i-xiii
- Chenhall, R. H. (2005). Integrative strategic performance measurement systems, strategic alignment of manufacturing, learning and strategic outcomes: An exploratory study. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30, 385-422.
- Chin, W. W., Marcolin, B. L., Newstead, P., & Newsted, P. R. (1996). A Partial Least Squares latent variable modeling approach for measuring interaction effects:

Results from a monte carlo simulation study and voice mail emotion/adoption study. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Information Systems*, 21–41.

Chin, W. W. (1988). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. *Modern methods for business research*, 295(2), 295-336.

Choi, N., & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(3), 363–376.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* 2nd edn.

Cooley, W. W. (1978). Explanatory observational studies. *Educational Researcher*, 7(9), 9- 15.

Cooper, J., & Schindler, M. (2008). *Perfect Sample Size in Research*. New Jersey.

Coltman, T., Devinney, T. M., Midgley, D. F., & Venaik, S. (2008). Formative versus reflective measurement models: Two applications of formative measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12), 1250-1262

Colton, D., & Covert, R. W. (2007). *Designing and constructing instruments for social research and evaluation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Comunian, A. L., & Gielen, U. P. (1995). Moral Reasoning and Prosocial Action in Italian Culture. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 135(6): 699-706.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Darmawan, C., & Santella, R. (2021). Dairy and Product Annual, Indonesia. United States Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. *Report no. ID2021-0039*

Daryanto, A. (2007), *Persusuan Indonesia: kondisi, permasalahan dan arah kebijakan*, From the desk of Arief Daryanto, 23 September.

Davcik, N. S. (2014). The use and misuse of structural equation modeling in management research. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*. Vol 11 no. 1, 2014. pp. 47-81.

David, F. R., & David, F. R. (2017). *Strategic Management Concept and Cases*. Sixteenth Edition, Global Edition. Pearson Education, ISBN 978-0-13-416784-8

Dawson, J. F. (2014). Moderation in management research: What, why, when, and how. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(1), 1–19.

Dees, J. G. (2012). A Tale of Two Cultures: Charity, Problem Solving, and the Future of Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 321–334.

- Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2004). The functional architecture of human empathy. *Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 71-100, doi: [10.1177/1534582304267187](https://doi.org/10.1177/1534582304267187).
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index construction with formative indicators: An alternative to scale development. *Journal of marketing research*, 38(2), 269-277.
- Dion, M. (2012). The economic and non-economic dimensions of social enterprises' moral discourse: an issue of axiological and philosophical coherence. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 1-24.
- Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health Services, Ministry of Agriculture. (2019).
- Dvash, J. & Shamay-tsoory, S. G. (2014). Theory of Mind and Empathy as Multidimensional Constructs Neurological Foundations. *Top Lang Disorders*, 34(4), pp. 282-295.
- Drayton, W. (2002). The Citizen Sector: Becoming As Entrepreneurial And Competitive As Business. In *California CMR* (Vol. 44, Issue 3).
- Dreesbach, S. (2010). Unterschiede in der Persönlichkeit und in den Zielen von Social und Business Entrepreneurs [Unpublished master's thesis]. Munich: Ludwig Maximilian University.
- Duteurtre, G., Sembada, P., & Nguyen, M. H. (2018). Past experiences and future challenges to design sustainable policies and strategies. Report of the Workshop 'Foresight scenarios for the dairy sector in Indonesia', 4 December.
- Dyah, E. (2021). *Alhamdulillah, Peternak Sapi Perah Masih Sejahtera Walau Pandemi*. [Online] Available at: <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-5488381/alhamdulillah-peternak-sapi-perah-masih-sejahtera-walau-pandemi>
- Ehrlich, H. J. (1969). American Sociological Association Springer Attitudes, Behavior, and the Intervening Variables Author. In *Source: The American Sociologist* (Vol. 4, Issue 1). <http://www.jstor.orgURL:http://www.jstor.org/stable/27701451>
- Ernst, K. (2011). *Heart over mind—An empirical analysis of social entrepreneurial intention formation on the basis of the theory of planned behaviour* (Unpublished dissertation) Wuppertal: University Wuppertal.
- Fang, W. T., Ng, E., Wang, C. M., & Hsu, M. L. (2017). Normative beliefs, attitudes, and social norms: People reduce waste as an index of social relationships when spending leisure time. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 9(10).
- FAO (2015), Annual Report on FAO's Projects and Activities in Support of Producer Organizations and Cooperatives, FAO, Rome.

- Fauzan, R., & Junita, N. (2021). *Setahun, Nestle Setor Rp1,6 Triliun ke Peternak Sapi Perah*. [Online] Available at: <https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20211204/99/1473788/setahun-nestle-setor-rp16-triliun-ke-peternak-sapi-perah>
- Fayol, H. (1916). *Industrial and General Administration*. Paris: Dunod, 1916.
- Ferreira, J. J., Raposo, M. L., Rodrigues, R. G., Dinis, A., & do Paço, A. (2012). A model of entrepreneurial intention: An application of the psychological and behavioral approaches. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 19(3), 424–440.
- Fiore, M., Galati, A., Golebiewski, J., & Drejerska, N. (2020). STAKEHOLDERS' INVOLVEMENT IN ESTABLISHING SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODELS. The case of Polish dairy cooperatives. *British Food Journal Vol. 122 No. 5, 2020 pp. 1671-1691*. DOI [10.1108/BFJ-04-2019-0263](https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-04-2019-0263)
- Firman, A., Marina, S., Hermawan, Paturachman, S., Linda, H., & Anita, F. (2016). Evaluation of Good Dairy Farming Practice Method on Dairy Farming in Subang District, West Java, Indonesia. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14334/Proc.Intsem.LPVT-2016-p.204-212>
- Firman, A., Paturochman, M., Budimulyati, S. L., Hadiana, M. H., Taspurin, D., Suwartapradja, S. O., & Munandar, M. (2019). Succession decisions in Indonesia family dairy farm business. <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd31/9/achma31136.html>
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Forster, F., & Grichnik, D. (2013). Social Entrepreneurial Intention Formation of Corporate Volunteers. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4(2), 153–181.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of marketing research*, 382- 388.
- Fornell, C., & Bookstein, F. L. (1982). Two structural equation models: LISREL and PLS applied to consumer exit-voice theory. *Journal of Marketing research*, 440-452.
- Fowler, A. (2000). NGDOs as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation?. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(4), 637–54.
- Fuqua School. (2005). *The Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship*. <http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/>.
- Gandhi, T., & Raina, R. (2018). Social entrepreneurship: the need, relevance, facets and constraints. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol. 8 No. 1, doi: [10.1186/s40497-018-0094-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-018-0094-6).

- Garson, G. D. (2016). *Partial least squares regression and structural equation models*. Asheboro: Statistical Associates
- Gayati, M. D., & Burhani, R. (2018). *Kementan berharap program "IDEA" tingkatkan produktivitas sapi perah*. [online] Available at: <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/701548/kementan-berharap-program-idea-tingkatkan-produktivitas-sapi-perah>
- Gefen, D., Straub, D., & Boudreau, M. C. (2000). Structural equation modeling and regression: Guidelines for research practice. *Communications of the association for information systems*, 4(1), 7.
- Geisser, S. (1974). Effect to the random model: A predictive approach. *Biometrika*, 61(1), 101-107.
- Geisser, S. (1975). The predictive sample reuse method with applications. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 70(350), 320-328.
- Ghalwash, S., Tolba, A. and Ismail, A. (2017). What motivates social entrepreneurs to start social ventures?. *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 268-298.
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Pogram IBM SPSS. Edisi Sembilan*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro
- GKSI Jawa Barat, (2022). [online] Available at: <https://www.gksi-jawabarat.co.id/anggota.php>
- Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(3), 351–374.
- Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge management: an organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185–214.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & Ortberg, J. (1983). Moral obligation and attitudes: their relation to behavioral intentions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 5, p. 1025, available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.5.1025>
- Groch, K., Gerdes, K. E., Segal, E. A., & Groch, M. (2012). The Grassroots Londoloji Model of African Development: Social Empathy in Action. *Journal of Community Practice*, 20(1–2), 154–177.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2(163-194), 105.
- Guo, L., Libby, T., Wong-On-Wing, B., & Yang, D. (2019). Strategy Evaluation When Using A Strategic Performance Measurement System: An Examination of Motivational and Cognitive Biases. *Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research*, Volume 21, 97126. ISSN: 1475-1488/doi:10.1108/S1475-148820180000021005

- Gupta, V. K., & York, A. S. (2008). Attitudes toward entrepreneurship and small business: Findings from a survey of Nebraska residents and small business owners. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 2(4), 348–366.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2010). SEM: An introduction. *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*, 629–686.
- Hair, J. F., Bush, R. P., & Ortinau, D. J. (2009). *Marketing research in a digital environment*.
- Hair, J. F. & Lukas, B. (2014), *Marketing Research* (Vol. 2). Australia: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage Publications.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N.P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7>
- Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2005). Religiosity and prosocial behaviours in adolescence: The mediating role of prosocial values. *Journal of Moral Education*, 34(2), pp. 231–249.
- Hassan, H. M. K. (2020). Intention towards social entrepreneurship of university students in an emerging economy: the influence of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurship education. VOL. 28 NO. 3 2020, pp. 133-151, © Emerald Publishing Limited, ISSN 1074-8121. DOI [10.1108/OTH-04-2020-0012](https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-04-2020-0012)
- Hassan, L. M., Shiu, E., & Shaw, D. (2016). Who Says There is an Intention–Behaviour Gap? Assessing the Empirical Evidence of an Intention–Behaviour Gap in Ethical Consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(2), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2440-0>
- Haugh, H. (2005). The role of social enterprise in regional development. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 2(4), 346–57.
- Hayton, J. C., & Cacciotti, G. (2013). Is there an entrepreneurial culture? A review of empirical research. In *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* (Vol. 25, Issues 9–10, pp. 708–731).
- Hennman, L. (2023). Leadership: Theories and Controversies. [online] Available at: <https://henmanperformancegroup.com/leadership/leadership-theories-and-controversies/>

- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. In *New challenges to international marketing* (277-319). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Henseler, J. & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Goodness-of-fit indices for partial least squares path modeling. *Computational Statistics*, 28(2), 565–580.
- 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*, 43(1), 115-135.
- Hertzog, M. A. (2008). Considerations in determining sample size for pilot studies. *Research in nursing & health*, 31(2), 180-191.
- Hockerts, K. (2015). The Social Entrepreneurial Antecedents Scale (SEAS): a validation study. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 11(3), 260–280.
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 105–130.
- Hockerts, K. (2018). The Effect of Experiential Social Entrepreneurship Education on Intention Formation in Students. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(3), 234–256.
- Hoffman, J., Hoelscher, M. & Sorenson, R. (2006). Achieving Sustained Competitive Advantage – A Family Capital Theory. *Family Business Review* 19 (2): 135–45.
- Holmgren, R. A., Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R. A. (1998). The Relations of Children's Situational Empathy-related Emotions to Dispositional Prosocial Behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 22(1), pp. 169–193.
- Hossain, M., & Kauranen, I. (2016). Open innovation in SMEs: a systematic literature review. In *Journal of Strategy and Management* (Vol. 9, Issue 1, pp. 58–73). Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Hsu, C. L., Chang, C. Y., & Yansritakul, C. (2017). Exploring purchase intention of green skincare products using the theory of planned behavior: Testing the moderating effects of country of origin and price sensitivity. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 34, 145–152.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.10.006>
- Huang, L., Zhang, J., & Liu, Y. (2017). Antecedents of student MOOC revisit intention: Moderation effect of course difficulty. *International Journal of Information Management*, 37(2), 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.12.002>
- Hübner, G., & Kaiser, F. G. (2006). The Moderating Role of the Attitude-Subjective Norms Conflict on the Link Between Moral Norms and Intention. *European Psychologist*, 11(2), 99–109.

- Hulland, J. (1999). Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: A review of four recent studies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 195-204.
- Humphrey, R. H. (2013). The benefits of emotional intelligence and empathy to entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 3(3), 287-294. doi:10.1515/erj-2013-0057.
- Iakovleva, T., & Kolvereid, L. (2009). An integrated model of entrepreneurial intentions. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 3(1), 66–80.
- Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistic. (2022). *Populasi Sapi Perah Menurut Provinsi*. [online] Available at: <https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/24/470/1/populasi-sapi-perah-menurut-provinsi.html>
- Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistic. (2022). *Produksi Susu Sapi Segar Menurut Provinsi*. [online] Available at: <https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/24/493/1/produksi-susu-segar-menurut-provinsi.html>
- Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistic. (2022). *Jumlah Penduduk Menurut Jenis Kelamin dan Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Jawa Timur* [online] Available at: <https://jatim.bps.go.id/indicator/12/375/2/jumlah-penduduk-menurut-jenis-kelamin-dan-kabupaten-kota-provinsi-jawa-timur.html>
- Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistic. (2022). *Jumlah Penduduk Menurut Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Jawa Barat* [online] Available at: <https://jabar.bps.go.id/indicator/12/133/1/jumlah-penduduk-menurut-kabupaten-kota.html>
- Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistic. (2022). *Luas Wilayah Menurut Kabupaten/Kota Propinsi Jawa Timur*. [online] Available at: <https://jatim.bps.go.id/indicator/153/81/1/luas-wilayah-menurut-kabupaten-kota.html>
- Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistic. (2022). *Luas Wilayah Menurut Kabupaten/Kota Propinsi Jawa Barat*. [online] Available at: <https://jabar.bps.go.id/indicator/153/244/1/luas-daerah.html>
- Indonesian Constitution no. 25. (1992). Cooperatives. [online] Available at: <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokjdi/document/uu/783.pdf>
- International Cooperative Alliance (ICA). (1995). The Statement on the Cooperative Identity.
- International Cooperative Alliance (ICA). (2005). [online] Available at: <http://www.ica.coop/>
- 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.

- Ittner, C., & Larcker, D. F. (2005). Moving from strategic measurement to strategic data analysis. In C. S. Chapman (Ed.), *Controlling strategy: Management, accounting and performance measurement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobsen, M., & Jensen, R. (2015). Common method bias in public management studies. *International Public Management Journal*, 18(1), 3-30.
- Jarvis, C. B., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2003). A critical review of construct indicators and measurement model misspecification in marketing and consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2), 199-218.
- Johnson, S. (2000). Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurship. Canadian Center for Social Entrepreneurship. <http://www.bus.ualberta.ca/ccse/Publications/>
- Laoli, N. (2020). *Produksi Susu Segar Nyaris Stagnan dalam 20 Tahun Terakhir*. [Online] Available at: <https://industri.kontan.co.id/news/produksi-susu-segar-nyaris-stagnan-dalam-20-tahun-terakhir>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). Using The Balanced Scorecard As A Strategic Management System. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(1) (January/February), 7585.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001). *The Strategy-focused organization: How balanced scorecard companies thrive in the new business environment*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kautonen, T., Tornikoski, E. T., & Kibler, E. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions in the third age: The impact of perceived age norms. *Small Business Economics*, 37(2), 219–234.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). Convergence of structural equation modeling and multilevel modeling.
- Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assesment approach. *International Journal of E-Collaboration*, 11(4), 1–10.
- Kock, N. (2016). Hypothesis testing with confidence intervals and P values in PLS-SEM. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 12(3), 1-6.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). *The philosophy of moral development moral stages and the idea of justice*. Moral Education, HarperCollins, New York, NY.
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. H. (1977). Moral Development: a review of the theory. *Theory into Practice* 16(2): 53-59.
- Kolvereid, L. (1997). *Prediction of Employment Status Choice Intentions*.
- Krueger, N., & Dickson, P. R. (1994). How Believing in Ourselves Increases Risk Taking: Perceived Self-Efficacy and Opportunity Recognition. *Decision Sciences*, 25(3), 385–400.

- Krueger, N. F., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 5(4), 315–330.
- Krueger, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing Models Of Entrepreneurial Intentions. In *Journal of Business Venturing* (Vol. 15).
- Kusdianto, Y. (2020). *Tim PPM UAD Bantu Peternak Sapi Perah di Pakem*. [Online] Available at: <https://jogjapolitan.harianjogja.com/read/2020/11/17/512/1055603/tim-ppm-uad-bantu-peternak-sapi-perah-di-pakem>
- Lacap, J. P. G., Mulyaningsih, H. D., & Ramadani, V. (2018). The mediating effects of social entrepreneurial antecedents on the relationship between prior experience and social entrepreneurial intent: The case of Filipino and Indonesian university students. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 9(3), 329–346.
- Lackey, N. R., & Wingate, A. L. (1997). The Pilot Study: One Key. *Advanced design in nursing research*, 375.
- Lauwere, C. D., Verhaar, K., & Drost, H. (2002). *Het Mysterie van het Ondernemerschap, Boeren en Tuinders op Zoek Naar Nieuwe Wegen in een Dynamische Maatschappij (The Mystery of Entrepreneurship; Farmers Looking for New Pathways in a Dynamic Society, in Dutch with English summary)*. Wageningen University and Research Centre.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46, 352–367. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.352
- Legris, P., Ingham, J., & Colletette, P. (2003). *Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model*.
- Li, G. R., Wang, L. S., Zhang, W. W., Yang, G. J., Chen, X. F., & Zhang, W. X. (2019). Tailoring degradation-resistant thermal barrier coatings based on the orientation of spontaneously formed pores: From retardation to self-improvement. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 181.
- Li, H., An, N., & Liu, J. (2021). Strategic Planning, Strategy Map And Management Control: A Case Study. *Nankai Business Review International*, Vol. 12 No. 3, 2021, pp. 386-408. DOI [10.1108/NBRI-10-2020-0054](https://doi.org/10.1108/NBRI-10-2020-0054)
- Light, P. C. (2006). *Reshaping Social Entrepreneurship*. www.ssireview.org
- Lim, X. J. (2018). Perceptions and Intentions towards the Concept of Retirement Village. *Unpublished Thesis*.
- Liñán, F. (2004). *Intention-based models of entrepreneurship education*.

- Liñán, F. (2008). Skill and value perceptions: How do they affect entrepreneurial intentions? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4(3), 257–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-008-0093-0>
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). *Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intentions*.
- Liu, H. C., Liang, C., Chang, C. C., Ip, C. Y., & Liang, C. T. (2020). Optimizing Personality Traits and Entrepreneurial Creativity to Boost the Precursors of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions: Five Studies in Taiwan. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 47(1), 10–32.
- London, M. (2010). Understanding social advocacy: An integrative model of motivation, strategy, and persistence in support of corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(3), 224–245.
- López, F. P., & Apodaka. (1994). *Para Comprender la Conducta Altruista*, Pamplona. Editorial Verbo Divino
- Luc, P. T., Ward, H., Mot, T. D., & Duong, B. (2020). The influence of personality traits on social entrepreneurial intention among owners of civil society organisations in Vietnam. In *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Small Business* (Vol. 40, Issue 3).
- MacCallum, R. C., & Austin, J. T. (2000). Applications of Structural Equation Modeling in Psychological Research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51(1), pp. 201–226
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: a source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44.
- Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: How Intentions to Create a Social Venture are Formed. In *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 121–135). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: the case for a definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 29–39.
- Malhotra, N. K., & Peterson, M. (2014). Basic marketing research. Pearson.
- Markstrom, C. A., Huey, E., Stiles, B. M. & Krause, A. L. (2010). Frameworks of caring and helping in adolescence: Are empathy, religiosity, and spirituality related constructs?. *Youth and Society*, 42(1), pp. 59– 80.
- Massetti, B. L. (2008). The Social Entrepreneurship Matrix as “Tipping Point” for Economic Change. In *Complexity Adelphi University*.
- Maulinda, K. (2018). *Proses Pengembangan Social Enterprise Agriculture: Studi Biografi pada Agradaya*. Jurnal Studi Pemuda Volume 7 Nomor 2 tahun 2018. <http://doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.40114>

- McElwee, G. (2006). Farmers as entrepreneurs: developing competitive skills. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 187-206.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 40(4), 525–543.
- Memon, M. A., Ting, H., Cheah, J. H., Thurasamy, R., Chuah, F., & Cham, T. H. (2020). Sample Size For Survey Research: Review And Recommendations. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*: 4(2), i-xx, eISSN: 2590-4221
- Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, (2020).
- Minniti, M., & Nardone, C. (2007). Being in someone else's shoes: The role of gender in nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 28(2–3), 223–238.
- Mohammadi, P., Kamarudin, S., & Omar, R. (2020). Do Islamic Values Impact Social Entrepreneurial Intention of University Students in Malaysia? An Empirical Investigation Into The Mediating Role of Empathy. In *International Journal of Economics and Management Journal homepage* (Vol. 14, Issue 3).
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Moran, J. (2008). *Key Performance Indicators For Indonesia's Small Holder Dairy Farmers*.
- Morey, P. (2011). Dairy industry development in Indonesia. Available at: www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/93f48d00470e3bf883ffd7b2572104ea/Dairy+Industry+Development-2011.pdf?MOD=AJPERES
- Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 76–88.
- Mukti, A. H., & Hadi, M. N. (2018). *Beban Pajak Berasa Terlalu Memberatkan, KUD Mojosongo Boyolali Berharap Diturunkan*. [online] Available at: <https://jateng.tribunnews.com/2018/04/24/bebanpajak-dirasaterlalu-memberatkan-kud-mojosongo-boyolali-berharapditurunkan?page=1>
- Musayelyan, I. K., Raychenko, A. V., Latfullin, G. R., Maslennikov, V. V., & Horin, A. N. (2020). Management Cycles: Their Concept, Essence and Role in Modern Economy. *TEM Journal*. Volume 9, Issue 2, Pages 625-632, ISSN 2217-8309, DOI: 10.18421/TEM92-27
- Muzzafak, (2013). *Pengaruh pendidikan dan tingkat ekonomi terhadap keputusan orang tua untuk menikahkan anak-anak mereka di Desa Karang Duwak, Kecamatan Arosbaya, Kabupaten Bangkalan. J Paradigma. 1.*
- Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Education

- Nicholls, A. (2006). *SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Nieswiadomy, R. M. (2002). Qualitative research designs. Foundations of Nursing Research (4 th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Prentice Hall.
- Nilsson, J. (1996). THE NATURE OF COOPERATIVE VALUES AND PRINCIPLES Transaction cost theoretical explanations. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 67:4, 1996, pp.633-653.
- Novkovic, S. (2008). Defining the co-operative difference. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37 (2008) 2168–2177. doi:[10.1016/j.socec.2008.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2008.02.009)
- Nsereko, I. (2020). Conditional resource and social entrepreneurial action: the mediating role of social entrepreneurial intent. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*.
- Nsereko, I. (2021). Comprehensive social competence and social entrepreneurial action: the mediating role of entrepreneurial tenacity. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 17(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-04-2020-0038>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1978). Psychometric theory.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Validity. Psychometric theory, 99-132.
- Nurchayadi, G. (2021). *Tingkatkan Konsumsi Susu Lewat Upaya Sejahterakan Peternak Sapi*. [Online] Available at: <https://mediaindonesia.com/ekonomi/408834/tingkatkan-konsumsi-susu-lewat-upaya-sejahterakan-peternak-sapi>
- Nurmayanti, (2016). *Begini Kondisi Peternak Sapi di Indonesia*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.liputan6.com/bisnis/read/2661048/begini-kondisi-peternak-sapi-perah-di-indonesia>
- NYU Stern. (2005). *Social Entrepreneurship*. [Http://W4.Stern.Nyu.Edu/Berkley/Social.Cfm](http://W4.Stern.Nyu.Edu/Berkley/Social.Cfm).
- Oktavia, H. (2019). *dr. Gamal, Arek Malang Inisiator Klinik Asuransi Sampah Hingga Aplikasi Layanan Kesehatan*. [Online] Available at: <https://rri.co.id/humaniora/info-publik/703407/dr-gamal-arek-malang-inisiator-klinik-asuransi-sampah-hingga-aplikasi-layanan-kesehatan>
- Omoredede, A. (2014). Exploration of motivational drivers towards social entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 10(3), 239–267. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sej-03-2013-0014>
- Ortmann, G. F., & King, R. P. (2007). Agricultural Cooperatives I: History, Theory and Problems. *Agrekon*, Vol 46, No 1 (March 2007)

- Osiri, K., & Kungu, K. (2019). *Predictors of Entrepreneurial Intentions and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Look at Proactive Personality, Self-Efficacy and Creativity*.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Peng, D. X., & Lai, F. (2012). Using partial least squares in operations management research: A practical guideline and summary of past research. *Journal of Operations Management*, 30(6), 467–480.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept. *Journal of World Business* 41 (1): 56–65. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007.
- Permatasari, A., Doohan, G., & Kusmulyono, M.S. (2020). Factors Influencing Social Entrepreneurial Intention: A Case of a Private University in Bekasi. *International Journal of Family Business Practices Vol 3, Issue 2, 2020*
- Peterman, N. E., & Kennedy, J. (2003). Enterprise education: influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(2), 129-144.
- Petter, S., Straub, D., & Rai, A. (2007). Specifying formative constructs in information systems research. *Mis Quarterly*, 623-656.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879.
- Portela, M. C., Pronovost, P. J., Woodcock, T., Carter, P., & Dixon-Woods, M. (2015). How to study improvement interventions: a brief overview of possible study types. *BMJ Quality & Safety. BMJ Journals*
- Pratama, A. H. (2017). *Laporan ANGIN: Kondisi dan Tantangan Startup Bermisi Sosial di Tanah Air*. [Online] Available at: <https://id.techinasia.com/lapo-ran-angin-perkembangan-startup-bermisi-sosi-al-di-tanah-air>
- Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Social Entrepreneurship Leadership. *Career Development International* 4(3): 140-145.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods* 2008, 40 (3), 879-891 doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

- Preston, S.D., Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Grabowski, T.J., Stansfield, R.B., Mehta, S., et al. (2007). The neural substrates of cognitive empathy. *Social Neuroscience*, 2(3-4), 254–275.
- Prieto, L. C. (2011). *The Influence of Proactive Personality on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students : The Moderating Role of Hope*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279437971>
- Priyanti, A., & Soedjana, D. T. (2015). Indonesian Dairy Industry Perspective Within The ASEAN Economic Community. *Wartazoa, Vol. 25 No. 4 Th. 2015 Hlm. 159-170*
- Putri, A. W. (2017). *Peliknya Masalah Persusuan di Indonesia*. [Online] Available at: <https://tirto.id/peliknya-masalah-persusuan-di-indonesia-cAg7>
- Raditya, D. (2020). *Tambah Mutu Menuju Indonesia Kolam Susu*. [Online] Available at: <https://chub.fisipol.ugm.ac.id/2020/08/10/tambah-mutu-menuju-indonesia-kolam-susu/>
- Rahim, H. L., & Mohtar, S. (2015). Social Entrepreneurship: A Different Perspective. *International Academic Research Journal of Business and Technology* 1(1), 9-15
- Rahim, L. H., Mohtar, S., & Ramli, A. (2015). The Effect of Social Entrepreneurial Behaviour Towards Organizational Performance: A Study on Bumiputera Entrepreneurs in Malaysia. *International Academic Research Journal of Business and Technology* 1 (2) 2015 Page 117-125
- Rahmawati, L., & Wibisono, K. (2018). *Peternak sapi perah perlu dukungan regulasi agar lebih bergairah*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/704790/peternak-sapi-perah-perlu-dukungan-regulasi-agar-lebih-bergairah>
- Ramayah, T., Ling, N. S., Taghizadeh, S. K., & Rahman, S. A. (2016). Factors influencing SMEs website continuance intention in Malaysia. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(1), 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.06.007>
- Rambe, P., & Ndofirepi, T. M. (2019). Explaining Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among College Students in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(2), 175–196.
- Reis, T., & Clohesy, S. (1999). *Unleashing the New Resources and Entrepreneurship for the Common Good: a Scan, Synthesis and Scenario for Action*. W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI.
- Reynolds, P. D. (1991). *Sociology and Entrepreneurship: Concepts and Contributions*.
- Reynolds, N., & Diamantopoulos, A. (1998). The effect of pretest method on error detection rates: Experimental evidence. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(5/6), 480-498.

- Richardson, H. A., Simmering, M. J., & Sturman, M. C. (2009). A tale of three perspectives: Examining post hoc statistical techniques for detection and correction of common method variance. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(4), 762-800.
- Roberts, R., & Woods, C. (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: the concept of social entrepreneurship. *University of Auckland Business Review*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 45-51.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Management*. Fourteenth Edition. Global Edition. Pearson Education. ISBN 978-0-13-452760-4
- Robinson, P. B., Stimpson, D. V, Huefner, J. C., & Hunt, H. K. (1991). *An Attitude Approach to the Prediction of Entrepreneurship*.
- Romancini, P. (2019). If you want to make everyone happy, don't be a leader, sell ice cream. [Online] Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/you-want-make-everyone-happy-dont-leader-sell-ice-cream-romancini>
- Roscoe, J. T. (1975). *Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences* (Second ed.). New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Rossa, V., & Nodia, F. (2018). *Di Desa Susu, Peternak Sapi Belajar Teknik Modern Produksi Susu*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.suara.com/lifestyle/2018/12/11/191340/di-desa-susu-peternak-sapi-belajar-teknik-modern-produksi-susu>
- Rossiter, J. R. (2002). The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing. *International journal of research in marketing*, 19(4), 305-335.
- Roundy, P. T., Taylor, V. A., & Evans, W. R. (2015). Founded by Faith: Social Entrepreneurship as a Bridge between Religion and Work. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Ethics*, 9(2013), pp. 34–40.
- Ruiz-Rosa, I., Gutiérrez-Taño, D., & García-Rodríguez, F. J. (2020). Social entrepreneurial intention and the impact of COVID-19 pandemic: A structural model. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(17).
- Salhi, B. (2018). Impact of Personal Motivation on the Intention and Behaviour of Social Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/impact-of-personal-motivation-on-the-intention-and->
- Sari, S. M. (2016). *Pasokan Lokal Rendah, Peternak Sapi Perah Harus Pacu Kinerja*. [Online] Available at: <https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20161124/99/606097/pasokan-lokal-rendah-peternak-sapi-perah-harus-pacu-kinerja>
- Sarstedt, M., & Mooi, E. (2014). *A concise guide to market research. The Process, Data, and Methods Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. Newyork: Springer

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business*. London: Pitman.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research Methods for Business Students (7th ED p. 301 - 302)*. Pearson, UK.
- Saunders, M., & Bromwich, D. (2012). New model rural cooperatives in Gansu: a case study. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* Vol. 6 No. 4, 2012 pp. 325-338. DOI 10.1108/17506201211272760
- Saunders, M., & Lewis, P. (2012). *Doing Research in Business & Management: An Essential Guide to Planning Your Project*. Pearson
- Schlaegel, C., & Koenig, M. (2014). Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intent: A Meta-Analytic Test and Integration of Competing Models. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 291–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12087>
- Sebayang, K. D. A. (2013). Empowerment The Institutional Milk Cooperation Using Soft Systems Methodology. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 449-466.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods For Business: A Skill Building Approach (7th ed.)*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd
- Seyoum, B., Chinta, R., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2021). Social support as a driver of social entrepreneurial intentions: the moderating roles of entrepreneurial education and proximity to the US small business administration. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 28(3), 337–359.
- Shapero, A. (1982). Social dimensions of Entrepreneurship. In C Kent, D Sexton, & K Vesper (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 72–90). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Shaw, E. (2004). Marketing in the social enterprise context: Is it entrepreneurial? *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 7(3), 194–205.
- Shi, L., Yao, X., & Wu, W. (2020). Perceived university support, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, heterogeneous entrepreneurial intentions in entrepreneurship education: The moderating role of the Chinese sense of face. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 12(2), 205–230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-04-2019-0040>
- Schroeder, T. C. (1992). Economies of scale and scope for agricultural supply and marketing cooperatives. *Review of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 93-103.
- Shukran, K., & Rahman, F. (2011). *A Grameen Bank concept: Micro-credit and poverty alleviation program in Bangladesh Knowledge transfer from academia to organization View project Sustainable Development View project*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330507597>

- Smith, I. H., & Woodworth, W. P. (2012). Developing social entrepreneurs and social innovators: A social identity and self-efficacy approach. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 11(3), 390–407.
- Sousa-Filho, J. M. de, Matos, S., da Silva Trajano, S., & de Souza Lessa, B. (2020). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions in a developing country context. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 14.
- Staatz, J. M. (1987). The Structural Characteristics Of Farmer Cooperatives And Their Behavioral Consequences.
- Stebbins, R. (1987). *Sociology, The Study of Society*. Harper and Row: New York, 1987, p.
- Stone, M. (1974). Cross-validatory choice and assessment of statistical predictions. *Journal of the royal statistical society. Series B (Methodological)*, 111-147
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. 1st penyunt. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- Sullivan, G. M., & Feinn, R. (2012). Using effect size—or why the P value is not enough. *Journal of graduate medical education*, 4(3), 279-282.
- Susandijani, & Davies, P. A. (2018). *Hari Susu Sedunia, Simak 3 Hambatan Yang Dialami Peternak Lokal*. [Online] Available at: <https://bisnis.tempo.co/read/1085529/hari-susu-sedunia-simak-3-hambatan-yang-dialami-peternak-lokal>
- Susanty, A., Bakhtiar, A., Jie, F. & Muthi, M., (2017). The Empirical Model Of Trust, Loyalty, And Business Performance Of The Dairy Milk Supply Chain. A comparative study. *British Food Journal Vol. 119 No. 12*, pp. 2765-2787
- Susanty, A., Bakhtiar, A., Puspitasari, N.B., Susanto, N. & Handjoyo, D.K.S., (2019). The performance of dairy supply chain in Indonesia: a system dynamics approach. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management Vol. 68 No. 6*, pp. 1141-1163
- Susanty, A., Puspitasari, N.B., Prastawa, H. & Renaldi, S.V., (2020). Exploring the best policy scenario plan for the dairy supply chain: a DEMATEL approach. *Journal of Modelling in Management* , 2.
- Syifa. (2022). *Puluhan Mahasiswa Kampus Muhammadiyah Ini Bantu Dinas Peternakan dan Kesehatan Hewan Atasi PMK*. [Online] Available at: <https://muhammadiyah.or.id/puluhan-mahasiswa-kampus-muhammadiyah-ini-bantu-dinas-peternakan-dan-kesehatan-hewan-atasi-pmk/>
- Tarigan, M. (2021). *Pemerintah Ingatkan Peluang Usaha Peternakan Sapi Perah di Jatim Tinggi*. [Online] Available at: <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/1535552/pemerintah-ingatkan-peluang-usaha-peternakan-sapi-perah-di-jatim-tinggi/full&view=ok>

- Tasavori, M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2011). Socially Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Multinational Corporations: Are MNCs 'Social Entrepreneurs'? In *Firm-Level Internationalization, Regionalism and Globalization* (pp. 397–411). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230305106_23
- Tayie, S. (2005). Research methods and writing research proposals. Pathways to Higher Education.
- Taylor, M. E., & Sanner, J. E. (2017). The Relationship Between Concussion Knowledge and the High School Athlete's Intention to Report Traumatic Brain Injury Symptoms: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of School Nursing*, 33(1), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059840515619683>
- Thake, S., & Zadek, S. (1997). Practical people, noble causes. How to support community based social entrepreneurs. New Economic Foundation.
- The Coordinating Ministry for The Economic Affairs of The Republic of Indonesia, Deputy for Food and Agriculture Coordination. (2018).
- The East Java Livestock Services. (2022). [online] Available at: <https://disnak.jatimprov.go.id/web/pages/65-koperasi-persusuan-jawa-timur>
- Thomas, H. J., Connor, J. P., Baguley, C. M., & Scott, J. G. (2017). Two sides to the story: Adolescent and parent views on harmful intention in defining school bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 43(4), 352–363. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21694>
- Thompson, J. L. (2002). The world of the social entrepreneur. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 412-431.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). *Social entrepreneurship - a new look at the people and the potential*. <http://www.emerald-library.com>
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2017a). Predictors of social entrepreneurial intention: an empirical study. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 53–79.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2017b). The role of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on social entrepreneurial attitudes and social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), 165–185.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2017c). An empirical analysis of the factors affecting social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(1).
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2020). Mediating Role Of Prosocial Motivation In Predicting Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2020.1755993
- 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. In *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* (Vol. 9, Issue 4, pp. 282–298).
- Urbach, N., & Ahlemann, F. (2010). Structural equation modeling in information systems research using partial least squares. *JITTA: Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application*, 11(2), 5.
- Urban, B. (2020). Entrepreneurial alertness, self-efficacy and social entrepreneurship intentions. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(3), 489–507.
- Urban, B., & Kujinga, L. (2017). The institutional environment and social entrepreneurship intentions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 23(4), 638–655.
- Usman, S., Masood, F., Khan, M. A., & Khan, N. ur R. (2021). Impact of empathy, perceived social impact, social worth and social network on the social entrepreneurial intention in socio-economic projects. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*.
- Utomo, H. S., (2012). *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Melalui Pendekatan Sociopreneurship*. Jakarta, Business Conference.
- Veciana, J.M., Aponte, M., & Urbano, D. (2005). University Students' Attitudes Towards Entrepreneurship: A Two Countries Comparison. In *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* (Vol. 1).
- Verzat, C., & Bachelet, R. (2006). *Developing an Entrepreneurial Spirit among engineering college students: what are the educational factors?*
- Vogl, G. (2008). Work as Community: Narratives of Solidarity and Teamwork in the Contemporary Workplace, Who Owns Them?. *Sociological Research Online*, 14(4), 4.
- Wei-Skillern, J., Austin, J. E., Leonard, H. & Stevenson, H. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the Social Sector* (Vol. 13). SAGE
- Wilton, C., & Venter, R. (2016). *Identifying social entrepreneurial intent among students in South African Universities*.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social Cognitive Theory of Organizational Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 361–384.
- Wood, S. (2012). Prone to Progress: Using Personality to Identify Supporters of Innovative Social Entrepreneurship The greatest challenge for social entrepreneurs lies in persuad-ing all other actors to reinforce and support them. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 31(1), 1547–7207.

- Wright, T., & Darmawan, B., (2016). Indonesia dairy and products annual: Indonesia 2016 dairy and products annual report. USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, Jakarta.
- Wright, T., & Meylinah, S., (2014). Indonesia dairy and products annual report 2014, GAIN Report, No. ID 1438, USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, Jakarta.
- Wu, W., Wang, H., Wei, C. W., & Zheng, C. (2019). Sharing achievement and social entrepreneurial intention: The role of perceived social worth and social entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Management Decision*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-05-2019-0667>
- Wulandari, A. M., & Dewanti, S. I. (2007). *Dampak Penguatan Usaha Mikro Terhadap Penguatan Perempuan (Studi pada Kelompok Perempuan Usaha Mikro di Propinsi DIY)*.
- Yaseen, A., Somogyi, S., & Bryceson, K. (2018). Entrepreneurial behaviour formation among Farmers: Evidence from the Pakistani dairy industry. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies*, 8(1), 124–143.
- Yin, R. K. (2013) Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Younis, A., Xiaobao, P., Nadeem, M. A., Kanwal, S., Pitafi, A. H., Qiong, G., & Yuzhen, D. (2020). Impact of positivity and empathy on social entrepreneurial intention: The moderating role of perceived social support. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 21(1).
- Yu, C., Ye, B., & Ma, S. (2020). Creating for others: linking prosocial motivation and social entrepreneurship intentions. *Management Decision*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-06-2019-0815>
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519–532.
- Zapkau, F. B., Schwens, C., Steinmetz, H., & Kabst, R. (2014). Disentangling the effect of prior entrepreneurial exposure on entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(3), 639–653.
- Zaremohzzabieh, Z., Ahrari, S., Krauss, S. E., Samah, A. B. A., Meng, L. K., & Ariffin, Z. (2018). Predicting social entrepreneurial intention: A meta-analytic path analysis based on the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 264–276.
- Zeyer, A. & Dillon, J. (2019). The role of empathy for learning in complex Science|Environment|Health contexts. *International Journal of Science Education*, 41(3), pp. 297–315
- Zhang, Y., Trusty, J., Goroshnikova, T., Kelly, L., Kwong, K. K., McGuire, S. J. J., Perusquia, J., Prabhu, V. P., Shen, M., & Tang, R. (2021). Millennial social

entrepreneurial intent and social entrepreneurial self-efficacy: a comparative entrepreneurship study. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 17(1), 20–43.

Zikmund, W., Babin, B., Carr, J., & Griffin, M. (2012). Business research methods: Cengage Learning. H4 B. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 44(2), 268-284.

