

A Review on Research Perspectives on Social Entrepreneurial Intention Formation[#]

Savitha M.^{1*} and Savitha G. Lakkol²

¹Research Scholar, JSS Centre for Management Studies, Sri Jayachamrajendra College of Engineering, Mysuru – 570006, Karnataka, India

²Associate Professor, JSS Centre for Management Studies, JSS Science and Technology University, Mysuru – 570006, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Social Entrepreneurship (SE) has gained booming interest among both researchers as well as practitioners. Researchers have defined SE in various forms of businesses. This study briefly reviewed various studies defining Social Entrepreneurship by several authors that helped to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the terms, 'social enterprise' or 'social venture', 'social entrepreneur' and 'social entrepreneurship'. Through the initial review the paper attempts to define the social enterprise/entrepreneur/entrepreneurship. All the three concepts emphasise that social enterprise neither entirely belongs to 'for-profit' nor 'not-for-profit' enterprises. Hence, social enterprises can be positioned along a continuum between enterprises pursuing purely social goals and strictly backed by economic goals. The next section of the study reviews different kinds of antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions found in the literary studies. The study revolves around the most common factors influencing the social entrepreneurial intentions by reviewing the relevance of selected studies considering the unit of analysis. The social entrepreneurial intention is found to be influenced by empathy, moral judgment, self-efficacy, social support, prior experience in facing and addressing the social problems. These antecedents were commonly found in those studies in which the responses were sought from the social entrepreneur as well as from students. Through the review, it is clear that there is a call to put through an extensive exploratory as well as empirical research to support the stated antecedents of social entrepreneurial intention in the existing literature.

Keywords: Continuum, Social Enterprises, Social Entrepreneur, Social Entrepreneurship, Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

JEL Classification: L31

1. Introduction

The global community is the largest society where people are being exposed to many problems like poverty, lack of food, health and sanitation, education and even many other basic needs of ordinary people. Society is being faced with several threats of natural calamities, pollutions, robbery, corruption and many more. The Social Entrepreneurs are playing a key role in providing sustainable solutions to solve these pressing issues. Though Social Entrepreneurship concept has caught

the attention of researchers and practitioners, yet the popularity is not being seen in the development of its literature nor a prescribed definition. Research studies are thriving to light upon a consensually accepted definition across the globe. It has been largely understood as another form of a not-for-profit organization.

While United Nations has set 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Social Entrepreneurship can be considered as one of the prominent responses to fulfil unmet individual and societal needs. In addition, it

*Email: savithamkumar@gmail.com

[#]This is the modified version of the paper presented in the 9th International HR Conference on "Talent Management and Leadership Challenges in the New Normal Business" organised by SDMIMD, Mysuru on 16-17 December, 2021.

helps in pursuing economic, social, and environmental goals simultaneously through enterprising ventures (Haugh, 2007).

This study is a comprehensive review of the existing literature on Social Entrepreneurship. The review is needed to track the genesis and growth of the concept from the Social Entrepreneurship research perspective. This study also focuses on the interaction between entrepreneurship concept and its influence on the Social Entrepreneurship concept from the conceptual understanding perspective. The study explores Social Entrepreneurship literature, intending to define and synthesize Social Entrepreneurship definitions as a continuum along ‘for-profit’ and ‘not-for-profit’ ventures.

The first segment of the paper presents the interaction between entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship. The next section identifies the researchers’ perspectives on Social Enterprise, Social Entrepreneur and Social Entrepreneurship from the previous research to bring about a clear distinction in these three terms. The final segment reviews various Social Entrepreneurship researches to comprehend the factors influencing Social Entrepreneurship intentions and its success. Finally, concluding remarks are presented.

2. Interaction between Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is a process of building up to something new that has value by dedicating the required time and efforts, with a presumption of the risks associated with financial, psychological and social and ultimately ensuing the monetary rewards and personal satisfaction with independence (Tran and Von Korfflesch, 2016). Schumpeter, (2013) views an “entrepreneur as individuals who tap market opportunities through technical and organizational innovation”. Hisrich, (1990) defines an entrepreneur as the one who exhibits innovative thinking while executing social and economic operations to use the resources. He identifies Social Entrepreneur’s acceptance of risks and failures.

It is all about taking risk, according to Drucker, (1979). These definitions summarise that the entrepreneurs have the qualities like innovativeness, risk-taking and the ability to coordinate resources and operations.

The Social Entrepreneurship process is not independent of entrepreneurship. Social Entrepreneurs possess characteristics same as business entrepreneurs, except for their societal concern and few other factors. Lumpkin, et. al., (2013) suggesting that entrepreneurial antecedents and outcomes differ within a social context. However, little is known about whether entrepreneurial processes differ within social contexts. In this paper, we ask to what extent the antecedents and outcomes that make social entrepreneurship unique influence entrepreneurial processes. Using an inputs-throughputs-outputs framework, we assess the relationship between four antecedents (social mission/motivation, opportunity identification, access to resources/funding, and multiple stakeholders identifies the main entrepreneurial orientation factors namely, being innovative, pro-active, competitive, aggressive, independent and risk taking. Ghalwash, et. al. (2017) made similar observation in the context of Social Entrepreneurship. In line with this idea, they identify similar entrepreneurial mind-sets, risk-taking and innovation as the key characteristics of Social Entrepreneurs. Considering these similarities in entrepreneurial qualities, the Social Entrepreneurship cannot be reputed as a mere ‘not for profit’ initiative. There is a lot to understand, the review observations presented in the following section can crystallize the understanding on Social Entrepreneurship, Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneur.

3. Researchers’ Perspectives on Social Enterprises, Social Entrepreneur and Social Entrepreneurship

The existing studies on Social Entrepreneurship have studied Social Entrepreneurship in diverse contexts to define Social Entrepreneurship. Yet, the orientation converges at a single concept that the melodic theme

underlying is to make a social benefit or provide an ultimate solution to society's problems through innovation. Drucker (1979) who brought out the concept of Social Enterprise; he also proposes, "most of private enterprise is a part of society and serves as a social operation". He recognises the need for a social sector to support the private sector and governments to satisfy social needs and provide a strong sense of citizenship and community involvement.

3.1 Social Enterprises

Dees, who is viewed as the father of Social Entrepreneurship concept, defines Social Enterprises as private organizations committed to solve social problems, serve the disadvantaged and provide socially essential products that were not adequately fulfilled by public agencies or private markets (Dees, 1998). These organizations pursue such goals that could not be measured simply by profit making or market penetration, or voter support. Whereas Haugh (2005) views a Social Enterprise as a particular purpose business, a combination of innovation-entrepreneurship-social purpose and generates revenues by trading, thereby seeking financial sustainability. Their principal objective is to provide social benefits rather than generating financial profits. The surplus actualised is again utilized for the beneficiary groups' social goals. It is interesting to note that the surplus is not distributed to the enterprise's control subjects.

Another notable definition provided by Mair and Schoen (2007) view Social Enterprise as an initiative that addresses society's needs and/or catalyses the transformation of society. They view that the primary objective of the venture is to create social value, while economic value creation serves as one of the necessities instead of a necessary condition. Urban (2015a) provided another view of Social Enterprise. He considers it as a new enterprise activity of being self-employed or an extension of an existing Social Enterprise or even an enterprise operated by a team of individuals having social goals. The profits are again invested to meet the social needs instead of being distributed to the investors. Table 1 shows the various definitions of social enterprise. An essay is made to bring out the distinctions in each definition.

Through the explanations, it may be observed that a Social Enterprise concept lacks a proper legal definition. Studies on Social Entrepreneurship are evolving, providing more excellent and in-depth understandings of the area. Though it has no specific definition, it cannot be presumed as a restriction, but this can be considered as a significant opportunity to give afterthought on bringing out a theoretical clarity on social enterprise and its legal body. One common observation is that the social enterprise is regarded as a continuum among the for-profit and not for profit firms. The definitions on social enterprise constantly emphasise on social value creation overriding the profit motto for these firms without compromising on the financial sustainability.

3.2 Social Entrepreneur

Dees (1998) has provided an extensive definition drawn from the ideas by the agents like Schumpeter, Drucker and Stevenson on Social Entrepreneurs. He defines Social Entrepreneurs as change agents who act on a mission to create a value in the society. In the process, they pursue new opportunities, innovate, adapt and learn. A Social Entrepreneur is not constrained by the resources. They achieve the desired outcome with a high sense of accountability and commitment. This definition can be considered as a comprehensive explanation, which encompasses a holistic nature of a social entrepreneur. Further, several scholars attempted to explain the phenomenon.

Social Entrepreneurs create and manage entrepreneurial organizations with an objective to create a social change and to develop their client group; they come up with new ideas from business (Prabhu, 1999; LaBarre, et al, 2001). They are not only change makers but also risk takers on behalf of the organization that they serve (Brinckerhoff, 2000). A Social Entrepreneur is a mission-driven individual using entrepreneurial behaviours to deliver a social value to the less privileged (Abu-Saifan, 2012). Table 2 shows the various definitions of social entrepreneurs as defined in the literature.

Various studies define Social Entrepreneurs as change makers in the society. They are characterised as leaders, innovators, risk takers, mission driven and

committed to solve social issues in an innovative way. The explanations provided to define social enterprise can be seen reiterated in Social Entrepreneur definition. Especially balancing between financial and social goals can be seen emphasized while explaining Social Entrepreneur.

3.3 Social Entrepreneurship

Social Entrepreneurship is an entrepreneurial activity, which can be identified within or across business sectors, non-profit or government sectors that is innovative and creating social value (Austin, et al, 2006). Once more, Mair and Marti (2006) punctuate the fact that Social Entrepreneurship employs ground-breaking ways in use and combination of resources to act on chances to catalyse social change and treat social needs. More recently, it is defined as systematic execution of effort within for-profit or not-for-profit enterprise that deals primarily with social needs and brings out convincing change through risk taking, innovation, and adaptation that may or may not include earned income strategies Auberry (2015). Table 3 shows the various definitions from past studies.

Based on various authors' definitions, the terms Social Enterprise, Social Entrepreneur and Social Entrepreneurship can be distinguished. Social enterprise could be understood as a concern, either for-profit or not-for-profit, which could also be another alternative in the form of self-employment opportunity to provide innovative solutions for societal problems in innovative ways. Even a social entrepreneur possesses all the qualities of being creative, innovative, risk bearing, being a social change leader, social visionary. Social entrepreneur implements earned income strategies for the well-being of the society. Social Entrepreneurship is ultimately a phenomenon where resources are mobilized in a ground-breaking way to meet the community's unmet needs to create a sustainable system.

Several authors have authorized the distinct nature of social entities as not-for-profit organizations; it is fenced those social enterprises can also perform equally well as a 'not-for-profit' or 'for-profit' set up. Depending on the type of social demands and business

models, 'not-for-profit' or 'for-profit' avenues are chosen over the profit mottos. Here, the argument shifts towards the variations among social and economic value creation. If it is business entrepreneurship, social wealth creation is obtained as a spin-off of the economic wealth accumulated. In social entrepreneurship, the grandness is given to economic wealth creation. It does not extrapolate that they cannot adopt "earned income strategy," but social wealth creation is their principal objective. In contrast, economic wealth creation is a much-needed by-product that promises social enterprises' sustainability (Mair and Marti, 2006).

3.4 Positing Social Enterprise along a Continuum

Social enterprises work on a societal objective by reinvesting their profits for the enterprise's development, thereby striving to make the social organization sustainable. This kind of organization entirely belongs to neither the profit-oriented businesses nor the not-for-profit organizations. It caves in a continuum between the two extremes. Social enterprises have a long backstage chronicle but a short one in public. The social enterprise practice has been backed by the call for sustainability, particularly when there is descending support from traditional, philanthropic, and government sources while the funding needs are ascending.

The differentiation between commercial entrepreneurship and SE is not completely dual. It is a spectrum ranging from purely commercial or economical to strictly social. This conception of idea avoids the differentiation of the social entrepreneurial landscape into two opposite functionalities. In practice, these practices are coming together to marry the market's mechanisms to involve economic and social value, thereby making total value creation. They have common elements despite being at both extremes. More clearly, social entrepreneurial activities should reflect economic realities, while economic activity should also create social appreciation. While Social Entrepreneurship is recognized for its social intention, and reflected in various forms of organizations, though substantial multifariousness exists in the kinds of activity, they can all come under the umbrella of Social

Entrepreneurship (Shaw and Carter, 2007; Alter, 2007 ; Williams and Nadin, 2011). The extensively used social versus commercial entrepreneurship dualism that depicts these as discrete fields possessing distinct and separate logics have been critically evaluated.

The study ascertained that majority of the entrepreneurs do not purely pursue either profit-oriented or social goals. Instead, they articulate both profit-making and social principles when explaining their entrepreneurial endeavour. A concern that has begun with commercial endeavours may change their motto over a while. Social Entrepreneurship outcomes are different from traditional entrepreneurship, and the assessment of those outcomes is different (Ebrashi, 2013). Social entrepreneurs tackle market upsets corresponding to externalities, public goods and distributional equity.

Having defined Social Enterprises, Social Entrepreneurs and Social Entrepreneurship, the next section relooks several conceptual models and empirical studies explaining the factors that influence Social Entrepreneurship intentions.

4. Factors Influencing Social Entrepreneurship Behavioural Intentions

Intentions are well discussed in the field of entrepreneurship; hence, it is a more agreeing concept. The affiliation among the intentions and behaviours are justified in socio psychology. Multiple models in the literature have effectively predicted the intention behind any behaviour. Traditional models have predicted a venture creation's entrepreneurial intention as entrepreneurial behaviour, mainly purposive and goal-oriented behaviour in particular. Hence, it is vital to understand the intentions behind an entrepreneurial process.

The following models were formulated to understand the entrepreneurial process. Social entrepreneurial behavioural intentions are more directed towards

satisfying social needs. The purpose of their business is more pronounced; thus, the models can help understand the ascendants of the social entrepreneurial intentions in social venture creation.

4.1 Entrepreneurial Intention Models

The first entrepreneurial event model was formulated by Shapero and Sokol, (1982). This model is mainly used to ascertain entrepreneurial intentions. The model is worked upon two primary preconditions. Firstly, an individual has to comprehend the thought of establishing an enterprise as a credible one. It means that the business idea should be attractive as well as achievable. The entrepreneurial intentions have their antecedents from the perceived desirability and perceived feasibility of turning into an entrepreneur with the tendency to act on the available opportunities. In this model, a particular entrepreneurial event can set off an individual to act, would direct one's behaviour rather than his/her habit.

4.2 Theory of Planned Behaviour Entrepreneurial Model (TPB)

The theory of planned behaviour entrepreneurial model was derived by Krueger (1993) from Ajzen's (1991, 1985), Ajzen (1987), general theory of planned behaviour. The theory of planned behaviour has its assumption that any behaviour required a substantial amount of planning. So, the intentions are based on three factors, an individual's attitude for the behaviour, subjective norms and one's perception of behavioural control. In TPB entrepreneurial model, Kruger, et al. (2000) stated that the outset of a new venture is an intentional process. Three main antecedents can influence this process; attitude towards venture creation, which arose from perceived desirability, the perceived social norms for engagement in the conception of business and the perceived control for entrepreneurial behaviours.

From past research, few studies have proposed a conceptual model to explain the factors determining intentions. These studies explored the antecedents but

Table 1. Definitions on Social Enterprise

Authors (year)	Definition	Key distinction
Dees, 1998	Social Enterprises are private organizations dedicated to solving social problems. They serve the disadvantaged and provide socially important goods. In their judgment, public agencies or private markets have failed to meet them. These organizations have pursued goals that could not be measured simply by profit generation, market penetration or voter support.	Societal objective aimed at solving social problems
Haugh, 2005	Social Enterprises are businesses that cater to a social purpose. They combine innovation, entrepreneurship and social purpose and seek to be financially sustainable by generating revenue from trading. Their social mission prioritizes social benefits above financial profit. If surplus is generated, that is further used to meet the social aims of the beneficiary group or community. The surplus is not distributed to those with a controlling interest in the enterprise.	Meeting Societal needs while maintaining sustainability
Hockerts, 2015	'Social Enterprises are hybrid firms straddling the boundary between for-profit business world and social mission-driven public and non-profit organizations.	Hybrid of for-profit and non-profit firms
Alter, 2007	A Social Enterprise is any business venture created to meet social purpose. The aim is to mitigate or reduce a social problem. While avoiding market failure these firms aim to generate social value through financial discipline and innovation.	Generate social value through financial discipline and innovation
Mair and Schoen, 2007	A social venture is an initiative that addresses social needs and catalyses social transformation. The creation of social value is the primary purpose of the venture, while economic value creation represents a necessary but not a binding condition.	Social value creation overriding the profit motto
Urban and Teise, 2015	Social Enterprise is an attempt towards new enterprise creation, such as self-employment, forming a new enterprise or the expansion of an existing social enterprise. They may be formed by an individual, teams of individuals or an established social enterprise. Social or community goals are their fundament and the profit is reinvested within the social venture itself rather than returning it to investors.	Another choice of self-employment with community goal base

Table 2. Definitions of Social Entrepreneur

Authors (year)	Definitions	Perspective of the definition
Social Entrepreneur		
Waddock and Post, 1991	Being responsible private sector citizens, social entrepreneurs perceive social issues and attempt to bring a catalytic change in the public sector agenda.	Catalysts of private sector for public sector
Prabhu, 1999	Social Entrepreneurs, by being leaders not only create but also manage innovative entrepreneurial ventures. The primary mission of the venture is to achieve social change and development of their client group.	Innovative creators of social change
Brinckerhoff, 2000	Social Entrepreneurs take risks on behalf of the people and the organization they serve	Risk taker
Thompson, et al, 2000	Social Entrepreneurs identify opportunity to satisfy some unfulfilled needs that the state welfare system will not or unable to meet. They bring together the necessary resources (generally people volunteers, money, and premises) to create a difference.	A private welfare system to meet the social needs
LaBarre, et al, 2001	Social Entrepreneurs personify as innovators, they are influenced to tackle few of society's most mysterious situations by implementing new business ideas.	Innovators
Bornstein, 2004	Social Entrepreneurs have novel ideas to solve bigger social issues. They work relentlessly to accomplish their visions. They will not cease unless their ideas are reached out to the maximum extent.	Relentless vision pursuers
Abu-Saifan, 2012	Social Entrepreneur is mission-driven using a set of entrepreneurial behaviours to deliver a social value to the less privileged, all through an entrepreneurially oriented entity that is financially independent, self-sufficient, or sustainable.	Mission driven

not tested empirically. Nevertheless, few empirical studies have also found explaining the intentions.

4.3 Exploratory Studies in Social Entrepreneurship

A considerable number of studies are undertaken by several researchers on behavioural intentions of social

entrepreneurs. Table 4 shows the works that have arrived at a conceptual framework. These are only proposed models but not tested empirically. These models served as the base for many future empirical studies.

4.4 Empirical Studies in Social Entrepreneurship

Several empirical studies have been undertaken to validate the antecedents on social entrepreneurial behavioural intentions and its dimensions with relevance

An earlier empirical study was made by Hwee Nga and Shamuganathan (2010) social livelihood and environmental degradation. This article suggests that the time has come for entrepreneurs to adopt a more integrative view of business that blends economic,

social and environmental values. Social entrepreneurs present such a proposition through their deep commitment towards the social vision, appreciation of sustainable practices, innovativeness, ability to build social networks and also generate viable financial returns. It could be expected that social entrepreneurs often possess certain distinct personality characteristics which define their behaviours/actions. Personality traits are partly developed by innate nurturing, socialization and education. These tacit traits are also formed values/beliefs held and play an important role in driving social entrepreneurial decision making. Thus,

Table 3. Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship

Authors (year)	Social Entrepreneurship	Focus of Concept
Fowler, 2000	Social Entrepreneurship acts at yielding and sustaining social benefits by making socio-economic structures, organisations, relations and practices.	Viable solutions for social benefit
Sullivan Mort, et al., 2003	Social Entrepreneurship is a multidimensional construct involving both entrepreneurially virtuous and moral complexity. It has power to acknowledge social value generating opportunity. It is an entrepreneurial behaviour to achieve the social mission through key decision-making, innovativeness, pro activeness and risk-taking.	Reflection of entrepreneurial behaviour to realize social value
Hibbert, et al., 2002	Social Entrepreneurship employs entrepreneurial behaviour to meet social ends rather than to make profit. Alternatively, the profits to benefit a specific disadvantaged group.	
Austin, et al., 2006	Social Entrepreneurship is innovative, social value creating organisation that can be observed inside or all over the non-profit, business, or government sectors.	Occurrence in non-profit or public sectors
Alvord et al., 2004	Social Entrepreneurship provides innovative solutions to solve immediate social problems through mobilising the ideas, capabilities, resources and social arrangements needed for sustainable transformations for social issues.	Alternatives made for sustainable transformation
Mair and Martí, 2006	Social Entrepreneurship, as a process utilizes the resources by innovative combination of resources to catalyse a social change and redress social needs.	A process of Innovation for social change
Tan, et al., 2005	Social Entrepreneurship is an innovative and risk-taking endeavour, to generate business profit for the society.	Innovative risk-taking endeavour.
Roberts and Woods, 2005	Social Entrepreneurship constructs, evaluates to pursue opportunities for social transformations that is accomplished by visionaries and dedicated individuals with passion.	Process for transformation
Zahra, et al., 2009	Social Entrepreneurship comprises of all those activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth. It is creation of new ventures or managing existing organisations in an innovative manner.	Innovation to enhance social wealth
Murphy and Coombes, 2009	The creation and undertaking of a venture intended to meet a specific social cause in a context of mobilization.	Mobilizing for a social cause
Tukamushaba, et al., 2011	Social Entrepreneurship is a process of applying business-like, innovative approaches to social problems to make a difference.	Innovative business for social issue
Ebrashi, 2013	Social Entrepreneurship involves discovering new opportunities to eliminate social and institutional barrier and address market failures related to the provision of public goods and distributional equity. Experimenting ideas, establishing innovative social organizations, having clear social outcomes and impact to perform activities, to achieve the social outcomes and impact.	Holistic view of process
Auberry, 2015	Social Entrepreneurship is the systematic execution of effort within a for-profit or not-for-profit enterprise that deals primarily with social needs and brings about positive change through risk taking, innovation, and adaptation that may or may not include earned income strategies.	Business for social cause irrespective of profits

Table 4. Proposed models on Social Entrepreneurial behavioural intentions

Authors	Antecedents Proposed
Mair and Noboa, 2006	Empathy, moral judgment, self-efficacy, social support, perceived desirability, perceived feasibility.
Tukamushaba, et al, 2011	Empathy, moral judgment, motivation, Action-o-traits, socialization, self-efficacy, social support, perceived desirability, propensity to act, perceived feasibility.
Jiao, 2011	Human capital, Desirability & Feasibility, social capital, social, environmental factors, institutional environment factors.
Zur, 2015	Social problem, information, entrepreneurial mind-set, social awareness.

personality traits may influence the intentions and the manner in which the individual acts. We hold that if social entrepreneurship is to be effective and impactful, business and management education can facilitate the development of these critical personality traits. Thus, this study primes at determining the personality traits that influence social entrepreneurs' start-up intentions. It also reinforces the findings that personality traits do influence entrepreneurship in general. This study examines the influence of the Big Five personality traits on social entrepreneurship dimensions. The findings reveal that agreeableness positively influences all dimensions of social entrepreneurship, whereas openness exerts a positive influence on social vision, innovation and financial returns. Methodologically, this study develops valid and reliable scales for social entrepreneurship and verifies the adopted Big Five personality measure of Schmit et al., (2000) concerning the antecedents related to personality traits. An important observation was made among the previous studies. It is noted that this research considered responses from student communities from various universities like technical, business administration, entrepreneurship courses, agriculture and undergraduate courses. Few studies are observed on corporate employees, and a very few studies on social entrepreneurs. Considering the distinction that exists amongst the respondents' group, empirical studies have been categorized into three sections based on literature review:

- Empirical studies considering students as respondents (Table 5).
- Empirical studies considering corporate volunteers, journalists as respondents.
- Social entrepreneurs as respondents (Table 6).

Table 5 sums up the various studies considering response from student samples that are discussed briefly. Significant studies have been made to study the effect of personality traits on Social Entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurial intentions. An initial study on social entrepreneurs (Van Ryzin, et al, 2009) was empirically made on United States online panel to explain who in society would be likely to become social entrepreneurs. The study interestingly described the social entrepreneurs as primarily female, non-whites, youth, college-educated or business experienced individuals. They are also found to be happier individuals who tend to show some interest in politics. These individuals tend to show brotherly love and liberal-minded.

One of the known studies on personality traits of social entrepreneurs by Hwee Nga and Shamuganathan (2010) social livelihood and environmental degradation. This article suggests that the time has come for entrepreneurs to adopt a more integrative view of business that blends economic, social and environmental values. Social entrepreneurs present such a proposition through their deep commitment towards the social vision, appreciation of sustainable practices, innovativeness, ability to build social networks and also generate viable financial returns. It could be expected that social entrepreneurs often possess certain distinct personality characteristics which define their behaviours/actions. Personality traits are partly developed by innate nurturing, socialization and education. These tacit traits are also formed values/beliefs held and play an important role in driving social entrepreneurial decision making. Thus, personality traits may influence the intentions and the

Table 5. Social Entrepreneurial behavioural intentions on students

Author (year)	Antecedents	Findings
Hwee Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010	Big Five personality traits Extraversion, Agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism.	Agreeableness positively influences all the dimensions of social entrepreneurship. Openness also positively influences social vision, innovation, and financial returns
Ernst, 2011	Attitude to become a social entrepreneur, social entrepreneurial social capital, perceived behavioural control on becoming a social entrepreneur, social entrepreneurial human capital, subjective norms on becoming social entrepreneur, social entrepreneurial personality.	subjective norms, perceived behavioural control and attitude in becoming a social entrepreneur are essential for the establishment of social entrepreneurial behaviour; social entrepreneurial social capital, social entrepreneurial human capital, and social entrepreneurial personality show the relevance to the formation of social entrepreneurial behaviour.
Ayob, et al., 2013	Empathy, Social Entrepreneurship exposure, perceived desirability, perceived feasibility of social enterprise start-up	Exposure to Social Entrepreneurship and perceived feasibility positively affects perceived desirability to start a social enterprise; empathy significantly determines perceived feasibility; perceived desirability with its mediation influences the relationship between perceived feasibility and intentions to commence a social enterprise.
Baierl, et al, 2014	General social appraisal, the perceived probability of success, perceived social impact	General social appraisal demonstrates a positive influence on social entrepreneurial intentions by strengthening the relationship among perceived social impact and SE intentions. Also, it is observed that general social appraisal undermines the influence of the perceived probability of success.
Urban, 2015b	Independence, Achievement, Self-Efficacy, Vision, Empathy and Moral Judgment, SocialSupport, Innovativeness	Variance for achievement orientation, moral judgment and Empathy, and self-efficacy were found.
Hockerts, 2015	Empathy, moral judgment, self-efficacy and social support	Nomological validity of the variables was confirmed.
İrengün and Arıkoğa, 2015	Extraversion, Agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism	Positive relation between financial returns, use of resources and extraversion, no relation between extraversion and social vision
Urban and Kujinga, 2017	Perceived desirability, perceived feasibility	Perceived desirability and feasibility positively influence social entrepreneurial intentions.
Tiwari, et al, 2017a	Attitude to become a social entrepreneur, creativity, emotional intelligence and moral obligation perceived behavioural control and subjective norms	Creativity shows the most positive influence on social entrepreneurial intention, which is followed by emotional intelligence.
Tiwari, et al, 2017b	Attitude to become a social entrepreneur, self-efficacy, subjective norms, emotional intelligence	Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy show a positive influence on attitude and social entrepreneurial intention.
Ip, et al, 2018	Personality traits, creativity, and social capital	Openness negatively influenced social entrepreneurial intentions; originality influenced social entrepreneurial intentions, no direct relation found between social capital and social entrepreneurial intentions.
Jemari, et al., 2017	Human capital and social capital	Social entrepreneurial human capital and social entrepreneurial social capital shown strong positive relation with social entrepreneurial intention. Among these two factors human capital shows the strongest influence on social entrepreneurial intention.

Author (year)	Antecedents	Findings
Hockerts, 2017	Empathy, moral judgment, self-efficacy, social support, prior experience with social problems	Prior experience in social problems forecasts social entrepreneurial intentions mediated by Empathy, moral judgment, social support, and social problems. Social entrepreneurial self-efficacy social entrepreneurial intentions as well as the prior experience with social problems.
Aure, 2018	Grit, agreeableness, prior exposure to social action, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, empathy, perceived social support and moral obligation.	The relationship between social entrepreneurial intentions and perceived social support is mediated by empathy and self-efficacy; grit and the social entrepreneurial intention is intermediated by self-efficacy and social support.
Kruse, et al., 2019	Theory of planned behaviour, Basic Human values theory, personal values.	Personal values dimensions as openness and self-transcendence are shown to influence social entrepreneurial intentions positively.
Yu and Wang, 2019	Sharing achievement (sustainability, enjoyment and economic benefits), sharing economy, social worth, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy	Sharing achievement affects social entrepreneurial intention positively which is mediated by perceived social worth. Social entrepreneurial self-efficacy moderates between perceived social worth and social entrepreneurial intentions by positively moderating on all the relationships in the model.
Younis, et al., 2020	Positivity, empathy, mediated by social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, moderated by perceived social support	Self-efficacy is positively influenced by empathy and positivity, which has subsequently positive influence on social entrepreneurial intention.

Table 6. Social Entrepreneurial behavioural intentions on Social Entrepreneurs

Nga, et al, 2018	Big Five personality traits such as extraversion, Agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism.	Conscientiousness influences positively on all dimensions except financial returns. Openness positively influences social networks and innovation. Extroversion positively influences social networks and financial returns. Neuroticism negatively influences social networks.
------------------	--	---

manner in which the individual acts. We hold that if social entrepreneurship is to be effective and impactful, business and management education can facilitate the development of these critical personality traits. Thus, this study primes at determining the personality traits that influence social entrepreneurs' start-up intentions. It also reinforces the findings that personality traits do influence entrepreneurship in general. This study examines the influence of the Big Five personality traits on social entrepreneurship dimensions. The findings reveal that agreeableness positively influences all dimensions of social entrepreneurship, whereas openness exerts a positive influence on social vision, innovation and financial returns. Methodologically, this study develops valid and reliable scales for social entrepreneurship and verifies the adopted Big Five personality measure of Schmit et al., (2000) is on

big five personality traits, where agreeableness was found to be positively influencing all the dimensions of social entrepreneurship. In Another notable study by İrengün and Arıkboğa (2015) on personality, traits like extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness and neuroticism, where extraversion showed a positive influence on social entrepreneurial dimensions like financial returns and use of resource (Ip et al., 2018). In addition, considered personality traits, found on the contrary that openness negatively influenced social entrepreneurial intentions.

Theory of planned behaviour was administered to study the SE intentions, considering additional constructs such as social entrepreneurial-social capital, human capital and personality. All these constructs showed the relevance to the occurrence of social entrepreneurial

behaviour (Ernst, 2011). Significant studies have considered critical factors, for instance, empathy, self-efficacy, moral judgment and social support in their efforts to study social entrepreneurial intentions. These factors have proved to be positively influencing social entrepreneurial intentions (Aure, 2018; this research extended their SEI conceptual model by examining grit (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews & Kelly, 2007; Ayob, et al, 2013; Hockerts, 2015; Tiwari, et al, 2017a; Urban and Teise, 2015; Younis, et al, 2020) a feeling of moral obligation to help these, a high level of self-efficacy concerning the ability to effect social change and perceived availability of social support. Nomological validity is demonstrated by showing that, as specified by Mair and Noboa (2006).

4.5 Empirical Studies Considering Corporate Volunteers, Journalists as Respondents

Forster and Grichnik (2013) studied the social entrepreneurial intentions on corporate volunteers, using prominent factors like empathy, self-efficacy, perceived social norms, perceived collective efficacy, perceived-desirability and feasibility. Outcomes of the study depicted a positive relationship among empathy, perceived social norms, collective-efficacy, self-efficacy, and social entrepreneurial intentions.

Liu, et al (2018) brought out a valuable finding on journalists as they share many features of social entrepreneurs. Having worked for starting up of social ventures their intentions to become social entrepreneurs was studied by embracing variables such a personality traits, creativity and social capital. The observations of this present study showed that creativity significantly influences their social entrepreneurial intentions.

A much recent study by Urban (2020) the purpose of this study is to develop insights from existing theories in entrepreneurship frameworks and apply these in the social entrepreneurship context. Consequently the study examines to what extant beliefs and cognitions shape social entrepreneurial intentions. Design/methodology/approach Hypotheses were statistically tested using multiple regression analyses based on

survey data (n = 156 was made on entrepreneurs who were delegates taking part in workshops on Social Entrepreneurship were considered. The study purported to apply the entrepreneurship theories with respect to the context of social entrepreneurship. The study results found that entrepreneurial alertness describes the social entrepreneurial intentions, with the self-efficacy positively mediating this relationship.

Recent studies (Table 6) that were conducted on social entrepreneurial behavioural intentions on social entrepreneurs have added to the literature with relevance to the social entrepreneurs themselves. These studies help in confirming the soaring factors that influence the social entrepreneurial behavioural intentions. They are personality factors such as conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness. The other factors include empathy, self-efficacy, social support, moral judgment and prior experience in social problems.

5. Conclusion

This review article attempts to study the researchers' perspective on social entrepreneurship, which has enabled the different views of social enterprises, social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship. Having a clear understanding, we can justify that a social organization is a kind of venture having the characteristics of both a traditional business enterprise and a non-profitable or charitable organization. Since social enterprise attempts to fulfil societal needs by adopting entrepreneurial practices, they sustain themselves by reinvesting the profits entirely for social development. They can be located along a continuum ranging from enterprises that are purely economical to purely social.

Further, this article studies various antecedents to social, behavioural intentions across different settings. A significant observation of all to be observed is that factors like empathy, self-efficacy, and moral judgment account mostly. These are followed by perceived desirability and feasibility. It is also interesting to note studies grounded on personality traits. The first of its kind study was made by Hwee Nga & Shamuganathan, (2010) social livelihood and environmental

degradation. This article suggests that the time has come for entrepreneurs to adopt a more integrative view of business that blends economic, social and environmental values. Social entrepreneurs present such a proposition through their deep commitment towards the social vision, appreciation of sustainable practices, innovativeness, ability to build social networks and also generate viable financial returns. It could be expected that social entrepreneurs often possess certain distinct personality characteristics which define their behaviours/actions. Personality traits are partly developed by innate nurturing, socialization and education. These tacit traits are also formed values/beliefs held and play an important role in driving social entrepreneurial decision making. Thus, personality traits may influence the intentions and the manner in which the individual acts. We hold that if social entrepreneurship is to be effective and impactful, business and management education can facilitate the development of these critical personality traits. Thus, this study primes at determining the personality traits that influence social entrepreneurs' start-up intentions. It also reinforces the findings that personality traits do influence entrepreneurship in general. This study examines the influence of the Big Five personality traits on social entrepreneurship dimensions. The findings reveal that agreeableness positively influences all dimensions of social entrepreneurship, whereas openness exerts a positive influence on social vision, innovation and financial returns. Methodologically, this study develops valid and reliable scales for social entrepreneurship and verifies the adopted Big Five personality measure of Schmit et al., (2000) among students and the study found a positive relationship between openness and social entrepreneurship. A similar study was again undertaken on students which revealed that openness negatively influences social entrepreneurial intentions (Ip, et al., 2018). Subsequently, a personality traits study was made on social entrepreneurs themselves by Nga, et al (2018) revealed that openness showed a positive influence on social entrepreneurship. This observation infers that a study concerning a particular context also matters to validate any understanding and applicability across various contexts.

The study findings of works on SE intentions convey that researcher have made many assorted value-adding contributions to Social Entrepreneurship literature. Concisely, it can be concluded that the most contributing factors of social entrepreneurial intentions have been explored for further empirical investigation. Though the student sample has helped validate several models and few theories, it is also crucial to infer that the studies' findings cannot be applied across all the contexts.

As Baierl, et al., (2014) rightly said about student samples, they contribute to more significant heterogeneity than social entrepreneurs' sample. In addition, students' samples have been discussed as 'controversial' in entrepreneurship literature that necessitates additional explanations. The findings represent their present-day intentions, but it cannot be assumed that these students would turn into social entrepreneurs in their future career. Social entrepreneurial intention is a dependent variable that needs to be delved into on potential entrepreneurs. The study summarises that taking up Social Entrepreneurship is also an alternate choice of career in addressing a community's social needs. Similarly, if the study is made with relevance to corporate employees, it cannot reflect the antecedents responsible for the social entrepreneurial behavioural intentions.

Social entrepreneurial intentions can interpret the intentions before establishing a social enterprise or even prior making career choices. It would be more apt to analyse the factors accountable for creating social entrepreneurs successfully. Such studies on social entrepreneurs themselves are relatively found scanty. Future studies should consider research in social entrepreneurs' context, although their social enterprises are in their nascent stages.

6. References

- Abu-Saifan, S. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Definition and boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review*. 2(2):22–7. <https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview523>

- Ajzen, I. (1985). From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. *Action Control*, pp. 11–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69746-3_2
- Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, traits and actions: dispositional prediction of behaviour in social psychology. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 20:63. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60411-6](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60411-6)
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2):179–211. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/07493-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/07493-5978(91)90020-T)
- Alter, K. (2007). CSR in Small Businesses. *Business and Society*. 152(4):666–73.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., and Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 40(3):260–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886304266847>
- Auberry, D. W. (2015). Socio-demography, Social Entrepreneurship and changing models of enterprise success: An Empirical Examination. Sullivan University. Proquest Dissertation Publication.dees
- Aure, P. A. H. (2018). Exploring the social entrepreneurial intentions of senior high school and college students in a Philippine University: A PIs-Sem Approach. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*. 21(2):1–11.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 30(1):1–22. <https://www.clearlyso.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Social-and-Commercial-Entrepreneurship-Same-Different-or-Both.pdf> <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x>
- Ayob, N., Yap, C. S., and Sapuan, D. A. (2013). Social Entrepreneurial intention among business undergraduates: An Emerging Economy Perspective 1. October. <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.5470>
- Baierl, R., Grichnik, D., Spirrlle, M., and Welpel, I. M. (2014). Antecedents of Social Entrepreneurial intentions: The role of an individual's general social appraisal. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 5(2):123–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2013.871324>
- Bornstein, D. (2004). How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas. Oxford University Press.
- Brinckerhoff, P. C. (2000). Social Entrepreneurship: The art of mission-based venture development. In *Social Entrepreneurship: The Art of Mission-Based Venture Development*. John Willey & Sons.
- Dees, J. G. (1994). Social enterprise: Private initiatives for the common good. Harvard Business School Note 9-395-116. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Case Services
- Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 13(9):560. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2261721>
- Drucker, P. (1979). *The Practice of Management*. London: Pan Books.
- Ebrashi, R. El. (2013). Social Entrepreneurship theory and sustainable social impact. *Social Responsibility Journal*. 9(2):188–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-07-2011-0013>
- Ernst, K. (2011). Heart over mind - An empirical analysis of social entrepreneurial intention formation on the basis of the theory of planned behaviour. *Bergische Universität Wuppertal*.
- Forster, F., and Grichnik, D. (2013). Social Entrepreneurial intention formation of corporate volunteers. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 4(2):153–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2013.777358>
- Fowler, A. (2000). NGDOS as a moment in history: Beyond aid to Social Entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third World Quarterly*. 21(4):637–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713701063>
- Ghalwash, S., Tolba, A., and Ismail, A. (2017). What motivates social entrepreneurs to start social ventures? *Social Enterprise Journal*. 13(3):268–98. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sej-05-2016-0014>
- Haugh, H. (2005). The role of Social Enterprise in regional development. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. 2(4):346–57. <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:ids:ijesbu:v:2:y:2005:i:4:p:346-357> <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2005.007085>
- Haugh, H. (2007). New strategies for a sustainable society: The growing contribution of Social Entrepreneurship. *Business Ethics Quarterly*. 17(4):743–9. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq20071747>
- Hibbert, S. A., Hogg, G., and Quinn, T. (2002). Consumer response to Social Entrepreneurship: The case of the Big Issue in Scotland. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 7(3):288–301. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.186>
- Hisrich, R. D. (1990). Entrepreneurship/intrapreneurship. *American Psychologist*. 45(2):209–22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.209>
- Hockerts, K. (2015). The Social Entrepreneurial Antecedents Scale (SEAS): A validation study. *Social Enterprise Journal*.

- Journal. 11(3):260–80. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sej-05-2014-0026>
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. 41(1):105–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12171>
- Hwee Nga, J. K., and Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on Social Entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 95(2):259–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0358-8>
- Ip, C. Y., Wu, S.-C., Liu, H.-C., and Liang, C. (2018). Social Entrepreneurial intentions of students from Hong Kong. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*. 27(1):47–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971355717738596>
- İrengün, O., and Arikboğa, Ş. (2015). The effect of personality traits on Social Entrepreneurship intentions: A field research. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 195:1186–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.172>
- Jemari, M. A., Kasuma, J., Kamaruddin, H. M., Tama, H. A., Morshidi, I., and Suria, K. (2017). Relationship between human capital and social capital towards Social Entrepreneurial intention among the public university students. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*. 4(12):179–84. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2017.012.032>
- Jiao, H. (2011). A conceptual model for Social Entrepreneurship directed toward social impact on society. *Social Enterprise Journal*. 7(2):130–49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508611111156600>
- Krueger, N. (1993). The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 18(1):5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879301800101>
- Kruger, N. F., Reilly, M. D., and Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 15(5):411–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(98\)00033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(98)00033-0)
- Kruse, P., Wach, D., Costa, S., and Moriano, J. A. (2019). Values matter, don't they? - Combining theory of planned behavior and personal values as predictors of Social Entrepreneurial Intention. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 10(1):55–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1541003>
- LaBarre, P., Fishman, C., Hammonds, K. H., and Warner, F. (2001). Who's Fast Leaders. 2002. *Fast Company*. 52(1):83–128.
- Liu, H.-C., Yin Ip, C., and Liang, C. (2018). A new runway for journalists: On the intentions of journalists to start Social Enterprises. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*. 14(2):83–100. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20181424>
- Lumpkin, G. T., Moss, T. W., Gras, D. M., Kato, S., and Amezcua, A. S. (2013). Entrepreneurial processes in social contexts: How are they different, if at all? *Small Business Economics*. 40(3):761–83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9399-3>
- Mair, J., and Martí, I. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction and delight. *Journal of World Business*. 41(1):36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
- Mair, J., and Noboa, E. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. *Social Entrepreneurship*. 121–35. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625655_8
- Mair, J., and Schoen, O. (2007). Successful Social Entrepreneurial business models in the context of developing economies: An explorative study. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*. 2(1):54–68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17468800710718895>
- Murphy, P. J., and Coombes, S. M. (2009). A model of social entrepreneurial discovery. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 87(3):325–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9921-y>
- Nga, J. K. H., Priale, M. A., Darmohraj, A., Moschetti, M., Fuchs, R. M., and Saenz, M. (2018). Personality traits and Social Entrepreneurship dimensions in Peru and Argentina. *Compendium*. 5(11):120–43.
- Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Greener management international Asian Case Research Journal. *International Journal of Technology Management*. 1–11. http://research.iimb.ernet.in/bitstream/123456789/8055/1/WP_IIMB_131.pdf
- Roberts, R., and Woods, C. (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of Social Entrepreneurship. *University of Auckland Business Review*. 7(1):45–51.
- Schmit, M. J., Kihm, J. A., & Robie, C. (2000). Development of a Global Measure of Personality. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(1):153–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00198.x>
- Schumpeter, J. A. (2013). Economic theory and entrepreneurial history (H. G. J. Aitken (ed.)). Harvard University Press. p. 45–64. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674594470.e5>

- Shapero, A., and Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1497759>
- Shaw, E., and Carter, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. 14(3):418–34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000710773529>
- Sullivan Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., and Carnegie, K. (2003). Social Entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 8(1):76–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.202>
- Tan, W.-L., Williams, J., and Tan, T.-M. (2005). Defining the ‘Social’ in ‘Social Entrepreneurship’: Altruism and Entrepreneurship. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. 1(3):353–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-005-2600-x>
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., and Lees, A. (2000). Social Entrepreneurship - A new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*. 38(5):328–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740010340517>
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., and Tikoria, J. (2017a). An empirical analysis of the factors affecting Social Entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*. 7(1):1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-017-0067-1>
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., and Tikoria, J. (2017b). The role of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on social entrepreneurial attitudes and social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 8(2):165–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2017.1371628>
- Tran, A. T. P., and Von Korfflesch, H. (2016). A conceptual model of Social Entrepreneurial intention based on the social cognitive career theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. 10(1):17–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/apjie-12-2016-007>
- Tukamushaba, E. K., Orobia, L., and George, B. P. (2011). Development of a conceptual model to understand international Social Entrepreneurship and its application in the Ugandan context. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*. 9(4):282–98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-011-0079-9>
- Urban, B., and Kujinga, L. (2017). Towards social change: South African university students as social entrepreneurs. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 31(1):243–59. <https://doi.org/10.20853/31-1-872>
- Urban, B. (2015a). An exploratory study on outcomes of Social Enterprises in South Africa. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*. 23(02):271–97. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s0218495815500090>
- Urban, B. (2015b). Evaluation of Social Enterprise outcomes and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 42(2):163–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-03-2013-0071>
- Urban, B. (2020). Entrepreneurial alertness, self-efficacy and Social Entrepreneurship intentions. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. 27(3):489–507. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-08-2019-0285>
- Urban, B., and Heinrich, T. (2015). Antecedents to Social Entrepreneurship intentions: An empirical study in South Africa. *Management Dynamics*. 24(2):36–53. <https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC174651>
- Van Ryzin, G. G., Grossman, S., DiPadova-Stocks, L., and Bergrud, E. (2009). Portrait of the Social Entrepreneur: Statistical evidence from a US Panel. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 20(2):129–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-009-9081-4>
- Waddock, A., and Post, E. (1991). Catalytic Change. *Public Administration Review*. 51(5):393–401. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976408>
- Williams, C. C., and Nadin, S. (2011). Beyond the commercial versus Social Entrepreneurship divide. *Social Enterprise Journal*. 7(2):118–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508611111156592>
- Younis, A., Xiaobao, P., Nadeem, M. A., Kanwal, S., Pitafi, A. H., Qiong, G., and Yuzhen, D. (2020). Impact of positivity and empathy on Social Entrepreneurial intention: The moderating role of perceived social support. *Journal of Public Affairs*. 2019 Dec. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2124>
- Yu, T. L., and Wang, J. H. (2019). Factors affecting Social Entrepreneurship intentions among agricultural university students in Taiwan. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*. 22(1):107–18. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2018.0032>
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., and Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 24(5):519–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>
- Žur, A. (2015). Social problems as sources of opportunity: Antecedents of Social Entrepreneurship opportunities. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*. 3(4):73–87. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2015.030405>