

Exploring the determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions: Evidence from India

Preeti kumari

**Research Scholar, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology,
Murthal, Sonapat, 131039**

Dr Satpal

**Associate Professor, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology,
Murthal, Sonapat, 131039**

Abstract

Social Entrepreneurship is a practice and a field of scholarly investigation these days. Academics and non-profit organizations have grown increasingly interested in social entrepreneurship over the years. Many different practitioners have held discussions on these subjects from different angles. This paper shed a light on the background and the present composition of discussions on these topics. The aim of the present study is to explore the determinants of social entrepreneurship intentions. To attain this objective, we have collected the data from students of MBA final year who have intent to become a social entrepreneur. In addition, this article is based on responses of 355 students. We used MS Excel and SPSS V.24 to analyze the data. Our results provided that empathy have significant predictor of social entrepreneurial intentions. In addition, our findings documented that social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, perceived social support, moral obligation are significant predictors of social entrepreneurial intent (SEI). Some of the findings are consistent with previous research. Therefore, our findings provide useful insight to multiple stakeholders.

Keywords: Determinants, Social Entrepreneurship, India, Stakeholders.

1. Introduction

The elements of social entrepreneurial intents are the focus of this study. Policymakers and educationalists who are willing to encourage more individuals to engage in social entrepreneurship must first understand the antecedents of their goals (S-ENT). S-ENT is a term that has been used to define a variety of phenomena in the literature (Dees, 2012; Defourny and Nyssens, 2010; Mort et al., 2003), including the encounter of societal improvement opportunities, income generation for social purposes, the establishment and administration of social initiatives, and the democratic domination of such organizations. The documentation of chances to achieve social impact through the production of market and non-market disequilibria is defined in this article as social entrepreneurial behavior (Hockerts, 2007, 2010). The most common way for such procedures to take place is through

the establishment of a social enterprise. When we copy any product or service that has already been supplied in the market, this is referred to as a managerial or business activity.

When a creative element is incorporated, it becomes entrepreneurship, which then evolves into social entrepreneurship (SE) when social value is added to the work. SE is distinguished from commercial entrepreneurship by this key feature of social value generation (Austin & Stevenson, 2010). SE can take many forms, including entrepreneurs' commitment to making a difference, benefactors' support for "investment" portfolios, and social purpose businesses' commitment to adding profit motivation to the nonprofit sector. Social entrepreneurship refers to the identification of social problems and the promotion of social change through the use of entrepreneurial concepts, methods, and practises.

It all raises the need of conducting research which focuses on the description of a social problem and then the understanding of the development, launch, and management of a social initiative for achieving the desired change. The reform might or might not totally eradicate a societal problem. It can take a lifetime to perfect the current circumstance. Therefore, rest of the study is organized as follows Section 2 deals with review of literature. Section 3 provides research methodology and data collection. In Section 4 deals with the analysis of the data and the interpretation of results. Section 5 concludes the findings.

2. Literature Review

Theoretical assertions about the antecedents of social entrepreneurial intents were initially advanced by Mair and Noboa (2006). Entrepreneurial intention theory (Krueger, 1993; Krueger, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000) and, in particular, the theory of planned behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991) are used in their model. See Carsrud and Brännback (2009), Krueger (2009), and Fayolle and Linan (2009) for a more extensive discussion of the entrepreneurial intentions literature (2014). When looking at the literature on social entrepreneurship intent (SEI), two main study threads appear. The first is based on social psychology, with the goal of better understanding behaviours in general and the mental process that leads from attitudes and beliefs to effective action. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Bandura (1980) are two key contributions from the discipline that are particularly pertinent to the study of SEI (1997).

Ajzen's (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) is a further development that has developed one of the utmost extensively utilized theories of social psychology in general (Ajzen 2012). The second strand (Shapiro 1984; Shapiro and Sokol 1982; Bird 1988) is specific to the subject of entrepreneurship. The most pressing issue for scholars in this topic is the distinction between social entrepreneurship and its relationship to social innovation. The difference between these two interconnected concepts, according to Phillips (2015), is that social innovation is concerned with actors which move resources in order to bring about some sort of social transformation or societal restoration, whereas social entrepreneurship is concerned with ideas in which actors regulate market demand in order to provide economic firmness to the social problem's endeavors (Tracey et al. 2011).

Social innovation is not only a social action; it also denotes to a collection of inventive events and roles aimed at meeting a need that is primarily distributed through a company whose primary objective is social improvement (Mulgan, 2006). Social entrepreneurship, on the other hand, is a type of entrepreneurship (Defourny & Nyssens 2010). These parallels arise

from the fact that the assertion of social entrepreneurship appears to be linked to the emergence of an entrepreneurial phenomena that mimics a goal to renovate the balance amid the economy and social development (Prabhu 1999). Researchers have noted that social innovation is a broad notion that cannot be implemented in isolation; thus, it is not incorrect to claim that social enterprise and social entrepreneurs operate inside a social innovation system (Phillips, 2015). Chepurenska, A. (2015), explored that if the students from supportive entrepreneurship educations are supposed to report a high level of intensity related to entrepreneurial intention. Findings suggest that students from supportive EE are likely to become more entrepreneurship oriented in comparison to others. The results are limited up to the students of Ukraine only.

Singh, N., & Inbanathan, A. (2018), identified the business model for sustainable development in the country. In the sustainable development in the country, social entrepreneurship strategies and innovative solutions help improve the social problem. In all over the world, the social entrepreneurial concept is trending that help in generating great solution and innovation ideas related to social problem and issues. The innovation of social entrepreneurship aids to attain social value creation in the country that resolves the problem of maintaining sustainability in social and economic development. In this article, the researcher faces the various problem and make so many efforts, money and time in gathering information about different models for sustainable development that is used in India which is biggest research gap of this study.

3. Research Methodology

This article's goal is to investigate the factors that influence social entrepreneurial goals. We gathered data from MBA final-year students who intended to start social businesses. For data collection, we designed a structured questionnaire with statements on determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. Primarily, 600 questionnaires were distributed among the students through online and offline mode. 370 out of 600 questionnaires were returned by survey participants. 355 of the 370 questionnaires were then discovered to be completely adequate and suitable for further investigation. As a result, the 355 student responses used to create this article. The data was examined using MS Excel and SPSS V.24. As Annexure A, the questionnaire is provided.

4. Data analysis and discussion

4.1 Demographic profile of the respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Our findings show that 93.52% of respondents were males followed by 6.48% of respondents were females. Further, our results provide that 50.70% of respondents belong to 31-60 age group followed by 34.37% of respondents were less than 30 years and rest of 14.93% of respondents belong to more than 60 years age group. Moreover, our findings show that 51.27% of respondents were graduates followed by 45.92%, 2.25% and 0.56% of respondents were post-graduates, below 12th, and others degree holders, respectively. Next, our findings provide that 53.24% of respondents belong to Rs. 30,001-1,00,000 income group while 30.99% of respondents

belong to less than Rs. 30,000. In addition, 12.68% and 3.10% of respondents belong to Rs. 1,00,001-1,50,000 and above Rs. 1,50,000 income group.

4.2 Correlations between variables

Table 2 displays the relationships between the variables. According to our findings, there is a strong and positive relationship between empathy and moral responsibility ($r=0.522$, $p0.001$), social entrepreneurial self-efficacy ($r=0.441$, $p0.001$), perceived social support ($r=0.575$, $p0.001$), and social entrepreneurial purpose ($r=0.621$, $p0.001$). Our results also show a strong and positive relationship between moral obligation and social entrepreneurial self-efficacy ($r=0.331$, $p0.01$), perceived social support ($r=0.509$, $p0.001$), and social entrepreneurial purpose ($r=0.578$, $p0.001$). Additionally, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy is positively correlated with both social entrepreneurial intent and perceived social support ($r=0.559$, $p0.001$). Next, there is a strong correlation between social entrepreneurial desire and perceived social support ($r=0.590$, $p0.001$).

Table 1: Demographics of respondents

Variables	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	332	93.52
	Female	23	6.48
Age (years)	<30	122	34.37
	31-60	180	50.70
	>60	53	14.93
Educational qualification	<12 th	8	2.25
	Graduation	182	51.27
	Post-Graduation	163	45.92
	Others	2	0.56
Monthly income (in Rs.)	Less than 30,000	110	30.99
	30,001-1,00,000	189	53.24
	1,00,001-1,50,000	45	12.68
	Above 1,50,000	11	3.10

Notes: N=355.

Source: The survey.

4.3 Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

The results of the regression model are shown in Table 3. Our discovery of a positive and significant constant coefficient ($=1.281$, $p 0.05$) suggested that the dependent variable's value would be positive even in the absence of additional independent factors. Furthermore, a one unit rise in empathy (EMP) results in a 0.521 unit increase in social entrepreneurial intent, according to the positive and significant coefficient of empathy (EMP) ($=0.521$, $p0.01$) (SEI). The coefficient of moral obligation (MO) is thus significant and positive ($=0.471$, $p0.001$), indicating that one unit increase in MO causes 0.471 unit rise in social entrepreneurial intent (SEI). Additionally, a one unit rise in social entrepreneurial self-efficacy (SESE) results in a 0.512 unit increase in social entrepreneurial intent, according to the positive and significant

coefficient of social entrepreneurial self-efficacy (SESE) ($=0.512$, $p0.05$) (SEI). Additionally, a one unit increase in perceived social support (PSS) causes a 0.413 unit rise in social entrepreneurial intent, according to the positive and significant coefficient of perceived social support (PSS) ($=0.413$, $p0.001$) (SEI). Additionally, our findings showed that empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy in social entrepreneurship, and perceived social support are important barriers to social entrepreneurship intention.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics and correlations matrix

Variables	Cronbach's alpha	Mean	SD	EMP	MO	SESE	PSS	SEI
Empathy (EMP)	0.819	3.222	0.887	1				
Moral Obligation (MO)	0.921	3.771	1.054	0.522***	1			
Social Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (SESE)	0.891	3.884	1.020	0.441***	0.331**	1		
Perceived Social Support (PSS)	0.922	3.918	1.102	0.575***	0.509***	0.441***	1	
Social Entrepreneurial Intent (SEI)	0.901	4.124	0.813	0.621***	0.578***	0.559***	0.590***	1

Notes: *, **, *** correlation is significant at 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001, respectively.

Table 3: Results of regression model

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard error	t-value	Standardized coefficients
Constant	1.281	0.298	4.299*	-
Empathy (EMP)	0.521	0.071	7.338**	0.511
Moral Obligation (MO)	0.471	0.034	13.853***	0.344
Social Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (SESE)	0.512	0.141	3.631*	0.491
Perceived Social Support (PSS)	0.413	0.039	10.590***	0.319

Notes: Dependent variable = Social Entrepreneurial Intent (SEI). $R^2=61.17$. *, ** and *** coefficient is significant at 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001, respectively.

Source:

The

authors

5. CONCLUSION

Our study has successfully looked at the paradigm of four antecedents that predict their impact on social entrepreneurial intention (Mair & Noboa, 2006). In order to evaluate their model, we first added experience as a variable. Our findings showed that social entrepreneurship ambitions are significantly predicted by empathy. Additionally, our data showed that social entrepreneurial intent is significantly predicted by moral obligation, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and perceived social support (SEI). Some of the results are in line with earlier studies. Forster and Grichnik (2013) discovered that self-efficacy and perceived collective efficacy predict corporate volunteering intentions, therefore "the findings on social entrepreneurial self-efficacy and perceived social support" are in line with their findings. As a result, our studies offer insightful information to several parties.

References

- Chepurenko, A. (2015). Entrepreneurship Theory: New challenges and prospects. *Форсайт*, 9(2 (eng)).
- Dees, J.G. (2012). A tale of two cultures: Charity, problem solving, and the future of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 321–334.
- Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32–53.
- Fayolle, A. & Liñan, F. (2014). The future of research on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 663–666.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 382–388.
- Forster, F. & Grichnik, D. (2013). Why social entrepreneurs act—The intention formation of corporate volunteers. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4(2), 153–181.
- Hockerts, K. (2007). Social entrepreneurship. In W. Visser, D. Matten, M. Pohl, & N. Tolhurst (Eds.), *The A-Z of corporate social responsibility* (p. 422). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hockerts, K. (2010). Social entrepreneurship between market and mission. *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), 177–198.
- Hockerts, K. (2015a). How hybrid organizations turn antagonistic assets into complementarities. *California Management Review*, 57(3), 83–106.
- Hockerts, K. (2015b). Antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions: A validation study. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 11(3).
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44.

Mort, G.S., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 76–88.

Singh, N., & Inbanathan, A. (2018) *Social Entrepreneurship: A Business Model for Sustainable Development*. Institute for Social and Economic Change. <http://www.isec.ac.in/>

Tracey, P. & Jarvis, O. (2007). Toward a theory of social venture franchising. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(5), 667–685.

Annexure A: Questionnaire

Section A

Demographic profile of the respondent (kindly tick)

1. Age (years):

- < 30
- 31-60
- > 60

2. Educational qualification:

- Up to 12th
- Graduation
- Post-Graduation
- Professional (CS, CA, ICWA etc.)
- Others

3. Occupation:

- Student
- Service holder
- Business
- Others

4. Monthly income (in Rs.)

- Less than 30,000
- 30,001-1,00,000
- 1,00,001-1,50,000
- Above 1,50,000

Section B

This section of questionnaire has been developed to measure determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions; please specify (√) your opinion on each of them:

Strongly disagree (SD) = 1; Disagree (D) = 2; Neutral (N) = 3; Agree (A) = 4; Strongly Agree (SA) = 5

Code	Items	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Empathy					
EMP1	When thinking about socially disadvantaged					

	people, I try to put myself in their shoes.					
EMP2	Seeing socially disadvantaged people triggers an emotional response in me.					
EMP3	I feel compassion for socially marginalized people.					
	Moral Obligation					
MO1	It is an ethical responsibility to help people less fortunate than ourselves.					
MO2	We are morally obliged to help socially disadvantaged people.					
MO3	Social justice requires that we help those who are less fortunate than ourselves.					
	It is one of the principles of our society that we should help socially disadvantaged people.					
	Social Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy					
SESE1	I am convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it.					
SESE2	I could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces.					
SESE3	Solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to					
	Perceived Social Support					
PSS1	People would support me if I wanted to start an organization to help socially marginalized people.					
PSS2	If I planned to address a significant societal problem people would back me up.					
PSS3	It is possible to attract investors for an organization that wants to solve social problems.					

Section C

This section of questionnaire has been developed to measure social entrepreneurial intent; please specify (√) your opinion on each of them:

Strongly disagree (SD) = 1; Disagree (D) = 2; Neutral (N) = 3; Agree (A) = 4; Strongly Agree (SA) = 5

Code	Items	SD	D	N	A	SA
SEI1	I expect that at some point in the future I will be involved in launching an organization that aims to solve social problems.					
SEI2	I have a preliminary idea for a social enterprise on which I plan to act in the future.					
SEI3	I have plan to start a social enterprise.					