JSIP 14 (1) (2025)

Journal of Social and Industrial Psychology

http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/sip

Entrepreneurial Commitment among Youth Entrepreneurs: The Role of Individual, Social, and Contextual Factors

Aftina Nurul Husna[1]✉, Aning Az Zahra[2]

[1]Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

[2]Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Humanities, Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang, Indonesia

Article Info

Keywords:
entrepreneurial commitment, entrepreneurial motivation, Protean career orientation, family support, family business involvement, Person-Entrepreneurship Fit, youth entrepreneurs

Abstract

Entrepreneurial commitment is a relatively new topic in entrepreneurship studies. Although its role is crucial as a bridge between entrepreneurial intention and action, research on this variable from a psychological perspective remains limited, especially in Indonesia. Grounded in social cognitive theory and career-life preparedness, this study investigates the influence of individual factors (gender, motivation, entrepreneurial characters, self-efficacy, and protean career orientation), social (perceived family support and involvement in family business), and contextual (business status, perception of employability, and Person-Entrepreneurship Fit) on entrepreneurial commitment. A total of 95 young adults who were university students, aged 18–25, owned a business and came from entrepreneurial families were recruited through convenience sampling in a cross-sectional survey. The variables in this study were measured using psychological scales that have been psychometrically validated. The results of the regression analysis showed that, out of the ten variables tested, entrepreneurial motivation, Protean career orientation, family support, involvement in the family business, and Person-Entrepreneurship Fit in the dimension of skill fit had a significant influence on entrepreneurial commitment. Although differences in commitment scores were found based on gender and business ownership status, these two variables did not show significant effects in the regression model. These findings lay the foundation for future studies on strategies to enhance entrepreneurial commitment and the role of commitment in improving business performance, as well as the development of evidence-based entrepreneurship education programs for the younger generation.

✉Correspondence address:
E-mail: anhusna@mail.unnes.ac.id

ISSN 2964-4135

INTRODUCTION

The demographic bonus in 2030-2045 is expected to boost Indonesia's economic growth (Suyatna & Nurhasanah, 2017). One of the efforts is to increase the number of young entrepreneurs, in accordance with the government's target to increase the ratio of the number of entrepreneurs to the total population of Indonesia by 12 percent by 2045 (Mursid, 2023). Based on a 2018 survey in Indonesia, 40% of entrepreneurs in micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) are <34 years old and more than 60% are high school graduates (Asian Pacific Foundation of Canada, 2018). In 2019, the World Economic Forum even reported that 35.5% of Indonesian youth wanted to pursue a career in entrepreneurship, higher than neighboring countries such as Thailand (31.9%) and even Singapore (16.9%) (Asian Development Bank, 2021).

Although Indonesia has great potential for youth entrepreneurship, there are many challenges faced, especially in the post-pandemic period (Diandra & Rahmatullah, 2020). Generally, businesses started by young people have immature organizational characteristics, weak in capital, weak in product innovation, and lack of experience and skills in navigating businesses facing challenges and threats (Giardino et al., 2014; Kalyanasundaram, 2018; Nurcahyo et al., 2018). As a result, businesses started by young people often face a high risk of failure. In addition, entrepreneurship is essentially an activity characterized by uncertainty, challenges and risks. The existence of these challenges means that, while many young people are interested in and attempt entrepreneurship, not many are committed enough to actually engage in the process of building a sustainable business (Adam & Gabay-Mariani, 2021). Therefore, it is worth exploring what factors can strengthen this commitment in order to support the sustainability of the ventures that young people have started.

According to (Fayolle et al., 2011), commitment is what binds a person to keep doing something he has chosen. Commitment is the force that stabilizes behavior and gives a person the energy to do whatever is needed to achieve his goals, even when faced with obstacles or temptations of other attractive alternatives. In the context of entrepreneurship, commitment concerns how much effort a person is willing to invest in his business (Fayolle et al., 2011). Fayolle et al. explained that entrepreneurial commitment is a state in which a person is ready and willing to devote or dedicate a lot of time, energy, and costs, as well as intellectual, relational, and emotional resources he has for his business. Entrepreneurial commitment in a person can be seen from two conditions, namely: his preference to choose to remain an entrepreneur regardless of his current activities and his ability to overcome resistance to changes that arise from choosing entrepreneurship, such as discomfort due to new lifestyles and discomfort due to uncertainty and risk.

Entrepreneurial commitment is a determining variable in the entrepreneurial process because it plays a role in bridging the gap between entrepreneurial intention and actual action/ behaviorintention gap (Adam & Fayolle, 2015). The existence of commitment is the starting point of the actual entrepreneurial process and gives rise to a new venture (Fayolle et al., 2011). Although not long researched in entrepreneurship studies, entrepreneurial commitment has begun to be studied using various theoretical perspectives. Based on goal attainment theory, a person's high or low entrepreneurial commitment is influenced by his or her assessment of how desirable and feasible a business target is to pursue and achieve (De Clercq et al., 2009). Meanwhile, based on organizational commitment theory, commitment to career choice as an entrepreneur and commitment to business projects that have been started can be seen from the aspects of individual normative, continuance, and affective commitment (Gabay-Mariani & Boissin, 2021; Tasnim et al., 2018).

Entrepreneurial commitment is also examined based on collective and individual dimensions. In the collective dimension, individual decisions to continue the family business are influenced by a sense of responsibility to the family and a desire to preserve the family spirit. There are four types of successor commitment to the family business, namely: affective, normative, calculative, and imperative commitment (Salvato et al., 2010). On the individual dimension, the dynamics of entrepreneurial commitment can be explained using psychosocial theory. Bruyat found that

commitment is decisive in the transition from intention to action, to start, continue, or sustain a venture (Fayolle et al., 2011). Many people stall at the intention stage and do not start or even stop midway because of weak commitment. In contrast, people can be very persistent in sustaining their efforts despite challenges and difficulties when they are fully committed.

According to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2018), humans have agency to determine their behavior. His or her functioning is the result of the role of intrapersonal influences, the person's own behavior, and environmental forces. In acting, humans motivate and guide themselves towards the future, and adjust to other people or the environment in which they are located. Behavior can also be formed through social modeling, through the presence of role models. Based on social cognitive theory and a review of previous studies, entrepreneurial commitment can be modeled by considering the role of personal and environmental factors around an entrepreneur.

Determinants at the personal level are individual personality characteristics. Based on previous studies, a number of characteristics are known to play a role in entrepreneurial performance, such as: an individual's motivation for entrepreneurship (Robichaud et al., 2010; van der Swan et al., 2016), individual entrepreneurial characteristics (Shane & Ventakaraman, 2000), and entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Mauer et al., 2009; Newman et al., 2018). In the current study, it is predicted that entrepreneurial commitment is influenced by: the motives behind a person's entrepreneurship, his entrepreneurial character, namely the need for achievement, innovativeness, risk-taking, and independence, and self-efficacy, namely the belief in being able to carry out tasks related to the business being run.

Meanwhile, in the social environment, there are several factors that should be considered to influence entrepreneurial commitment, especially those related to family. the stability of the choice to become an entrepreneur is influenced by the presence or absence of support or approval from parents (Garcia et al., 2019). In terms of choosing an entrepreneurial career, sometimes families oppose it because they expect their children to have a more stable job. In addition, the experience of being involved in the family business is also hypothesized to play a similar role on entrepreneurial commitment. The family business is a very important arena of career exploration and provides children with the opportunity to explore the desirability and feasibility of a successful career in this field (Murphy & Lambrechts, 2015). Therefore, in the current study, it is hypothesized that the perception of whether the family supports an individual's career choice as an entrepreneur influences commitment to entrepreneurship.

From the perspective of vocational psychology, career-life preparedness theory suggests that individuals manage their careers by considering various possibilities in an ever-changing environment. Career planning should contain an element of adaptability, which is the readiness to cope with predictable and unpredictable things in order to prepare and participate in work roles amidst the changing conditions of the world of work (Rogers & Creed, 2011). Previous studies have found several factors that are seen to influence career choice in entrepreneurship, namely: perceived Person-Entrepreneurship Fit (PEF) (Markman & Baron, 2003; Zhu et al., 2022) , perceived employability to be absorbed in the workforce for salaried jobs (Atitsogbe et al., 2019; Neneh, 2020) , and Protean career orientation in which individuals measure their success based on their internal values and are able to self-manage their personal career so that they have the ability to be more adaptive (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). Therefore, it is predicted that a person's entrepreneurial commitment is influenced by self-match with entrepreneurship, employability assessment, and career orientation.

In Indonesia, there are still very few studies that examine entrepreneurial commitment from a psychological perspective. Generally, research is conducted in the fields of economics, business, and management where commitment is placed as an influence factor for entrepreneurial intention, work motivation, business performance, or business performance (Nadhar et al., 2017; Purwaningsih & Burhanuddin, 2021; Sari et al., 2022). The current study is very important to get a comprehensive explanation of entrepreneurial commitment, especially in the younger generation in Indonesia. It is hoped that this research can enrich the theoretical knowledge of entrepreneurship psychology and

vocational psychology, and become a consideration for developing entrepreneurship education that pays attention to the psychological aspects of an entrepreneur.

METHOD

The participants of this study were students in public and private universities with the following criteria: (1) aged between 17-25 years old, (2) have pioneered a career in entrepreneurship either as a main or part-time job, and (3) have an entrepreneurial family. Using non-probability sampling with convenient sampling technique, 93 out of 405 respondents met the inclusion criteria. Although limited, this sample size is adequate for multiple regression analysis involving 2–5 predictors with a moderate squared multiple correlation ($\rho^2 = 0.25–0.50$) (Knofczynski & Mundfrom, 2008). Data were collected online through a digital questionnaire with written informed consent. Ethical approval was not required based on the Indonesian Psychology Code of Ethics. The study examined one dependent variable—entrepreneurial commitment—and eight predictors grouped into personal (e.g., gender, entrepreneurial motives, character, self-efficacy, and protean career orientation), social (family support), and contextual factors (business status, perceived employability, Person-Entrepreneurship Fit (PEF), and involvement in the family business).

All variables were measured using validated instruments. Entrepreneurial commitment was assessed with a 7-item scale ($\alpha = 0.686$), and entrepreneurial motives (push motive $\alpha = 0.848$; pull motive $\alpha = 0.797$) with a 10-item scale. Entrepreneurial character was measured by the 23-item SK-Wira scale (Husna & Akmal, 2021), while entrepreneurial self-efficacy used a 19-item scale covering four venture phases (McGee et al., 2009; Husna & Akmal, 2020). Protean career orientation (value-driven $\alpha = 0.947$; self-direction $\alpha = 0.857$) was measured using subscales adapted from Briscoe et al. (2006). Family support was assessed with a 10-item scale ($\alpha = 0.942$). Perceived employability used two subscales (internal $\alpha = 0.856$; external $\alpha = 0.905$) from Rothwell et al. (2008). PEF was measured with three separate subscales: skill fit ($\alpha = 0.708$), trait fit ($\alpha = 0.718$), and environment fit ($\alpha = 0.845$). Involvement in the family business was measured with a 15-item scale ($\alpha = 0.958$). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression. The researcher conducted data preparation to convert the variables of gender and business status into dummy variables, with the category "female" in the gender variable and "owned" in the business status variable set as the baseline category. The models tested in this study are summarized in **Table 1.**

Table 1. Hypothesis models and research variables

Model		Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
1	Individual Factors	(a) Gender	
		(b) Entrepreneurial motive	
		(c) Entrepreneurial character	
		(d) Entrepreneurial self-efficacy	
		(e) Protean career orientation	
2	Social (Family) Factors	(f) Family support	Commitment entrepreneurship
		(g) Involvement in family business	
3	Contextual Factors	(h) Business status owned	
		(i) Perceived employability	
		(j) Person-Entrepreneurship Fit (PEF)	

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of descriptive analysis showed the profile of participants as in **Table 2**. The majority were female (57%) and aged 21-22 years (54.8%). Some have owned their own business (34.5%), and quite a number are only running a family-owned business (40.9%). Almost all students reported having been in entrepreneurship for <3 years (74.1%) and were involved in their family business (82.8%). The normality test on the scores of each variable showed that the data were generally normally distributed, except for the pull motives variable with a kurtosis value >2 (**Table 3**). The researcher performed a quadratic transformation of the pull motives score, and the result of the transformation score showed a relatively more normal data distribution (Skewness = 0.910; Kurtosis = 0.179). Henceforth, the transformed pull motives variable scores were used for analysis.

Table 2. Description of research participants (N = 93)

Variable	Category	N	%
Gender	Female	53	57
	Male	40	43
Age	19	3	3,2
	20	12	12,9
	21	27	29,0
	22	24	25,8
	23	18	19,4
	24	4	4,3
	25	4	4,3
Business status	Owned	32	34,4
	Jointly owned with friends	19	20,4
	Family-owned	38	40,9
	Owned by others	4	4,3
Duration of entrepreneurship	< 1 year	23	24,7
	1-2 years	31	33,3
	2-3 years	15	16,1
	3-4 years	8	8,6
	4-5 years	2	2,2
	> 5 years	14	15,1
Involvement in family business	No	16	17,2
	Yes	77	82,8

Tabel 3. Score description and data normality

	Variables	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt
1.	Entrepreneurial commitment	17	35	27,73	4,34	-0,083	-0,599
2.	Entrepreneurial motive (push)	5	25	13,49	3,73	0,236	0,647
	Entrepreneurial motive (pull)	5	25	21,60	3,84	-1,603	3,423
3.	Entrepreneurial character	59	115	99,82	14,91	-0,845	-0,452
	Achievement needs	8	25	21,67	3,52	-1,134	1,248
	Innovativeness	20	35	30,85	4,66	-0,879	-0,519
	Risk taking	15	25	21,81	3,30	-0,753	-0,737
	Autonomy	14	30	25,49	4,21	-0,683	-0,590
4.	Entrepreneurial self-efficacy	43	95	80,34	14,91	-0,659	-0,962
5.	Protean career orientation						
	Value driven	9	30	24,87	4,28	-0,940	0,829
	Self-direction	8	20	16,74	2,94	-0,684	-0,489
6.	Family support	10	50	39,39	7,85	-1,046	1,689
7.	Involvement in family business	19	75	58,56	12,12	-0,736	0,469
8.	Perceived employability						
	Internal	8	20	15,38	2,70	-0,218	-0,534
	External	17	40	29,60	5,62	-0,438	-0,746
9.	Person-Entrepreneurship Fit						
	Skill fit	14	30	24,22	4,20	-0,365	-1,038
	Trait fit	10	25	18,84	3,66	0,027	-0,770
	Environmental fit	15	25	19,76	2,76	0,021	-0,625

Notes. Skew = Skewness with Standard Error (SE) = 0.25; Kurt = Kurtosis with SE = 0.495

Prior to the regression analysis, the researcher conducted a regression assumption test on Model 1. In this model, it is hypothesized that entrepreneurial commitment can be predicted by a number of individual characteristics, namely: entrepreneurial motivation (push and pull motives), entrepreneurial character dimensions (need for achievement, innovativeness, risk-taking, and autonomy), entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and Protean career orientation (value driven and self-direction).

The main assumptions of regression, such as: linearity, normality of residuals, homoscedasticity, and autocorrelation, were met, except for multicollinearity. The variables that are dimensions of entrepreneurial character and Protean career orientation showed Variance Inflation Factor or VIF values >5. To overcome this, the researcher decided to combine these dimensions by calculating a composite score of entrepreneurial character and Protean career orientation. As a result, no multicollinearity problem was found (VIF gender= 1.180; VIF (push) (-motives) = 1.217; VIF (pull) (-motives) = 2.939; VIF (self) (-efficacy) = 2.377; VIF character = 3.024; VIF(Protean) (-career) = 1.920).

Before conducting the regression analysis, we also examined the correlation matrix between the predictor variables and entrepreneurial commitment and conducted a t-test to see if there is a difference in entrepreneurial commitment according to gender. The correlation analysis showed that all variables were moderately correlated with entrepreneurial commitment, except push motives ($p>0.05$) (**Table 4**). Meanwhile, the results of the independent t-test show that there is a highly significant difference in entrepreneurial commitment by gender with men showing a higher level of commitment than women ($t(91) = -4.019$; $p < 0.01$). The role of these two variables, push motives and gender were further examined by regression analysis to find out if they have any influence by controlling for the effects of other predictors.

Table 4. Correlation analysis of predictors with entrepreneurial commitment in Model 1

Variable	EC	EM push	EM pull	ESE	ECh	PCO	G
EC	1						
EM push	−0,027	1					
EM pull	0,697*	0,336*	1				
ESE	0,637*	0,052	0,608*	1			
ECh	0,660*	0,104	0,751*	0,677*	1		
PCO	0,612*	0,089	0,506*	0,658*	0,601*	1	
G	-0,388*	-0,152	-0,376*	-0,296*	-0,323*	-0,255*	1

Notes. EC = Entrepreneurial Commitment; EM push = Entrepreneurial Motives (push motives); EM pull = Entrepreneurial Motives (pull motives); ESE = Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy; ECh = Entrepreneurial Character; PCO = Protean Career Orientation; G = Gender; * p<0.01 (2-tailed)

The regression analysis showed that Model 1 contributed 66% to entrepreneurial commitment ($R = 0.812$; $R^2 = 0.660$; $F(6, 86) = 27.771$; $p < 0.01$). Among the five predictors, individually, only push and pull motives and Protean career orientation proved to be highly significant predictors of entrepreneurial commitment. Meanwhile, gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial character showed no significant effect ($p>0.05$). Different from pull motives ($B = 0.015$; $t = 4.748$; $p < 0.01$) and Protean career orientation ($B = 0.151$; $t = 2.818$; $p < 0.01$) which showed a positive relationship direction with entrepreneurial commitment, push motives had a negative relationship ($B = -0.290$; $t = -3.590$; $p < 0.01$). This means that someone who tends to be an entrepreneur because he is forced or because of the pressure of the situation (push motives), his entrepreneurial commitment tends to be lower.

Interaction with family as the individual's closest social environment is also considered as a predictor of entrepreneurial commitment. In Model 2, entrepreneurial commitment is hypothesized to be predicted by the presence of family support and an individual's involvement as a child in a family-run business. All major regression assumptions related to linearity, residual normality, homoscedasticity, and autocorrelation were met in this model. The correlation analysis showed that family support ($r = 0.567$; $p < 0.01$) and involvement in the family business ($r = 0.461$; $p < 0.01$) had a statistically significant moderate correlation with entrepreneurial commitment. Regression results showed that the combination of family support and involvement in the family business contributed significantly to entrepreneurial commitment, with a total explained variance of 39.6% ($R = 0.629$; $R^2 = 0.396$; $F(2,90) = 29.479$; $p < 0.01$). Individually, family support ($B = 0.105$; $t = 3.336$; $p < 0.01$) and involvement in family business ($B = 0.254$; $t = 5.220$; $p < 0.01$) significantly contributed to the increase in entrepreneurial commitment.

Contextual factors include broader conditions that shape an individual's background, particularly the world of work in entrepreneurship. In Model 3, the influence of contextual factors is accounted for based on an individual's perception of his/her employability in the world of work on the internal and external dimensions, self-employment fit (PEF) assessment on the dimensions of skill fit, trait fit, and environmental fit, and the status of the business owned, whether "self-owned", "family-owned", or "co-owned with friends". Assumption tests showed no problems with linearity, residual normality, homoscedasticity, and autocorrelation in the data. Before conducting the regression analysis, we first examined the correlation matrix between the predictor variables and entrepreneurial commitment and conducted a t-test to see if there were differences in entrepreneurial commitment according to different business ownership status. Correlation analysis showed that, apart from "family-owned" and "co-owned with friends" ($p>0.05$), all variables had significant medium and positive correlations with entrepreneurial commitment (**Table 5**).

Tabel 5. Correlation analysis of predictors with entrepreneurial commitment in Model 3

Variabel	EC	SBS	FBS	CFS	PEI	PEE	PEF-K	PEF-S	PEF-L
EC	1								
SBS	0,214*	1							
FBS	-0,016	-0,705**	1						
CFS	-0,052	-0,377**	-0,176*	1					
PEI	0,513**	0,016	0,105	0,071	1				
PEE	0,385**	0,060	0,010	0,091	0,673**	1			
PEF-S	0,717**	0,152	0,018	0,030	0,559**	0,484**	1		
PEF-T	0,691**	0,157	0,032	-0,029	0,531**	0,387**	0,783**	1	
PEF-E	0,582**	0,074	0,040	0,089	0,441**	0,357**	0,690**	0,696**	1

Notes. EC = Entrepreneurial Commitment; SBS = Self-owned business status; FBS = Family-owned business status; CFS = Co-owned business with friends status; PEI = Perceived Employability internal dimension; PEE = Perceived Employability external dimension; PEF-S = Person-Enterpreneurship Fit skill; PEF-T = Person-Enterpreneurship Fit trait; PEF-E = Person-Enterpreneurship Fit environment; *p<0.05 (2-tailed); **p<0.01 (2-tailed)

Meanwhile, Welch's ANOVA showed a significant difference between groups, F (3, 89) = 4.349, p < 0.01. The Games-Howell post-hoc test showed a significant difference between the groups of "self-owned" ($Mean_{dif}$ = -6.315; p<0.01), family-owned" ($Mean_{dif}$ = -5.442; p<0.01), and "co-owned with friends" ($Mean_{dif}$ = -4.833; p<0.05) and "owned by others". These findings suggest that individuals who run a business owned by others tend to have lower levels of entrepreneurial commitment than other groups.

The regression analysis showed that the predictors in Model 3 contributed 58.4% to entrepreneurial commitment (R = 0.764; R^2= 0.584; F (8, 84) = 14.723; p < 0.01). However, of all the contextual predictors tested, only the skill fit aspect of Person-Enterpreneurship Fit (PEF) had a significant effect on entrepreneurial commitment (B = 0.386; t = 2.946; p < 0.01). Other variables, such as business status, perceived employability, trait fit with entrepreneurship and environmental fit for entrepreneurship did not significantly affect entrepreneurial commitment.

Entrepreneurial commitment is a determinant of the sustainability of a business. This study aims to identify factors that influence entrepreneurial commitment in students who are currently running a business and have an entrepreneurial family background. Various predictors including individual, social (family) and contextual aspects were examined using multiple regression analysis. It was found that, from the individual aspect, both push/ necessity-driven and pull/ opportunity-driven entrepreneurial motivation, as well as Protean career orientation contributed significantly. On the family aspect, family support and experience of being involved in the family business together play a significant role. Meanwhile, on the contextual aspect, only Person-Entrepreneurship Fit on the skill fit dimension has a significant effect on entrepreneurial commitment.

Motivation driven by opportunities and needs influences entrepreneurial commitment in the opposite direction. Someone who is entrepreneurial because of the attraction of positive things such as developing themselves, achieving independence, being creative, and improving the welfare of others, their entrepreneurial commitment tends to strengthen. Conversely, someone who is entrepreneurial out of necessity, such as due to economic hardship and financial need, their entrepreneurial commitment tends to weaken. This finding supports the idea that opportunity- and necessity-driven motivations are not dichotomous (Coffman & Sunny, 2021). Complementing previous knowledge that motivation is a factor that determines business establishment (Batz Liñeiro et al., 2024) , this finding adds new knowledge about what kind of motivation strengthens and weakens an individual's dedication to sustain his or her business.

Previous studies have found that Protean orientation is related to entrepreneurial orientation (Joshi et al., 2023; Marshall & Gigliotti, 2020). The present study's finding that Protean career orientation contributes to strengthening commitment to an entrepreneurial career, extends the existing conceptual framework on career dynamics in entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurs who make their values their guidelines and measures of career success (value driven) and are able to direct and self-manage their personal careers so that they are more adaptive, proactive, and independent in meeting the demands of performance and learning (self-direction) (Briscoe et al., 2006; Briscoe & Hall, 2006) , tend to be more committed to their established businesses and careers.

This research reinforces the idea from previous studies that family plays a large role in youth entrepreneurship. Mei et al. (2022) proved the role of entrepreneurial commitment as a mediator of the relationship between entrepreneurial intention and actual behavior, while family support plays a moderating role. In the current study, instrumental family support and knowledge, as well as experience of being involved in the family business strengthened entrepreneurial commitment in the younger generation as a significant predictor. This confirms the conceptual framework of the role of family as a source of support as well as a role model in entrepreneurship (Cardella et al., 2020).

The last finding, on the role of contextual factors, perceived employability and Person-Entrepreneurship Fit (PEF) on the dimensions of trait and environmental fit were not shown to have an influence on entrepreneurial commitment. The only variable that has a real effect is skill fit, which is the compatibility between the skills and abilities mastered with the demands of the work field (Baron & Markman, 2014; Markman & Baron, 2003). The role of contextual factors still needs to be explored further to identify appropriate variables as predictors of entrepreneurial commitment. This is because individual characteristics and family roles do not function in the same way, especially in the cultural or institutional context in Indonesia (Schlaegel et al., 2021). The current study is still limited to examining the influence of contextual factors perceived by individuals, with regard to the job market situation (the external dimension of perceived employability) and the existence of community and government support for business (the dimension of PEF environmental suitability).

CONCLUSION

This study identified several variables that are statistically significant in influencing the level of entrepreneurial commitment among young entrepreneurs. Among individual characteristics, entrepreneurial motivation and protean career orientation played the strongest role. In the family sphere, family support and involvement in the family business also made meaningful contributions. Meanwhile, of the many contextual factors, only the skill fit dimension in Person-Entrepreneurship Fit (PEF) had a significant influence on commitment. This finding indicates that the readiness to sustain a business, as reflected in the dedication of personal time, energy and resources, is highly dependent on the mastery of relevant entrepreneurial skills. Based on these findings, future research can be directed towards examining methods that can be used to enhance entrepreneurial commitment and investigating the extent to which entrepreneurial commitment plays a role in improving business performance, taking into account individual family and motivational factors.

The results above provide a valuable foundation for the development of more targeted entrepreneurship education programs. However, a comprehensive study of entrepreneurial commitment that considers individual, social, and contextual factors simultaneously still needs to be developed. This study has limitations in the relatively small sample size (<100 people) and non-probabilistic sampling techniques (convenience sampling). Therefore, generalization of the findings needs to be done carefully, especially for populations outside of 18-25 years old students. To improve the quality of findings in future research, it is recommended to use a larger and more representative sample of informal entrepreneurs. For this reason, collaboration with universities or schools, government agencies or associations of young entrepreneurs is important to attract participants from various regions in Indonesia in a more representative manner.

REFERENCES

Adam, A. F., & Fayolle, A. (2015). Bridging the entrepreneurial intention-behaviour gap: The role of commitment and implementation intention. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *25*(1), 36–54. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2015.068775

Adam, A. F., & Gabay-Mariani, L. (2021). Intended entrepreneurs' commitment: A new perspective on the mind-sets, antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *44*(1), 11–29. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2021.117936

Asian Development Bank. (2021). *Incubating Indonesia's young entrepreneurs: Recommendations for improving development programs*. https://www.adb.org/publications/indonesia-young-entrepreneurs-development-programs

Asian Pacific Foundation of Canada. (2018). *2018 Survey of Entrepreneurs and MSMEs In Indonesia: Building the Capacity of MSMEs Through Human Capital*.

Atitsogbe, K. A., Mama, N. P., Sovet, L., Pari, P., & Rossier, J. (2019). Perceived employability and entrepreneurial intentions across university students and job seekers in Togo: The effect of career adaptability and self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(FEB), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00180

Bandura, A. (2018). Toward a psychology of human agency: Pathways and reflections. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *13*(2), 130–136. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617699280

Baron, R. A., & Markman, G. D. M. (2014). Person-Entrepreneurship Fit: The role of individual difference factors in new venture formation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *18*(1), 41–60.

Batz Liñeiro, A., Romero Ochoa, J. A., & Montes de la Barrera, J. (2024). Exploring entrepreneurial intentions and motivations: A comparative analysis of opportunity-driven and necessity-driven entrepreneurs. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-024-00366-8

Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (2006). The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers: Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *69*(1), 4–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.002

Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., & Frautschy DeMuth, R. L. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers: An empirical exploration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *69*(1), 30–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.003

Cardella, G. M., Hernández-Sánchez, B. R., & Sánchez García, J. C. (2020). Entrepreneurship and family Role: A systematic review of a growing research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(January), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02939

Coffman, C. D., & Sunny, S. A. (2021). Reconceptualizing necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship: A needs-based view of entrepreneurial motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *46*(4), 823–835. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2019.0361

De Clercq, D., Menzies, T. V., Diochon, M., & Gasse, Y. (2009). Explaining nascent entrepreneurs' goal commitment: An exploratory study. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, *22*(2), 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2009.10593446

Diandra, Lady, & Rahmatullah, Y. F. (2020). *Result of Survey on Impact of COVID-19 on Youth Entrepreneurs in Indonesia*.

Fayolle, A., Basso, O., & Tornikoski, E. T. (2011). Entrepreneurial commitment and new venture creation: A conceptual exploration. In K. Hindle & K. Klyver (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on New Venture Creation* (Issue June 2020, pp. 160–182). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857933065.00016

Gabay-Mariani, L., & Boissin, J. P. (2021). Commitment profiles of nascent entrepreneurs: Insights from an empirical taxonomy among French student entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, *27*(5), 1214–1240. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-09-2020-0652

Garcia, P. R. J. M., Sharma, P., Massis, A. De, Wright, M., & Scholes, L. (2019). Perceived parental behaviors and next-generation engagement in family firms: A social cognitive perspective. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, *43*(2 Special Issue), 224–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258718796087

Giardino, C., Wang, X., & Abrahamsson, P. (2014). Why early-stage software ftartups fail: A behavioral framework. *International Conference of Software Business*, 27–41.

Husna, A. N., & Akmal, N. (2020). Indonesian adaptation of Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Scale. *1st Borobudur International Symposium on Humanities, Economics and Social Sciences*, *436*, 272–277. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200529.056

Husna, A. N., & Akmal, N. (2021). Construct validation of Entrepreneurial Character Scale. *Jurnal Psikologi*, *19*(4), 323–342. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.19.4.323-342

Joshi, M., Maheshwari, G. C., & Yadav, R. (2023). Moderating role of personal attitude, social norms and self-efficacy on the relationship between protean career pattern and entrepreneurial orientation among students in India: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *49*(3), 458–474. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2023.132530

Kalyanasundaram, G. (2018). Why do Startups fail? A case study based empirical analysis in Bangalore. *Asian Journal of Innovation and Policy*, *7*(1), 79–102. https://doi.org/10.7545/ajip.2018.7.1.079

Knofczynski, G. T., & Mundfrom, D. (2008). Sample sizes when using multiple linear regression for prediction. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *68*(3), 431–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164407310131

Markman, G. D., & Baron, R. A. (2003). Person-entrepreneurship fit: Why some people are more successful as entrepreneurs than others. *Human Resource Management Review*, *13*(2), 281–301. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00018-4

Marshall, D. R., & Gigliotti, R. (2020). Bound for entrepreneurship? A career-theoretical perspective on entrepreneurial intentions. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *16*(1), 287–303. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0523-6

Mauer, R., Neergaard, H., & Linstad, K. (2009). Self-Efficacy: Understanding the entrepreneurial mindset. In A. L. Carsrud & M. Brannback (Eds.), *Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mind* (pp. 233–257). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0443-0

Mcgee, J. E., Peterson, M., Mueller, S. L., & Sequeira, J. M. (2009). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: Refining the measure. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, *33*(4), 965–988. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00304.x

Mei, H., Ma, Z., Zhan, Z., Ning, W., Zuo, H., Wang, J., & Huang, Y. (2022). University students' successive development from entrepreneurial intention to behavior: The mediating role of commitment and moderating role of family support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(March), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.859210

Murphy, L., & Lambrechts, F. (2015). Investigating the actual career decisions of the next generation: The impact of family business involvement. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *6*(1), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.10.003

Mursid, F. (2023, November). Wapres: Jumlah pengusaha kita terlalu kecil dibandingkan negara lain. *Republika*.

Nadhar, M., Tawe, A., & Parawansa, D. A. (2017). The effect of work motivation and entrepreneurship orientation on business performance through entrepreneurial commitments of Coffee Shops in Makassar. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, *7*(1), 470–474.

Neneh, B. N. (2020). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and a student's predisposition to choose an entrepreneurial career path: The role of self-perceived employability. *Education and Training*, *62*(5), 559–580. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-06-2019-0108

Newman, A., Obschonka, M., Schwarz, S., & ... (2018). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: A systematic review of the literature on its antecedents and outcomes, and an agenda for future research. In *Journal of Vocational …*.

Nurcahyo, R., Akbar, M. I., & Gabriel, D. S. (2018). Characteristics of startup company and its strategy: Analysis of Indonesia fashion startup companies. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology(UAE)*, *7*(2), 44–47. https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i2.34.13908

Purwaningsih, Dewi., & Burhanuddin. (2021). Pentingnya komitmen dalam berwirausaha. *Jurnal Usaha*, *2*(2), 26–32.

Robichaud, Y., LeBrasseur, R., & Nagarajan, K. V. (2010). Necessity and opportunity-driven entrepreneurs in Canada: An investigation into their characteristics and an appraisal of the role of gender. *Journal of Applied Business & Economics*, *11*(1).

Rogers, M. E., & Creed, P. A. (2011). A longitudinal examination of adolescent career planning and exploration using a social cognitive career theory framework. *Journal of Adolescence*, *34*(1), 163–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.12.010

Rothwell, A., Herbert, I., & Rothwell, F. (2008). Self-perceived employability: Construction and initial validation of a scale for university students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.12.001

Salvato, C., Chirico, F., & Sharma, P. (2010). A farewell to the business: Championing rntrepreneurial exit in family firms. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, *22*(4), 321–348.

Sari, U. T., Artha, B., & Manggal, S. (2022). Pengaruh karakteristik wirausaha dan komitmen wirausaha terhadap kinerja usaha. *Managament Insight: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, *17*(2), 274–287.

Schlaegel, C., Engle, R. L., Richter, N. F., & Taureck, P. C. (2021). Personal factors, entrepreneurial intention, and entrepreneurial status: A multinational study in three institutional environments. In *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* (Vol. 19, Issue 3). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-021-00287-7

Shane, S., & Ventakaraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field research. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 217–226.

Sullivan, S. E., & Baruch, Y. (2009). Advances in career theory and research: A critical review and agenda for future exploration. *Journal of Management*, *35*(6), 1542–1571. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350082

Suyatna, H., & Nurhasanah, Y. (2017). Sociopreneurship sebagai tren karir anak muda. *Jurnal Studi Pemuda*, *6*(1), 527–537. https://doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.38011

Tasnim, R., Mahadi, N., Singh, H., & Saufi, R. A. (2018). Profiling entrepreneurial commitment across cultures: A Malaysian perspective. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *34*(2), 148–168. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2018.092024

van der Swan, P., Thurik, R., Verheul, I., & Hessels, J. (2016). Factors influencing the entrepreneurial engagement of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs. *Eurasian Business Review*, *6*, 273–296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40821-016-0065-1

Zhu, F., Syed, I., Hsu, D. K., Cohen, D., & Shinnar, R. S. (2022). "I put in effort, but I am still not passionate": The fit perceptions of novice entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *18*(May), e00322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2022.e00322