

**THE ROLE OF PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE,  
DESIRABILITY AND FEASIBILITY IN  
SHAPING DIGITAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP  
INTENTION**

**KARTIKA WATI BINTI MOHAMED**

**ASIA e UNIVERSITY  
2025**

THE ROLE OF PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE, DESIRABILITY AND  
FEASIBILITY IN SHAPING DIGITAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP  
INTENTION

KARTIKA WATI BINTI MOHAMED

A Thesis Submitted to Asia e University in  
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the  
Doctor of Business Administration

September 2025

## ABSTRACT

Graduate unemployment in developing nations like Malaysia, coupled with a gap in the nation's digital innovation ecosystem, necessitates a deeper understanding of the factors driving digital entrepreneurship. This study addresses a significant gap in the literature by developing and empirically testing an integrated theoretical model to identify the antecedents of digital entrepreneurial intention (DEI) among postgraduate students. The research synthesises constructs from the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), Social Learning Theory (self-efficacy) and the Entrepreneurial Intention Model to create a comprehensive framework. A cross-sectional study was conducted, gathering data from 394 Malaysian Master of Business Administration (MBA) students via an internet-mediated questionnaire. The hypothesised relationships were analysed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM). The empirical findings reveal that perceived knowledge of digital entrepreneurship, personal attitude and digital entrepreneurial self-efficacy are crucial and significant antecedents of DEI. Notably, while personal attitude was a strong predictor, the traditional TPB constructs of subjective norm and perceived behavioural control were found to be non-significant, suggesting the limited influence of social pressure and general control in this context. Furthermore, the study confirms that personal attitude and digital entrepreneurial self-efficacy act as significant partial mediators, channelling the positive effect of perceived knowledge onto digital entrepreneurial intention. The findings offer critical practical implications for higher education institutions and policymakers, highlighting the need to develop curricula that emphasise ICT-based learning and hands-on digital skills to bolster student attitudes and self-efficacy. Theoretically, the study contributes a validated, integrated model that refines the TPB for the digital context and underscores the superior predictive power of domain-specific self-efficacy over general perceived control.

**Keywords:** Digital entrepreneurship intention, digital knowledge, digital self-efficacy, attitude, Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), entrepreneurship education, MBA students, Malaysia

## **APPROVAL**

This is to certify that this thesis conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in quality and scope, for the fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctor of Business Administration.

The student has been supervised by: **Prof. Dato' Dr. Nik Maheran**

The thesis has been examined and endorsed by:

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohd Farid Shamsudin**  
**Asia e University**  
Examiner 1

**Assoc. Prof. Ts. Dr. Mohd Zukime Mat Junoh**  
**Universiti Malaysia Perlis**  
Examiner 2

This thesis was submitted to Asia e University and is accepted as fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctor of Business Administration.



.....  
**Prof. Ts. Dr. Zulkarnain Kedah**  
**Asia e University**  
Chairman, Examination Committee  
[29 September 2025]

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctor of Business Administration is my own work and that all contributions from any other persons or sources are properly and duly cited. I further declare that the material has not been submitted either in whole or in part, for a degree at this or any other university. In making this declaration, I understand and acknowledge any breaches in this declaration constitute academic misconduct, which may result in my expulsion from the programme and/or exclusion from the award of the degree.

**Name: Kartika Wati Binti Mohamed**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kartika Wati Binti Mohamed' in a cursive style.

**Signature of Student:**

**Date: 29 September 2025**



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah Rabbil 'Alamin.

First and foremost, my deepest gratitude to Allah swt for granting me the strength, patience and grace to complete this thesis. Without His guidance and blessings, this journey would not have been possible.

To my beloved husband Dr. Syid Ayob, thank you for your unwavering support, encouragement and understanding throughout this challenging yet fulfilling journey. To my dearest mother Datin Kamaliah, thank you for your continuous doa and unconditional love that have been my shield and source of comfort. To my precious children, you are my pillars of strength and my greatest inspiration to keep moving forward despite the challenges.

My heartfelt appreciation goes to my supervisor Dato' Professor Dr. Nik Maheran, for her invaluable advice, wisdom and guidance that have shaped the direction of my research. I am equally grateful to my advisor Dr. Norlina, whose persistent assistance, dedication and encouragement have been instrumental in navigating my APEL-Q journey.

Finally, I wish to express my sincere thanks to Asia e-University for granting me the opportunity and continuous support to complete my Doctor of Business Administration.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>APPROVAL</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATION</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	7
1.3 Global Innovation Index (GII) – 2023 & 2024	8
1.4 Research Questions	16
1.5 Research Objectives	18
1.6 Research Scope and Significance	19
1.6.1 Theoretical Scope	20
1.6.2 Sectoral and Geographical Analysis	21
1.6.3 Significance of the Study	24
1.7 Research Plan	26
1.8 Definition of Key Terms	28
1.9 Research Structure	31
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>35</b>
2.0 Introduction	35
2.1 Entrepreneurship	35
2.1.1 A Brief Overview	35
2.1.2 Entrepreneurship Intention Antecedents and Theories	38
2.1.3 The Digital Shift in Entrepreneurship	61
2.1.4 OECD Digital Economy Outlook	61
2.1.5 Interpretation of Malaysia’s Position	66
2.1.6 Key Trends in Malaysia	68
2.1.7 The Dual Roles of Digital Technology	70
2.2 Terms Related to Digital Entrepreneurship	75
2.2.1 Traditional Entrepreneurship vs. Digital Entrepreneurship	75
2.2.2 Digital Entrepreneurship and Traditional Entrepreneurship	80
2.2.3 Emerging Trends in Digital Entrepreneurship	84
2.2.4 Digital Entrepreneurship Ecosystem	85
2.2.5 Emerging Themes	90
2.2.6 Conceptual Framework: Digital Entrepreneurship Ecosystem	91
2.2.7 Digital Entrepreneurship Intention and Higher Education	93
2.3 Research Clusters	97
2.3.1 Perceived Knowledge on Digital Entrepreneurship	97
2.3.2 Perceived Desirability	111
2.3.3 Perceived Feasibility	115
	vii

2.3.4	Digital Entrepreneurship Intention	122
2.4	Chapter Summary	123
<b>CHAPTER 3 CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>		<b>124</b>
3.0	Introduction	124
3.1	Conceptual Development	129
3.1.1	Theoretical Reasoning	129
3.1.2	Hypothesis Development	130
3.2	Perceived Knowledge and its Influence on Perceived Desirability	131
3.3	Perceived Knowledge and its Influence on Perceived Feasibility	132
3.4	Perceived Desirability, Perceived Feasibility and Digital Entrepreneurial Intention	134
3.5	Perceived Feasibility and Digital Entrepreneurial Intention	134
3.6	The Mediating Roles of Desirability and Feasibility	135
3.7	Conceptual Model	137
3.7.1	Linking the Theoretical Model to the Entrepreneurship Intention Model, Entrepreneur Event Model, Theory of Planned Behaviour and Social Learning Theory	138
3.8	The Research Onion	138
3.9	Research Philosophy	140
3.9.1	Research Philosophy in Digital Entrepreneurship	149
3.9.2	Positivism	149
3.9.3	Interpretivism	150
3.9.4	Philosophical Stance of This Study	150
3.10	Research Approach	151
3.11	Research Strategy	153
3.11.1	Research Strategies in Digital Entrepreneurship	154
3.11.2	Research Strategy of This Dissertation	160
3.12	Research Method	164
3.13	Research Design (Time Horizon)	165
3.13.1	Rationale for Using Cross-Sectional Approach in This Dissertation	166
3.14	Data Collection Techniques	167
3.15	Data Analysis Approach	168
3.16	Questionnaire Development	169
3.16.1	The Choice of Questionnaire	169
3.16.2	Justification for Employing an Online (Internet-Mediated) Survey in This Dissertation	171
3.16.3	Design of Questionnaire Structure	172
3.16.4	Measurement Scale Development	173
3.16.5	Establishing Content Validity	180
3.17	Pilot Study	182
3.17.1	Phase 1: Expert Review for Content and Face Validity	182
3.17.2	Phase 2: Pre-Test with Target Respondents	183
3.17.3	Instrument Refinements and Preliminary Reliability Analysis	184
3.18	Main Studies	185
3.18.1	Sampling	185
3.18.2	Survey Unit Analysis and Participant Eligibility Criteria	197

3.18.3	Online Survey	199
3.18.4	Survey Administration	201
3.19	Data Quality Assurance: Reliability and Validity of the Measurement Instrument	202
3.19.1	Reliability Assessment	202
3.19.2	Validity Assessment	203
3.19.3	Unit of Analysis and Participant Eligibility Criteria	204
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>211</b>
4.0	Introduction	211
4.1	Data Quality	211
4.2	Respondents' Demographic Characteristics	212
4.2.1	Benchmarking of Sample Characteristics	214
4.3	Descriptive Analysis	217
4.4	Test for Normality	218
4.5	Assessment of Measurement Model	219
4.5.1	Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity	219
4.5.2	Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity	220
4.5.3	Assessment of Discriminant Validity via Cross-Loadings	226
4.5.4	Discriminant Validity	231
4.6	Structural Model Assessment	233
4.6.1	Assessment of Collinearity	233
4.6.2	Assessment of Coefficient of Determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) and Predictive Relevance (Q <sup>2</sup> )	235
4.6.3	Assessment of Path Coefficient (Significance of Paths)	237
4.7	Chapter Summary	252
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>253</b>
5.0	Introduction	253
5.1	Synopsis	253
5.2	Research Objectives Revisited	261
5.3	Discussion of Findings in Response to Research Questions	263
5.4	Contribution	267
5.4.1	Practical Contribution	267
5.4.2	Theoretical Contribution	274
5.5	Research Limitations	281
5.6	Future Research	284
5.7	Chapter Summary	286
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>288</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>307</b>
	Appendix A – Questionnaire	307
	Appendix B - Measurement of Model Coefficient Determination	318
	Appendix C – Graphical Representation of Inner Model After the Bootstrapping	319

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
Table 1.1	Graduate Employability Statistics – Malaysia (2024–2025)	4
Table 1.2	Graduate Employability Statistics (2023–2024)	5
Table 1.3	Malaysia's Entrepreneurship & Innovation Performance (As of 2023–2024) Based on Global Entrepreneurship Index (GEI) – 2024 Report	8
Table 1.4	Global Innovation Index (GII) – 2023 & 2024	9
Table 1.5	Distribution of Research Focus in Entrepreneurial Intention Literature	14
Table 1.6	Definition of Key Terms	28
Table 2.1	Antecedents of Entrepreneurial Intention (2010–2025)	39
Table 2.2	Knowledge Gaps and Future Research Opportunities	50
Table 2.3	Key Trends Driving Growth	62
Table 2.4	Historical vs. Current Comparison	62
Table 2.5	Comparative Table: Digital Technology Investment in Malaysia vs. OECD Countries (2020–2024)	65
Table 2.6	Challenges in Malaysia	69
Table 2.7	Definitions of a Digital Entrepreneur (2023–2025)	76
Table 2.8	Comparative Analysis of Digital and Traditional Entrepreneurship (2023–2025)	82
Table 2.9	Key Components of the Digital Entrepreneurship Ecosystem (2023–2025)	88
Table 2.10	Antecedents and Outcomes of Perceived Knowledge in Digital Entrepreneurship	100

Table 2.11	Recommended Programs & Policies to Support Digital Entrepreneurship	105
Table 2.12	Online Assessment for Digital Entrepreneurship Self-Efficacy	120
Table 3.1	Alignment of Research Objectives and Methodological Choices	128
Table 3.2	Major Research Philosophies	142
Table 3.3	Major Research Philosophies	145
Table 3.4	Research Approach	152
Table 3.5	Emerging Trends in Research Strategies (2019–2025)	155
Table 3.6	Recent Quantitative Research Strategies/Methods (2019–2025)	156
Table 3.7	Most Frequently Used Research Strategy: Quantitative	160
Table 3.8	Summary of Constructs Used	175
Table 3.9	Sampling Methods in Entrepreneurial Intention Studies (2019–2025)	188
Table 3.10	MBA Programs and Business Education	192
Table 3.11	Summary of Improvements	195
Table 4.1	Respondents Demography	213
Table 4.2	Comparison of Sample Demographics with National Profile	215
Table 4.3	Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for All Construct	217
Table 4.4	Skewness and Kurtosis for the Normality Test	218
Table 4.5	Items Loadings, Cronbach Alpha, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted	222
Table 4.6	Content Validity	228
Table 4.7	Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)	232
Table 4.8	Fornell-Larcker Criterion	233
Table 4.9	Multicollinearity Test	234

Table 4.10	Coefficients of Determination (R <sup>2</sup> )	235
Table 4.11	Result Summary of Direct Hypotheses Testing	239
Table 4.12	Mediation Analysis	247
Table 5.1	Linkages Between Research Questions, Objectives, Hypotheses, Findings and Implications	278

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure</b>		<b>Page</b>
Figure 1.1	Research Scope	21
Figure 1.2	Research Plan	27
Figure 2.1	Theory of Planned Behaviour	46
Figure 2.2	BHV-TPB Framework	49
Figure 2.3	Entrepreneurial Event Theory	56
Figure 2.4	Entrepreneurial Intention Model	57
Figure 2.5	Research Map of Digital Entrepreneurship	74
Figure 2.6	Conceptual Framework: Digital Entrepreneurship Ecosystem	93
Figure 2.7	Model of Learning and New Venture Creation	99
Figure 3.1	The Conceptual Model	137
Figure 3.2	The Research Onion	139
Figure 3.3	The Process of Deduction	153
Figure 3.4	Selection of Research Strategy	162
Figure 3.5	Choices of Research Methods	165
Figure 3.6	Types of Questionnaires	170
Figure 3.7	Procedure for Developing a Questionnaire	173
Figure 4.1	Measurement of Model Coefficient of Determination	236
Figure 4.2	Graphical Representation of Inner Model After the Bootstrapping Procedure (n = 5000 Bootstrapped Samples)	248
Figure 5.1	Empirical Model of Digital Entrepreneurial Intention	266

## LIST OF ABBREVIATION

ATT	Attitude
BHV	Basic Human Values Theory
DE	Digital Entrepreneurship
DEI	Digital Entrepreneurship Intention
DESE	Digital Entrepreneurship Self-Efficiency
DOSM	Department of Statistics Malaysia
EI	Entrepreneurial Intention
HEI	Higher Education Institution
MBA	Master of Business Administration
MCO	Movement Control Order
ME	Mediating Effect
MEDAC	Ministry of Entrepreneur Development and Cooperatives
MQR	Malaysian Qualification Register
PBC	Perceived Behavioural Control
PK	Perceived Knowledge
PV	Personal Values
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
SN	Subjective Norms

TPB Theory of Planned Behaviour

VIF Variance Inflation Factors

# **CHAPTER 1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.0 Introduction**

This chapter offers a comprehensive overview of the foundational elements of the research, thoroughly discussing the problem statement identified within the existing body of knowledge. It delineates the scope of the study, specifying the boundaries and focus areas that guide the investigation. In addition, it outlines the key research questions that will drive the inquiry, alongside the clear research objectives that aim to address these queries.

The research plan is presented in detail, providing insight into the methodologies and strategies that will be utilised throughout the study. Furthermore, the chapter discusses the research delimitation, which includes defining the specific sector and geographical area where the analysis will take place, ensuring clarity in the context of the findings.

The significance of the study is emphasised, highlighting its contributions to both academic discourse and practical applications in the field. This section underscores the importance of the research and its potential impact on future studies and real-world practices. Additionally, a brief description of some key terminology utilised throughout the research is provided, ensuring that readers are well-equipped to engage with the material presented.

### **1.1 Research Background**

Entrepreneurship, famously characterised by Schumpeter (1934) as a process of creative destruction, has emerged as a cornerstone of government policy initiatives across the globe. This dynamic field has garnered significant scholarly attention, as

evidenced by the works of Singh et al. (2024) and Morante Dávila et al. (2025). A focal point of this research is entrepreneurial intention, which is deemed crucial as it serves as a reliable predictor of the establishment of new enterprises (Sim et al., 2023). Entrepreneurs are widely recognised as the "engines of growth," and with effective support and resources, they possess the potential to make substantial contributions to their country's economic advancement and social progress (Sim et al., 2023; Saoula et al., 2023; Silva et al., 2024; Singh et al., 2024; Morante Dávila et al., 2025; Taneja et al., 2025).

Among the various theoretical frameworks explored in past research, the Entrepreneurial Intention Model proposed by Linan and Chen (2004) and Ferreira et al. (2012) stands out. This model identifies several motivational dimensions that can influence an individual's entrepreneurial intention, drawing from the widely recognised Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). These influential factors, or antecedents of intention, can be broadly categorised into personal attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control (PBC) (Ajzen, 1991).

In addition to these dimensions, there is a compelling argument for integrating the concept of self-efficacy into the discussion of entrepreneurial intention. Rooted in the Theory of Social Learning put forth by Bandura (1977), self-efficacy significantly differs from the previously mentioned perceived behavioural control. According to Newman et al. (2019), entrepreneurial self-efficacy is defined as "an individual's belief in his/her capability to perform tasks and roles aimed at entrepreneurial outcomes." In contrast, perceived behavioural control (PBC) primarily reflects an individual's perception of the degree of control over their circumstances (Perez & Alonso-Montesinos, 2023; Alam et al., 2024; Ajzen & Fishbein, 2024). In fact, Ajzen

& Fishbein (2024) in terms of theoretical development, offer a fresh perspective and propose PBC should include emotional and identity-related components

Hence, for a more nuanced and comprehensive framework in studying digital entrepreneurial intention, it is vital to include and rigorously test both self-efficacy and perceived behavioural control together in the current study's framework. This multifaceted approach promises to yield richer insights into the factors that drive entrepreneurial intentions in the digital era.

In the entrepreneurship intention model developed by Linan in 2004, several key factors influence an individual's desire to pursue entrepreneurial ventures. Among these, an independent variable known as entrepreneurial knowledge plays a crucial role as an antecedent to both perceived desirability and perceived feasibility, ultimately leading to entrepreneurial intention. Notably, perceived knowledge, particularly in the realm of digital entrepreneurship, is deemed especially significant in the context of the current study, as it represents the type of knowledge that can be effectively acquired within a higher education setting. Therefore, this study has adopted perceived digital entrepreneurial knowledge as an independent variable, tailoring it to fit within Linan's (2004) framework, as also evidenced in the works of Aloulou et al. (2024) and Shriha et al. (2025).

The rapid digital transformation of entrepreneurship presents another compelling area for exploration. Over the past two decades, technology has profoundly impacted a wide range of industries, encompassing both manufacturing and service sectors (Chaudhary & Biswas, 2025). In today's fast-paced business landscape, it has become essential for organizations to stay abreast of technological advancements, ensuring their systems remain compatible and aligned with these innovations.

According to the graduate employability statistics published by the Department of Statistics Malaysia (DOSM) the landscape of employment for graduates is rather concerning. Out of 5.87 million graduates in 2024, approximately 356,000 individuals found themselves unemployed, resulting in an unemployment rate of around 6.1%. To visually illustrate the challenges in graduate employment, Table 1.1 below provides a detailed depiction of the scenario faced by graduates in 2024.

**Table 1.1: Graduate Employability Statistics – Malaysia (2024–2025)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Graduates (approx.)</b>	<b>Unemployed Graduates</b>	<b>Unemployment Rate</b>
2020	5.36 million	202,000	4.4%
2021	5.48 million	230,000	4.2%
2022	5.61 million	247,000	4.4%
2023	5.74 million	298,000	5.2%
2024	5.87 million	356,000	6.1%

*Sources: DOSM Labour Force Survey (2024); MOHE Employment Status Report (2024)*

As of early 2025, both DOSM and the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) have released updated statistics that reflect changes in graduate employment status post-pandemic, including impacts from economic recovery, digital transformation and policy interventions.

**Table 1.2: Graduate Employability Statistics (2023–2024)**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Value</b>
Graduates entering labor market annually	350,000
Graduate unemployment rate (under 35)	6.2% (Q4 2024)*
Graduate underemployment rate	12–15%
Time taken to find first job	Median = 6 months; varies by field
Most affected fields	Arts, humanities and social sciences
High-demand fields	STEM, digital technology, engineering, health sciences

*Source: DOSM Labour Force Survey (2024)*

This figure highlights a considerable concern within the labor market. Compounding this issue, approximately 31.2% of recent graduates are employed in semi-skilled and low-skilled positions, leading to a significant mismatch between their qualifications and their jobs. This phenomenon of skill-related underemployment underscores a critical structural issue in the labor market, as the prevalence of graduates in such mismatched roles was already pronounced before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (DOSM, 2021).

The challenge of unemployment is not isolated; it is a pervasive issue that impacts many developing countries globally. In light of this, researchers like Ahmed et al. (2021) have posited that entrepreneurship can serve as a vital strategy for mitigating this pressing problem. The importance of entrepreneurship in fostering job creation cannot be overstated, as highlighted by recent studies (Fairlie & Fossen, 2020; Acs et al., 2023; Naudé & Minniti, 2023; Raffiee et al., 2024; Lebdioui, 2024; Ismail et al., 2024). With this foundational understanding, the subsequent section will

consider the research gaps that have emerged, ultimately leading to the formulation of the problem statement for the present study.

Despite numerous government initiatives such as the MyDigital Framework and substantial investment in the digital economy, Malaysia continues to face a persistent paradox: graduate unemployment is rising and key innovation metrics like technology absorption and product innovation lag behind global and regional competitors. This paper argues that this policy-performance gap stems from a critical oversight: a focus on macro-level ecosystem factors at the expense of understanding the micro-level psychological drivers of entrepreneurship. Policies designed to build an ecosystem are ineffective if they fail to ignite the entrepreneurial intention of individuals within it. The core problem, therefore, is not a lack of policy, but a lack of empirically validated insight into the specific cognitive antecedents—such as perceived knowledge, personal attitude and digital self-efficacy—that transform a graduate into a digital founder.

While the title of this study refers to "Ecosystem Factors," it is crucial to clarify their role within this research. These factors are not treated as direct independent variables within the quantitative model but rather as the essential context that shapes the core psychological constructs of the study. For instance, an 'ecosystem factor' like the availability of university-led digital labs, government training programs (e.g., MyDigital), or mentorship networks does not directly create entrepreneurial intention. Instead, its primary function is to build an individual's perceived knowledge and bolster their digital self-efficacy—the core variables this model measures.

Therefore, this study's contribution is not to measure the ecosystem itself, but to reveal the cognitive mechanism through which ecosystem interventions are translated into individual entrepreneurial intent. It answers the critical question: *How do*

*ecosystem initiatives actually work at the human level?* By understanding this psychological pathway, the effectiveness of any ecosystem-level policy or program can be accurately predicted and enhanced.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

In the National Entrepreneurship Policy 2030 Report, Malaysia's entrepreneurship landscape is portrayed as dynamic and continuously evolving, a change substantiated by the country's impressive standings on various international indices that evaluate entrepreneurship. These include the Global Entrepreneurship Index (GEI), Global Competitiveness Report (GCR), Global Innovation Index (GII) and the Doing Business report. Malaysia has emerged as the second developing nation, following China, to secure a place within the top 50, outpacing several developed countries such as Greece and Poland.

However, a closer examination of Malaysia's performance within specific sub-indices reveals significant challenges in its entrepreneurship ecosystem. Notably, there are concerning gaps in areas such as knowledge creation, the competency of the workforce, product innovation and the absorption of technology.

For instance, Malaysia's overall GEI rank slightly declined from 58 (2018) to 61 (2024). Improvement in key sub-indicators like technology absorption and product innovation has been modest, though still below global averages.

**Table 1.3: Malaysia's Entrepreneurship & Innovation Performance (As of 2023–2024) Based on Global Entrepreneurship Index (GEI) – 2024 Report**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Malaysia Score (2024)</b>	<b>Global Average</b>
Overall GEI Rank	61 out of 137	N/A
Technology Absorption	18%	30%
Product Innovation	21%	35%
High Growth Expectations	23%	40%

*Source: GEDI Institute (2024), Global Entrepreneurship Index 2024*

The challenge is compounded by a significant theoretical gap in the existing literature. While the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) is widely cited, its traditional constructs—particularly subjective norm and perceived behavioural control—are proving to be weak and often non-significant predictors for educated, self-directed populations in a digital context. Generic models fail to capture the nuanced realities of digital entrepreneurship, where domain-specific digital self-efficacy is far more critical than general perceived control and personal attitude outweighs social pressure. Consequently, there is an urgent need for a more robust, integrated theoretical framework that synthesises relevant theories to accurately model the path from knowledge to intention in the digital era. Without such a model, educational interventions and policy incentives will continue to miss their mark, perpetuating the very innovation lag and graduate unemployment they are designed to solve.

### **1.3 Global Innovation Index (GII) – 2023 & 2024**

The GII, published annually by WIPO, measures innovation performance using indicators related to infrastructure, knowledge creation, diffusion and impact.