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Abstract
This study investigates how personal factors can influence entrepreneurship's interest in terms of cognitive variables with indicators of skills and knowledge, affective variables with indicators of attitude and value, and conative variables with indicators of behavior and experience. This study uses a quantitative strategy through a sample of 338 informants. The root of the problem is reviewed from the literature review and strengthened by data collection from the online interview process. Based on these results, personal factors through related variables and indicators can be used as a research agenda to answer corporate contributions problems that offer answers related to reasons for entrepreneurship. The implication is aimed as a strategy to foster student interest in entrepreneurship by showing a close relationship that is mutually supportive and relevant from contributing to each variable related to personal factors. This study also provides a scientific contribution in the form of knowledge about an entrepreneurial interest created from personal factors.
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INTRODUCTION

As a young generation, it is closely related to understanding, which has potential even though they are categorized as students. Several previous studies have found that behaviors, knowledge, and attitudes about entrepreneurship will tend towards students'
entrepreneurial desires or desires which are the forerunners of future entrepreneurs (Gorman et al., 1997; Kourilsky & Walstad, 1998; Watchravesringkan et al., 2013).

Indonesia is a developing country and has a lot of unemployment. In the last year, unemployment has increased by 60 thousand people with the Open Unemployment Rate (TPT) in Indonesia to 4.99% (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020). At the same time, Audretsch (2012) stated that at least 2% of the population are entrepreneurs to become a developed country.

The data mentioned by the Asosiasi Pengusaha Indonesia (2018) states that the number of entrepreneurs in Indonesia reaches 3.1% of the total productive age and is minimal when compared to developed countries which get 14%, meaning that there is still a gap between them even though the entrepreneurial ratio in Indonesia has exceeded international standards, which is 2% (Pusat Data dan Informasi Kementerian Perindustrian RI, 2019).

Indonesia needs to boost this ratio further when juxtaposed with a population of around 260 million (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2018). Of this population, the achievement of 8.06% of the number of entrepreneurs will positively impact the Indonesian economy. In 2030-2040, it is predicted that Indonesia will experience a demographic bonus period. During this period, the productive age population is estimated to reach 64% of the total population projected at 265 million people. It is known that the entire millennial generation aged 20-35 years gets 24%, equivalent to 63.4 million of the 179.1 million people who are of productive age (14-64 years) (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2019).

A country’s success in managing the productive age group depends on the country's ability to prepare its generation to take advantage of the window of opportunity and lift the Indonesian economy from the demographic bonus. Nevertheless, the high percentage of unemployment in Indonesia is a challenge for the country to maximize the demographic compensation in the vulnerable 2030-2040. The unemployment rate is still relatively high and is dominated by student age.

Part of the reason is a boost from personal factors because the work is out of sync with their skills. This boils down to the lessons received at school, not by the needs of the job market. The educated unemployment rate at SMK is relatively high, namely 8.49%, then SMA 6.77%, diploma 6.76%, university 5.73%. This figure is, in fact, inversely proportional to the unemployment rate of elementary school graduates, namely 2.64% and junior high school, with 5.02% (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020).

In the student movement, the IPM (Ikatan Pelajar Muhammadiyah) is one of Indonesia’s largest student-based organizations. With a hierarchical structure from the branch leadership level, regional leadership branch leaders, regional leaders, and central leaders have a newly registered membership of 26,026 and touching 39.2% of the total (IPM, 2020). Armed with an age of 59, the Muhammadiyah Student Association has contributed a lot to Indonesia’s students.

Even after achieving such a long life, the HDI movement has not touched much of the entrepreneurial realm (IPM, 2018a). In comparison, the entrepreneurial activity will provide opportunities from environmental factors to answer challenges and contribute to the economy to create jobs and increase individual utility (Bosma et al., 2012). Cultivating entrepreneurship from scratch in students will prepare them for the future to meet economic challenges (Bowo, 2013).
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However, after the XIX Congress in Jakarta, entrepreneurship is in the structure down to the branches. The development of creativity and entrepreneurship is added to be a stimulant and facilitate students' creative power so that students have a favorable condition to be independent. This action agenda is an effort made to answer the challenges of the times in the era of 4.0 and maintain the spirit of self-reliance and students in general by raising awareness and building inclusive entrepreneurial activities through the studentpreneur movement (IPM, 2018b).

METHODS

The sample of this research is students who are members of the Bengkulu Student Association, consisting of Branch Leaders or Pimpinan Ranting (PR), which includes 15 schools, Regional Leaders or Pimpinan Daerah (PD) with ten regions (Bengkulu City, Bengkulu Tengah, Kepahiang, Curup, Lebong, Bengkulu Utara, Seluma, South Bengkulu and Kaur), and Province Leaders or Pimpinan Wilayah (PW) at the same level as student representatives throughout Bengkulu province in a hierarchical structure with a total of 338 informants.

| Table 1 Informant Data |
|-------------------------|
| Geographical Characteristics |
| n = 338 (100%) |

| PW | PD | PR |
|----|----|----|
| n = 13 (3.8%) | n = 130 (38.5%) | n = 195 (57.7%) |

PW BENGKULU
(n = 13) (3.8%)

PD BENGKULU
(n = 13) (3.85%)

• PR SMA Muhammadiyah 1
  (n = 13) (3.84%)
• PR SMA Muhammadiyah 2
  (n = 13) (3.84%)
• PR SMA Muhammadiyah 4
  (n = 13) (3.84%)
• PR MTS Muhammadiyah
  (n = 13) (3.84%)
• PR SMK Muhammadiyah
  (n = 13) (3.84%)
• PR MA Muhammadiyah
  (n = 13) (3.84%)
• PR MA Almubarok
  (n = 13) (3.84%)

PD KEPAHIANG
(n = 13) (3.85%)

PD REJANG LEBONG
(n = 13) (3.85%)

PD LEBONG
(n = 13) (3.85%)

PD BENGKULU TENGAH
(n = 13) (3.85%)

PD BENGKULU TENGAH
(n = 13) (3.85%)
Informant data based on geographic identity were taken from PW with 13 informants of 3.8%, PD as many as 130 informants with 38.5%, and PR of 195 informants with 57.7% of the student distribution data Bengkulu Province. Data analysis was conducted to review the level of relevance obtained through observation and interviews to examine what factors are related and how each of these factors will affect informants who have geographic locations.

Sampling is based on judgment or purposive sampling through an online interview process selected through researchers’ specific criteria to strengthen research results with an exploratory approach (Suri, 2011), namely 13 people are elected as a representative of each leader. For that, the data is then managed using the Nvivo plus 12 application. Through Word Similarity analysis, a conclusion is drawn. Nvivo is used to analyze quantitative data to produce more professional results (Hilal & Alabri, 2013).

However, before the data was strengthened by using an online interview system and then analyzed through NVIVO 12, a literature study was conducted to obtain a theoretical basis to support solving the problem under study. The theory accepted is the first step so that researchers can better understand the issues being studied by the scientific framework. The following is the literature review that was carried out in the development process in table 2.

### Table 2

| Variable            | Findings                                                                 | Authors                                           |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Cognitive           | The personal capacity development strategy is represented by cognitive factors through human resource management. The initial study of entrepreneurship focused on the entrepreneur’s characteristics (personality of an entrepreneur) or the entrepreneur’s specific personality. | (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011) (Manolova et al., 2012) |
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| Variable      | Findings                                                                 | Authors                        |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Variable      |                                                                            |                                |
| Affective     | Can review the orientation in seeing business opportunities.               | (Ahmad et al., 2014)           |
|               |                                                                            | (Mitchell et al., 2014)        |
|               | It perceives risks that can also affect entrepreneurial interest.           | (Baron & Tang, 2011)           |
|               | Management of emotional arousal identified for entrepreneurs with the ability to control feelings. | (Davis et al., 2017)           |
|               | Including attitudes that are highly dependent on personal conditions, affective abilities are part of the entrepreneurial ability approach. |                                |
|               | An entrepreneurial attitude is a tendency to be effective in dealing with risks that will arise in a business. | (Stroe et al., 2018)           |
|               | Creating the will to compete for growth and achievement based on the way the business is carried out. | (Chirico & Salvato, 2016)      |
|               | Prepares the entrepreneur in the coping capacity to face a hostile environment and overcome obstacles. | (Lauto et al., 2020)           |
|               | The formation of individuals who will foster entrepreneurial interest through behavior can be achieved by how effective it is in achieving goals. | (Murnieks et al., 2020)        |
| Conative      | An understanding of strategic reflection connected to collaborative processes. | (Ratten & Jones, 2018)         |
|               | Adopting personality and intelligence constructs which are then applied to entrepreneurship education in fostering entrepreneurial interest. | (Tempelaar et al., 2011)      |
|               | The conative mode of mental functioning has been distinguished historically but is still considered an interactive element of human intelligence and personality. | (McMullen & Kier, 2016)        |
|               | The ability to complete activities in situations that require concentration and control of one's emotions. | (Akrout & Diallo, 2017)        |

Source: Data process (2020)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

Interest is a thing or activity without any instructions that create a feeling of liking and a sense of belonging to the acceptance of a relationship that is inside and outside oneself (Djamarah, 2011). In entrepreneurial interest, the closer and more critical the relationships created, the greater the entrepreneurial interest that is felt (Wang, 2004; Almeida et al., 2014). Willingness and ability for a given task during the time interval
applied are different, both in terms of age and for each individual can be completed and shows that interests can vary (Cooke, 2016).

The study of students’ entrepreneurial interests is still wide open to be elaborated in various contexts. Furthermore, this study also looks at the influence of the variable review on personal factors that foster entrepreneurial interest, namely cognitive variables, affective variables, and conative variables in informants consisting of province leaders or Pimpinan Wilayah (PW), regional leaders, or Pimpinan Daerah (PD) and branch leaders Pimpinan Ranting (PR).

Based on tables 3 and 4 with a total review of the percentage of 100%, which is the result of the Nvivo 12 analysis. Table 3 explains that the most significant factor affecting students’ interest in entrepreneurship at PW is cognitive factors with 48%. Then the affective factor affects 32%, then the conative factor is only 20%. The same thing is shown by PD for each of the highest and lowest elements even though the number of percentages is different, with cognitive factors reaching 44%, affective factors by 39%, and conative factors only touching 16%. Whereas PR has different results from PW and PD at the level of analysis, it gets a significance of 46% on affective factors, followed by cognitive factors by 38% and conative elements by 15% on each variable.

![Figure 1]

The role of implementing variables
Source: Data processed

Then, it can be seen in table 4, which explains in detail personal factors, among cognitive variables consisting of indicators of skills and knowledge, affective variables, namely value and attitude, and conative variables are behavior and experience.

PW obtained significant indicators of skill (30%) and knowledge (22%), then followed by attitude (18%). Still, the value indicator (9%) on the affective variable was not higher than the behavior indicator (14%), a conative variable. There is not much different if you look at the results of PD, which at the level of significance of the indicators have the same average as cognitive variables, namely skills (24%), knowledge (22%),
attitude (21%), behavior (21%), value (12%) although there are differences through the acquisition of numbers in the results of the analysis.

While the PR shows different results according to table 3 regarding the affective variables that get the most significant results with the influence in growing students' interest in entrepreneurship. Where attitude (22%) is the highest indicator among others, then knowledge (20%), value (19%), skills (17%), and behavior (14%). However, the experience indicator obtained the lowest consistent results among other indicators on cognitive variables, affective variables, and conative variables, namely 4%, 3%, and 4%, respectively, for each hand.
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**Figure 2**

**The role of implementing indicators**

Source: Data processed

In word coding, the analysis of similarity on figures 3 and 4 with a total review of the percentage of 100% which is the result of the Nvivo 12 analysis which is carried out to obtain the similarity of relevant and mutually supportive analytical relationships related to cluster analysis to produce a diagram that classifies the linkages between the variables and indicators obtained.

Figure 3 illustrates the relationship between informants drawn from PW, PD, and PR by looking at trends at the analysis level through variables and indicators. PW's role is more dominant than PD and PR, with variable linkages reaching 35.2% because it is supported by all variables. In PD, the percentage shows the number 33.1% with cognitive and affective variables while the PR of 31.7% is only on affective variables.
Measurement of entrepreneurial attitudes on affective variables can be more stable because, according to Bolton & Lane (2012), it is carried out using indicators of interest in business opportunities, can think creatively and innovatively, has a positive view of business failure, has leadership and responsibility, and likes to face risks and challenges. Also, the conative variables get lower results because, at the level of the leadership structure, PW’s dominance is influenced by the relationship between knowledge and entrepreneurship as a source of entrepreneurial opportunities, as in the research findings by Sotarauta & Pulkkinen (2011).

In other results shown in Figure 4, which sharpens the research between variables and indicators, suggests that the application of the three variables shows that the cognitive variable has the most significant relationship affecting each of the other variables such as affective and conative variables with informants from PW, PD, and PR at a percentage of 39.1%.

On the other hand, the affective variable has a relationship to each indicator with 33.5%. Then the percentage of the relationship between the conative variables reaches
27.4% with all variables and hands such as skills and knowledge (cognitive variables), value and attitude (affective variables), behavior and experience (conative variables) also support and have a relationship between the level of personal factor analysis, in fostering student interest in entrepreneurship.

**Figure 4**  
The mutually supporting relationship between variables and indicators  
Source: Data processed

**Discussion**

Interest in entrepreneurship with psychological symptoms is to focus the center of attention and create something for entrepreneurs with feelings of happiness because it can benefit themselves (Usman & Hadi, 2020). This concentration of attention is caused by a sense of liking and is accompanied by the desire to see, prove, and learn to the next stage in entrepreneurship (Handaru et al., 2015). Being an entrepreneur will have the freedom to determine one's destiny and have the opportunity to play a role in society. By having their own business, a person can decide on their future and not depend on it (Hadyastiti et al., 2020).

This study also supports previous findings, which indicate that personal factors also play a role in starting an entrepreneur, as in Alfaruk (2013) research, because personality aspects of personality are based on objects and motives that cause these personalities to act. Information about entrepreneurship counts directly through psychological activity on subjects who live the values of an item (Kassean et al., 2015).

This participation context will provide experience and, finally, a desire to deepen what has been obtained with a structure that forms interest (Karhunen & Svetlana, 2010). In general, skills and knowledge on findings will produce a cognitive component that
contains understanding and belief in an object (Armstrong & Hird, 2009; Sánchez et al., 2011). Furthermore, in this case, the individual personality understands and believes about entrepreneurial attitudes through information from the sources of knowledge and perceptions obtained (Bhatti & Kumar, 2012).

The affective component will provide an overview of attitudes and values towards individual behavior that is comprehensive and shows directly. Then, the same thing from Fodor & Pintea (2017) research also received an emotional response about interest in whether to accept positively or negatively. Similar findings will also be found in the conative component, which will show individual behavior or attitudes towards an object (Kovač et al., 2010).

The significant results of the cognitive variables in this finding support Ahmad et al. (2014), which states that the heart of entrepreneurship is the cognitive role of orientation in seeing opportunities. Opportunity is perceived by individuals so that it is included in the realm of cognitive studies as an ability (Grégoire et al., 2011). Therefore, understanding the mental infrastructure that underlies entrepreneurial activity, in this case, is an opportunity as a richer perspective on how to nurture and foster entrepreneurial interest (Kautonen et al., 2011).

In another study, it is explained that empirically believes that the role of creating value is from the affective nature of entrepreneurial behavior (Foo et al., 2015). Affective traits are defined as individual differences that are stable in the long-term tendency to experience positive effects, for example, excited and enthusiastic or pessimistic, depressed and irritable (Shirokova et al., 2016). Meanwhile, Murnieks et al. (2020) supports this research by mentioning the formation of individuals who will foster entrepreneurial interest through behavior that can be achieved with influential variables in the influence of achieving goals.

Whereas McMullen & Kier (2016) argue, the cognitive model of mental function has been distinguished historically but is still considered an interactive element in human intelligence and personality. Personality refers to all the factors that determine a person as a human individual based on experience (Breugst et al., 2012). The conative component focuses on the area of strategy and the domain of behavior and knowledge, according to research by Lee et al. (2012).

Some of the things that cause conative variables to get the lowest findings are because each individual requires the ability to carry out activities that are difficult, complex, abstract, demanding, goal-oriented, socially and genuinely prestigious, and the ability to complete activities in situations that require concentration and control one's emotions (Akrout & Diallo, 2017). About quality, identifying specifically for holistic, integrative, and synergistic experiences, and an action-oriented view of entrepreneurial learning (Annemarie Østergaard, Susana C. Santos, 2018) (Østergaard et al., 2018).

Someone to start becoming an entrepreneur is formed because of personal factors related to aspects of one's personality (Lee et al., 2011). Therefore, interest can be used as a primary, sensible approach to understanding who will intend to become entrepreneurs (Choo & Wong, 2006; Clough et al., 2019). These studies are significant predictors of interest in entrepreneurship.
CONCLUSION

This study tries to analyze personal factors as an effort to bridge students' interest in entrepreneurship. Instrument development is reviewed through determinant variables and indicators that provide scientific and practical contributions to the literature. Various studies are used to determine student trends in starting entrepreneurship, including cognitive variables, affective variables, and conative variables with indicators of skills and knowledge, attitude and value, and behavior and experience. This study’s findings suggest that there are programs from organizations that can enhance and support variables and indicators that will impact the growth of student entrepreneurial interest as a plan, both in academics as a reference and best practices as entrepreneurs. Then, we can develop several further variable findings to strengthen interest in entrepreneurship.

Based on the analysis results, cognitive variables have a very significant effect compared to the other two variables with skill and knowledge as supporting variables, followed by affective variables with attitude and value and conative variables with behavior and experience. Although in PR, the affective variable is more dominant at the level of analysis. The conative variable gets a note that can be improved for the future because its significance is low compared to other variables. However, each variable and indicator got interrelated results to support and foster the entrepreneurial interest for students. This study's implication is intended as a strategy to promote students' interest in entrepreneurship by showing that there is a close relationship that is mutually supportive and relevant from the contribution of each variable related to personal factors. This study's limitations are focused on the interests of students who want to be entrepreneurial from an early age so that they are more mature in preparing the entrepreneurial agenda and future research and references. For further investigation, it is advisable to explore students' interests who want to be entrepreneurial in-depth in personal factors, sociological factors, and environmental factors. The hope is that it can increase the long-term probability of starting the company and entrepreneurial income (Elert et al., 2015).
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