FACTORS INFLUENCING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS OF STUDENTS AT A UNIVERSITY IN SOUTH AFRICA

Tawanda Ivern Chinaire, University of Fort Hare
Tendai Chimucheka, University of Fort Hare
Hilda Atemo Khayundi, University of Fort Hare

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship is increasingly viewed as a social change development, which important for South Africa because of the challenges that the country currently faces. The main objective of this study was to investigate the factors that influence social entrepreneurial intentions of students at a South African University in the Eastern Cape Province. A quantitative research approach and a descriptive research design were adopted for the study. Purposive sampling was used to select respondents. The study revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between the factors researched (empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy and social support) and students' social entrepreneurial intention. It is recommended that universities should have structures and systems that can guide students who aspire to be social entrepreneurs. Since social entrepreneurship has proven to be a promising strategy to eradicate some of the social challenges in South Africa, policies should be put in place to help aspiring social entrepreneurs in terms of finances, information, or guidance to ensure these ventures succeed.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurial Intention, Empathy, Moral Obligation, Self-Efficacy, Social Support.

INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship is increasingly viewed as a social change development, which has unquestionable application in South Africa because of the insufficiency and ineffectualness of governments' plans to full fill the entire social shortfall (Urban & Kujinga, 2017). This shows that social entrepreneurship is a promising scheme towards the alleviation of social issues affecting the nation.

Cukier et al. (2011) defines social entrepreneurship as doing business for a social reason. The concept applies methods used by business enterprises to address social problems and possibly make money in the end (Tran, 2017). Therefore, social entrepreneurship is a profit seeking business concept with the aim of achieving social value through the creation of social business while alleviating social issues. This serves as the main and central theme of social entrepreneurship, and differentiate it from other types of entrepreneurship.

After more than twenty years of democracy, South Africa still faces challenges of inequality, poverty, and high unemployment (Van der Westhuizen & Swart, 2015), even though the government is committed to transforming the country. This gives rise to the need for social

entrepreneurs. Lacap (2018) stated that social entrepreneurship is about searching for enhanced and innovative ways to attain and sustain social value.

To comprehend social entrepreneurship, we should recognise the importance of social entrepreneurial intention. According to Hsu and Wang (2018) entrepreneurial intention is taking a leap of faith, the conviction and eagerness to begin an enterprise, taking into consideration the views of other parties involved and assessing your competences. Social entrepreneurship intentions are said to be influenced by self-efficacy, social support, empathy, and moral judgment (Tran, 2017).

South Africa requires its universities to align themselves with social issues in order to develop social consciousness amongst students (Walker, 2015). According to Urban and Kujinga (2017), analysis on South African university students form a very important category, as we will begin actively relying on the future generation to solve the country's socio-economic challenges. It should be noted that the youth possess remarkable talent, energy, and interest that could be coordinated towards being the next social leaders (Walker, 2015).

Lekhanya (2015) stated that universities can play an essential role through their researchers and academics, by creating social institutions and structures, promoting social movements, and mobilizing resources to create sustainable social impact for social entrepreneurs. This will ultimately contribute to economic development and growth through the creation of jobs and innovation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Entrepreneurship

The concept of social entrepreneurship has been defined in different ways (Shin, 2018). Trivedi (2010) stresses the need for a more unified definition of the subject. In an earlier study, Short, Moss, and Lumpkin (2009) had argued that a clear definition is necessary for social entrepreneurship to become a structured field of study and to establish the legitimacy of the field. Social entrepreneurship is defined as doing business for a social cause, which could also be referred to as altruistic entrepreneurship (Cukier et al., 2011). The concept applies methods used by business enterprises to address social problems and possibly make money in the end (Tran, 2017).

To understand social entrepreneurship, one needs to have an understanding of what social entrepreneurs are. Social entrepreneurs are individuals who begin an enterprise to create value in the form of transformational benefits for society (Manyaka, 2015). In other words, they tackle and respond to social challenges that the government and the private sector fail to respond to. According to Saifan (2012), characteristics of social entrepreneurs are not very different from those of entrepreneurs as they display innovative minds, and the ability to change the environment they operate in. Table 1 provides a summary of some of the characteristics of social entrepreneurs.

Social entrepreneurship has been noted to be an effective strategy towards social change, and to fully comprehend social entrepreneurship, one may need to know how the desire to start a business with a social mission gets formed. Thus, there is need to understand social entrepreneurial intentions. For this study, a distinction is made between social entrepreneurship intentions and social entrepreneurial intentions as the terms are sometimes used interchangeably. Social entrepreneurship intentions can be described as the practice through which a person intends to start a business to create social change in society (Zakaria & Bahrein, 2018). On the

other hand, social entrepreneurial intentions involve a person's intentions of starting a business to advance social change through innovation. In other words, social entrepreneurial intention is taking a leap of faith, the conviction and eagerness to begin an enterprise to create social change, taking into consideration the views of other parties involved and assessing your competences (Hsu & Wang, 2018). Thomson (2009) describes social entrepreneurial intentions as the vital factor influencing ones' behaviour towards social entrepreneurship intentions. The following section will discuss the theoretical framework of social entrepreneurial intentions.

Table 1 CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS		
Source	Characteristics	Description
Dees (1998)	Social sector change agents	Social entrepreneurs adopt a mission to create change, recognise new opportunities, and engage in a continuous process of innovation while acting boldly irrespective of limited resources.
Brinckerhoff (2000)	Risk takers	Social entrepreneurs take risks on behalf of the people in their organisation
Waddock and Post (1991)	Private sector citizen	Social entrepreneurs are citizens of the private sector who identify opportunities in the public sector and in so doing play critical roles of bringing change to this sector.

Source: Mair and Naboa (2003)

Theoretical Overview and Hypotheses

Mair and Noboa (2006) being the first to advance theoretical prepositions about the antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions, drew on entrepreneurial intention theory, namely, the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and the theory of the entrepreneurial event (Shapero & Sokol, 1982) to explain how intentions are formed (Hockerts, 2017). These traditional models in the entrepreneurship literature depict intentions as a reliable predictor of entrepreneurial activity that ultimately results in the creation of new ventures (Tran & Von Korflesch, 2016).

According to Hockerts (2017), the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) by Ajzen's (1991) is a strong predictor of entrepreneurial intentions and behaviour, and has been widely tested in entrepreneurship research. The theory itself states that attitude towards behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control, together shape an individual's behavioural intentions and behaviours, which can be differentiated into internal and external control (Ajzen, 1991). Internal control refers to a person's self-efficacy whereas external control refers to a person's beliefs about the support or opposition they will receive.

According to Mair and Noboa (2006) several aspects of the social entrepreneurial context have to be adapted to the traditional measures that are used in the theory of planned behaviour. As was the case with Hockerts (2017), the researchers proposed the following antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions:

- Empathy as a proxy for attitudes towards behaviour,
- Moral judgment as a proxy for social norms,
- Self-efficacy as a proxy for internal behavioural control, and
- Perceived presence of social support as a proxy for external behavioural control.

According to Ayob et al. (2013) the four antecedents on social entrepreneurial intentions are interceded by the works by Shapero and Sokol's (1982) constructs of perceived desirability and feasibility. The authors further states that the effect of empathy and moral judgment are mediated by perceived desirability, while the effect of self-efficacy and social support are mediated by perceived feasibility. According to Ip et al. (2017) moral judgment was replaced with moral obligation, because moral judgement is only concerned with the reasons why an individual feel morally obliged instead of the extent of that obligation.

Empathy and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

Empathy is a concept associated with affective and emotional components (Kopec-Massey, 2017). It is defined as having the ability to understand and share how another person is feeling (Ip et al., 2017). Wood (2012) stresses the importance of empathy as a key driver in running a social enterprise by stating that empathic individuals possess qualities such as the ability to lead and motivate.

According to Gonzalez (2018) without empathy, it is difficult to build anything as you will fail to understand and perceive the problem the way the affected see it. Empathy is therefore vital for a potential social entrepreneur to create social value for the organisation. According to Hockerts (2017), an individual that reads literature that is empathic-focused tends to have a higher social entrepreneurial intent.

Empathy therefore represents an important element in the social entrepreneurship process affecting social entrepreneurial intentions. Accordingly, we can therefore assume that there is a positive relationship between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions.

Moral Obligation and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

Moral obligation is related to the commitment that individuals have towards their idea that will solve a social issue and feel morally obliged to pursue the idea (Tiwari et al., 2017). This can exert social pressure on the individual and can result in strengthened intentions, or weakened intentions (Hockerts, 2017).

Moral obligation was used to measure social norms, of which social entrepreneurs have to adhere to moral standards (Brannback & Carsrud, 2017). Although moral motives play a vital role, other motives such as personal fulfilment could contribute to entrepreneurial intent which lead to the disapproval of the positive association between intention and moral obligation by (Hockerts, 2017; Ip et al., 2017). Adopting on the connotations made by Hockerts (2017) that social norms imply a moral obligation to help people treated as insignificant resulting in the formation of moral intent. We can therefore assume that there is a positive relationship between moral obligation and social entrepreneurial intentions.

Self-Efficacy and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

Self-efficacy is a determinant of intentions in line with Ajzen's (1991) predictions. Kazmi et al. (2019) defined self-efficacy as the ability of an individual to have control over circumstances in a given situation. Ramadani et al. (2015) states that individuals with high self-efficacy tend to have strong entrepreneurial intentions.

Some societal challenges tend to be challenging, therefore it's only natural to assume that an individual need to also rely on their confidence. Thus, self-efficacy can be understood as the

belief that individuals can indeed contribute towards resolving societal issues (Hockerts, 2017). Since, self-efficacy leads to higher outcome expectation to be self-employed, we can therefore assume that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and social entrepreneurial intentions.

Social Support and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

Social support is perceived assistance that an individual assumes to receive from their surroundings (Chan, 2015). It can be in the form of money, service assistance, sympathy, information or guidance support (Smith & Darko, 2014). In other words, the individual is concerned about what sort of funding or any form of assistance can they acquire from their support systems for their efforts (Hockerts, 2017).

The study by Meyskens et al. (2010) indirectly test for perceived social support through a Resource-Based View lens and found out that social entrepreneurs rely on resources as part of their value-creation process. Ruttman (2012) states that investments in social enterprises can become powerful drivers of social entrepreneurship, job creation, and ultimately economic growth and poverty reduction. We can therefore assume that there is a relationship between social support and social entrepreneurial intentions.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a quantitative research approach and a descriptive design. Data was collected from students at a university in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa (University of Fort Hare). University students were used as the target population in this study as they are a common study population and they are at their uppermost level of educational background and are equipped with superb proficient cognitive skills.

Judgemental sampling, a non-probability sampling technique was used to select respondents. The study focused on 1353 registered students in the university's Faculty of Management and Commerce. Raosoft sample size calculator was used to calculate the recommended sample size, applying a confidence level of 95%, and margin of error of 5%, which is recommended in Management Sciences. The recommended sample size, which was used was 300 students.

The study used a survey method for data collection. A questionnaire was used as the data collection instrument which was derived from previously validated instruments. To measure social entrepreneurial intentions, the researchers adopted a 9 item scale also used by Kanonuhwa, Rungani and Chimucheka (2018) with statements already modified to suit the level of understanding of a South African student. Accordingly, to measure factors which influence social entrepreneurial intentions, this study adopted an 18 item scale from Hockerts (2015) which have been previously validated, and used by other researchers.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

There were 1353 registered undergraduate students in the Faculty of Management and Commerce in 2019 when data was collected. An online sample size calculator, Raosoft was used to calculate the sample size. Applying a confidence level of 95%, and the margin of error of 5% and 50% distribution, a sample size of 300 was recommended. Thus, 300 questionnaires were distributed and used in this study.

The questionnaire used consisted of three sections. Section A focused on the demographic statistics of the respondents. Section B deals with the factors that influence social entrepreneurial intentions. Section C deals with the social entrepreneurial intention. Since the scales of the demographic section are not uniform, it was left out from the reliability analysis. The reliability of the scales was measured using the Cronbach`s alpha coefficient and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 INTERNAL CONSISTENCY COEFFICIENTS ACROSS ALL MEASURES			
Variables	**Cronbach`s Alpha coefficient**	**Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items**	**N of Items**
Section B	0.516	0.517	18
Section C	0.832	0.856	9
All scales	**0.727**	**0.734**	**27**

Table 2 illustrates reliability analyses revealing a Cronbach's alpha exceeding 0.5 for all the constructs which indicates an acceptable internal consistency. Scales or tests can only be considered reliable and valid if their Cronbach's Alpha is ranging from 0.5 to 1 (Taber, 2018: 1278).

Descriptive Analysis

The majority of the respondents were male constituting of 166 out of 300 participants, while only 134 were female. From a total of 300 respondents, 92.33% were below the age of 25 years, while 7.67% were above 25. This is most likely because the study sample are students, from those in their first year of study, to those doing their final year. Over 75% of the respondents are between the ages of 17 and 27, with over 90% of them being under 40 years of age. According to Wongnaa and Seyram (2014) mature student population tends to be lower compared to the younger student population who enter tertiary education directly from the senior high schools. In this study, the majority of respondents were below the age of 25 years. Of the 300 participants, 60 were in their first year of study, 103 in their second year, 101 in their third year and only 36 in their fourth year.

Given that the target respondents were university students, majority (68.33%) did not have any work experience. However, 31.67% of the university students do have work experience. This is by Wongnaa and Seyram, (2014) who suggest that since most students enter tertiary university straight from high school before they acquire work experience.

Eighty percent of the students responded that they had no entrepreneurship education and twenty percent contend that they have received some form of entrepreneurship education. Eighty-eight percent have no access to finance, with only 12% indicating that they had or could have access finance to start a business. The results show that 78.67% of the students did not come from an entrepreneurial family, which means only 21.33% had exposure to entrepreneurship within their families.

Principal Component Analysis

In order to recognise the factors of social entrepreneurship, factor analysis was utilised. The technique is utilised to summarise information and in cases where a large number of

variables exists (Malhotra, 2010), in most cases, some of these variables may be explaining the same thing and may need to be removed. In this case, principal component analysis was utilised.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was conducted to check if the questionnaire items were sufficient enough to warrant a factor analysis. The results of the KMO test are as displayed in table 3 below.

Table 3 KMO AND BARTLETT'S TEST		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.769
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2589.643
	Df	153
	Sig.	.000

Sig. at 0.05 (2-tailed)

The results (BTS = 2589.643; sig. =0.000) indicated that the data was appropriate for the purpose of factor analysis. Statistically, the variables were interrelated to the extent that two or more variables may be categorised to give similar meaning and or explanation. In terms of sampling adequacy, the result of the "Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin" KMO was 0.769. The results indicate that there are sufficient items for each factor. The two tests provided the green light to proceed with conducting a factor analysis.

Total Variance Explained

The output of factor analysis presents the total variance possible within the factors considered for rotation. Table 4 presents the total variance explained by the factors considered to be the descriptors of social entrepreneurial intentions.

Table 4 TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cum. %
Seeing socially disadvantaged people triggers an emotional response in me.	4,933	27,408	27,408	4,933	27,408	27,408	4,156	23,091	23,091
When thinking about socially disadvantaged people, I try to put myself in their shoes.	3,034	16,858	44,266	3,034	16,858	44,266	2,622	14,564	37,656
Solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to.	1,947	10,819	55,085	1,947	10,819	55,085	2,516	13,976	51,632
I feel compassion for socially marginalized people.	1,498	8,322	63,407	1,498	8,322	63,407	2,120	11,776	63,407
Social justice requires that we help those who are less fortunate than ourselves.	0,958	5,323	68,730						
It is one of the principles of our society that we should help socially disadvantaged people.	0,831	4,617	73,347						

It is an ethical responsibility to help people less fortunate than myself.	0,773	4,296	77,643						
I am convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it.	0,654	3,632	81,276						
We are morally obliged to help socially disadvantaged people.	0,580	3,222	84,498						
It is possible to attract investors for an organization that wants to solve social problems.	0,507	2,814	87,312						
I could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces.	0,420	2,335	89,647						
People would support me if I wanted to start an organization to help socially marginalized People	0,388	2,154	91,801						
If I planned to address a significant societal problem people would back me up.	0,339	1,881	93,682						
I do not expect that I would receive much support if I were to start a social enterprise.	0,311	1,731	95,412						
I do not believe it would be possible for me to bring about significant social change.	0,290	1,613	97,025						
I find it difficult to feel compassionate for people less fortunate than myself.	0,199	1,108	98,133						
I do not experience much emotion when thinking about socially excluded people.	0,195	1,081	99,214						
I don't care how people feel who live on the margins of society.	0,141	0,786	100,000						

Out of 18, four factors with Eigenvalues greater than one account for 63.41% of the total variance. That is, "the higher the percentage of the total variance the greater the contribution the factor has towards social entrepreneurial intentions". Since the analysis included the confirmatory factor analysis, the 18 factors were further confirmed by the rotation sums of squared loading through Varimax rotation. Based on the results of the analysis only factors that have Eigenvalues greater than one were reserved. The rotated component (Factor) matrix is presented in the following section.

Rotated Component (Factor) Matrix

The idea of rotation is to reduce the number of factors on which the variables under investigation have high loadings. Rotation does not actually change anything but makes the interpretation of the analysis easier. Looking at Table 5 below, these factors were considered to be the main variables for further analysis.

	Component			
Table 5 **ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX**				
	Factor 1	**Factor 2**	**Factor 3**	**Factor 4**
I don't care how people feel who live on the margins of society.	0.802			
I do not experience much emotion when thinking about socially excluded people.	0.760			
I feel compassion for socially marginalized people.	0.760			
I find it difficult to feel compassionate for people less fortunate than myself.	0.758			
Seeing socially disadvantaged people triggers an emotional response in me.	0.757			
When thinking about socially disadvantaged people, I try to put myself in their shoes.	0.747			
We are morally obliged to help socially disadvantaged people.		0.803		
It is one of the principles of our society that we should help socially disadvantaged people.		0.769		
Social justice requires that we help those who are less fortunate than ourselves.		0.708		
It is an ethical responsibility to help people less fortunate than myself.		0.648		
If I planned to address a significant societal problem people would back me up.			0.859	
People would support me if I wanted to start an organization to help socially marginalized People			0.777	
It is possible to attract investors for an organization that wants to solve social problems.			0.742	
I do not expect that I would receive much support if I were to start a social enterprise.			0.700	
I could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces.				0.701
Solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to.				0.669
I am convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it.				0.663
I do not believe it would be possible for me to bring about significant social change.				0.535
Eigen values	**4.933**	**3.034**	**1.947**	**1.498**
Percentage (%) of variance	**27.408**	**16.858**	**10.819**	**8.322**
Least Correlation	**0.747**	**0.648**	**0.700**	**0.535**

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.a

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

The four factors developed by the Principal Component Analysis considered being the descriptors of social entrepreneurial intentions are presented below in the order of importance as indicated by their contribution to the percentage of total variance.

• "Factor one" was labelled as "Empathy". The factor included six items. The lowest Correlation to the underlying latent variable of the factor yielded a value of 0.747 indicating the reliability of the factor.

• "Factor two" was labelled as "Moral obligation". The factor included four items. The lowest Correlation to the underlying latent variable of the factor yielded a value of 0.648 indicating the reliability of the factor.

• "Factor Three was labelled as "social support". The factor included four items. The lowest Correlation to the underlying latent variable of the factor yielded a value of 0.700 indicating the reliability of the factor.

• "Factor four was labelled as "Self Efficacy". The factor included four items. The lowest Correlation to the underlying latent variable of the factor yielded a value of 0.535 indicating the reliability of the factor.

Eighteen items (descriptors) of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions were rotated to find their factor loading. From the total of eighteen descriptors, all eighteen items had factor loading above 0.3 and were retained.

Regression and Hypotheses Testing

The study employed the simple linear regression to test for an association between the variables. The summary of the multiple linear regression models is presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6 MODEL SUMMARY					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.418[a]	0.444	0.402	0.557	1.678

a. Predictors: (Constant), Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions
b. Dependent Variable: social entrepreneurship intentions

Based on the results in Table 6, the model can be accepted as fit. In this case, the "Adjusted R Square is used to determine how well a regression model fits the data. $R2 = 0.444$, and the adjusted $R2 = 0.402$ suggest that the independent variables explain over 40% of the variability of the dependent variable. Durbin-Watson = 1.678 suggesting that there is no multicollinearity and the model was appropriate for hypothesis testing.

Since the model is appropriate, ANOVA was used to test whether the data was fit for a regression model. The ANOVA table is presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7 ANOVA STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.371	1	4.371	9.470	0.002[b]
	Residual	137.549	298	.462		
	Total	141.920	299			

a. Dependent Variable: social entrepreneurship intentions
b. Predictors: (Constant), Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

The F-ratio presented in Table 7 is meant to test whether the actual regression model used in this analysis is fit for the available data. The results presented shows that the predictor variables statistically and significantly predict the dependent variable, F(9.470) with a mean square of "4.371", and a p=0.002; the sig or p-value is less than 0.05 (P<0.05) therefore "the regression model is a good fit of the data".

Table 8 STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES MODEL COEFFICIENTS					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
Model	**B**	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
1 (Constant)	2.526	0.300		8.426	0.000
Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions	0.239	0.078	0.175	3.077	0.002

a. Social entrepreneurship intentions

Assuming a prediction (probability) of, $p < 0.05$, it suggests that there is a significant relationship between the dependant variable and the independent variable.

Hypotheses Testing

H_1:   *The four determinants (Social Support, Self-efficacy, Moral Obligation, and Empathy) have no influence on SEI.*

According to the results from table 8, determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions are statistically significant at prediction (probability), $p < 0.05$ (B=0.239, P=0.002). The positive Beta of "0.239" suggests that determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions have a positive relationship with social entrepreneurial intentions.

As a result, we reject the null hypothesis that states that the four determinants (social support, self-efficacy, moral obligation, and empathy) have no influence on social entrepreneurial intentions. We therefore conclude that social support, self-efficacy, moral obligation, and empathy have an influence on social entrepreneurial intentions.

Multiple Linear Regressions

In order to determine the association between the four determinants of social entrepreneurship intention on social entrepreneurial intentions of students, multiple regression was used. The summary of the multiple linear regression model is presented in Table 9 below.

Table 9 MODEL SUMMARY					
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Durbin-Watson**
1	0.241[a]	0.558	0.545	0.473	1.671

a. Dependent Variable: Social entrepreneurship intentions

Based on the results in Table 9 above, the model can be accepted fit. $R^2 = 0.558$, and the adjusted $R^2 = 0.545$ suggest that the independent variables explain over 54% of the variability of the dependent variable. Durbin-Watson = 1.671 suggesting that there is no multicollinearity and the model was appropriate for hypothesis testing. ANOVA was used to test whether the data was fit for a regression model and the results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 ANOVA STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE					
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.245	4	2.061	4.549	0.001[b]
	Residual	133.675	295	0.453		
	Total	141.920	299			

a. Dependent Variable: Social entrepreneurship intentions
b. Predictors: (Constant), Empathy, Self-efficacy, Moral Obligation, Social Support

The F-ratio presented in Table 10 is meant to test whether the actual regression model used in this analysis is fit for the available data. The results presented shows that the predictor variables statistically and significantly predict the dependent variable F(4.549) with a mean square of "2.061", and a p=0.001; the sig or p-value is less than 0.05 (P<0.05) therefore "the regression model is a good fit of the data".

Table 11 STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES MODEL COEFFICIENTS						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.034	0.404		5.041	0.000
	Social Support	0.161	0.062	0.160	2.611	0.009
	Self-efficacy	0.252	0.262	0.253	0.998	0.040
	Moral Obligation	0.174	0.056	0.182	3.113	0.002
	Empathy	0.288	0.280	0.262	1.099	0.027

a. Dependent Variable: Social entrepreneurship intentions

Assuming a prediction (probability) of, p<0.05, it suggests that there is a significant relationship between the dependant variable and the independent variable.

H₂: *There is no relationship between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions.*

According to the readings from Table 11, empathy is statistically significant p<0.05 (B=0.288, p=0.027). The positive Beta of "0.288" suggests that empathy presents a positive relationship with social entrepreneurial intention. As a result, we reject the null hypothesis that states that there is no relationship between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions. We therefore conclude that there is a relationship between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions. These results are consistent with Hockerts (2017) who proposes that an individual that reads literature that is empathic-focused tends to have a higher social entrepreneurial intent.

H₃: *There is no relationship between moral obligation and social entrepreneurial intentions.*

According to the readings from Table 11, Moral obligation is statistically significant p<0.05 (B=0.174, p=0.002). The positive Beta of "0.174" suggests that moral obligation presents a positive relationship with social entrepreneurial intentions. As a result, we reject the null hypothesis that states that there is no relationship between moral obligation and social entrepreneurial intentions. We therefore conclude that there is a relationship between moral obligation and social entrepreneurial intentions.

These results are consistent with Hockerts (2017) who states that social norms imply a moral obligation to help people treated as insignificant resulting in the formation of moral intent leading to social entrepreneurial intentions.

H₄: *There is no relationship between self-efficacy and social entrepreneurial intentions.*

According to the readings from table 11, self-efficacy is statistically significant $p<0.05$ (B=0.252, P=0.040). The positive Beta of "0.252" suggest that self-efficacy presents a positive relationship with social entrepreneurial intentions. As a result, we reject the null hypothesis that states that there is no relationship between self-efficacy and social entrepreneurial intentions. We therefore conclude that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and social entrepreneurial intentions. These results are consistent with Ramadani et al. (2015) who stated that individuals with high self-efficacy tend to have strong entrepreneurial intentions.

H₅: *There is no relationship between social support and social entrepreneurial intentions.*

According to the readings from table 11, Social support is statistically significant $p<0.05$ (B=0.161, p=0.009). The positive Beta of "0.161" suggests that social support presents a positive relationship with social entrepreneurial intention. As a result, we reject the null hypothesis that states that there is no relationship between social support and social entrepreneurial intentions. We therefore conclude that there is a relationship between social support and social entrepreneurial intentions. These results are consistent with Hockerts (2017) who states that the individual is concerned about what sort of funding or any form of assistance can they acquire from support systems for their efforts.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study sought to investigate factors that influence social entrepreneurial intentions of students at a university in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. The study identified four factors that influence social entrepreneurial intentions, and these are empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy, and social support. The analysis conducted revealed that these factors have an effect on social entrepreneurial intentions.

The results of this study revealed that empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy, and social support are factors that influence social entrepreneurial intentions. From these findings, it is clear that there is a need to motivate and guide students who want to start their own social venture. Also, a culture to help others through innovative means need to be developed and promoted in universities and institutions of higher learning.

There is need for the government, the private sector and all other parties that promote social entrepreneurship to help improve access to resources as this has been found as important in influencing social entrepreneurial intentions. Support should be provided for those who are already in the process of establishing social entrepreneurial ventures.

There is need to support learning that promotes social entrepreneurship, and social entrepreneurship should be promoted at universities. Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that universities should put structures and systems that can guide those students who aspire to become social entrepreneurs.

Since social entrepreneurship has proven to be a promising strategy to eradicate some of the social challenges in South Africa, policies can be put in place to help aspiring social

entrepreneurs in terms of finances, information, or guidance to ensure that the ventures established survive.

AREAS FOR FUTURE STUDY

According to the findings of this study, empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy, and social support are factors that influence social entrepreurial intentions among students at the University of Fort Hare. The literature on social entrepreneurship in South Africa is relatively low, therefore it is recommended that future research further explore and identify factors using a larger sample and also using different methodologies such as qualitative methodologies.

Another avenue for future research could focus on exploring the effect of factors such as culture, personality traits, and attitude towards social entrepreneurship on social entrepreneurial intentions of university students. Since this study only focused on students, future research can also focus on factors that influence social entrepreneurial intentions of the youth in general.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was quantitative in nature; therefore it was limited to proving hypotheses and objectives through statistical methods. The study was also limited to one university in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. Although the sample size of this study was consistent with other previous similar studies, the findings of this study cannot be generalised for all universities in South Africa.

REFERENCES

Bahri, S. (2016). Factors Affecting the Quality of Accounting Implementation in Women's Cooperatives in the District of Pamekasan City, Pamekasan Regency. *Scientific Journal of Asian Business and Economics, 10*(2), 49-56.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. Organizational behaviour and human decision processes, *50*(2), 179-211.

Ayob, N., Yap, C.S., Sapuan, D, & Rashid, M.Z. (2013). Social entrepreneurial intention among business undergraduates: an emerging economy perspective. *International Journal of Business, 15*(3), 249–267.

Brannback, M, & Carsrud, A.L. (2017). Revisiting the Entrepreneurial Mind: Inside the Black Box. Expanded Edition. Switzerland: Springer.

Brinckerhoff, P.C. (2000). Social Entrepreneurship: The Art of Mission-Based Venture Development. Wiley.

Chan, A.N.W. (2015). Social support for improved work integration Perspectives from Canadian social purpose enterprises. *Social Enterprise Journal, 11*(1), 47-68.

Cukier, W., Trenholm, S., Carl D. & Gekas, G. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Content Analysis. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability, 7*(1), 99-119.

Dees, J.G. (1998). The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship.

Gonzalez, R. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship, Empathy, and Change making. Ashoka

Hockerts, K. (2015). Antecedents of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Validation Study. *Social Enterprise Journal, 11*(3), 260-80.

Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 1*(1), 1-46.

Hsu, C, & Wang, S. (2018). 'Social entrepreneurial intentions and its influential factors: A comparison of students in Taiwan and Hong Kong', Taylor & Francis Online.

Ip, C.Y., Wu, S.C., Liu, H.C, & Liang, C. (2017). Revisiting the Antecedents of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Educational Psychology, 6*(3), 301-23.

Kanonuhwa, M., Rungani, E.C. & Chimucheka, T. (2018). The association between emotional intelligence and entrepreneurship as a career choice: A study on university students in South Africa. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(0), 1-9.

Kazmi, S.M., Hammad, A., Ahmed, A, & Zulfiqar, S. (2019). Impact of Internal Cognitive Factors on Social Entrepreneurial Intention. *Business and Economic Research, 9*(1), 106-22.

Kopec-Massey, A. (2017). Exploring the role of empathy in social enterprise', Nectar

Lacap, J.P.G. (2018). Social Entrepreneurial Intentions of University Students in Pampanga, Philippines. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business, 6*(1), 1-16.

Lekhanya, L.M. (2015). The Role of Universities in Promoting Social Entrepreneurship in South Africa. *Journal of Governance and Regulation, 4*(3), 67-71.

Mair J, & Noboa, E. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: How Intentions to Create a Social Venture are Formed. In: Mair J., Robinson J., Hockerts K. (eds) Social Entrepreneurship. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Mair, J, & I. Marti. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 36–44.

Mair, J, & Noboa, E. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social enterprise get formed. *IESE Business School*, 521.

Malhotra, N. (2010). Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation. 6th Edition. London: Pearson Education.

Manyaka, S.J. (2015). Social entrepreneurship: A solution for transforming the disadvantaged community of Nellmapius. *Theological Studies, 71*(3), 1-7.

Meyskens, M., Robb-Post, C., Stamp, J.A., Carsrud, A.L, & Reynolds P.D. (2010). Social Ventures from a Resource-Based Perspective: An Exploratory Study Assessing Global Ashoka Fellows. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 34*(4), 661-80.

Ramadani, V., Gërguri-Rashiti, S, & Fayolle, A. (2015). Female Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies: Trends and Challenges. 1st Edition. Palgrave McMillan.

Ruttmann, R. (2012). Investing for Impact: How social entrepreneurship is redefining the meaning of return. *Credit Suisse Research Institute and Schwab Foundation, 1*(1), 1-58.

Saifan, S.A. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Definition and Boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 1*(1), 22-27.

Shapero, A, & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimension of entrepreneurship. In Kent, C.A., Sexton, D.L. and Vesper, K.H. (Eds.): Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship, 72–90.

Shin, C. (2018). How Social Entrepreneurs Affect Performance of Social Enterprises in Korea: The Mediating Effect of Innovativeness. Sustainability, 10(2643), 1-14.

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W, & Lumpkin, G.T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 3*(2), 161-94

Smith, W. & Darko, E. (2014). Social enterprise: constraints and opportunities – evidence from Vietnam and Kenya. *Social Enterprise Journal*.

Thompson, E.R. (2009). Individual entrepreneurial intent: construct clarification and development of an internationally reliable metric. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 33*(3), 669-694.

Tiwari, P., Bhat, A.K, & Tikoria, J. (2017). An empirical analysis of the factors affecting social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research, 7*(9), 1-25.

Tran, A.T.P, & Von Korflesch, 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.

Tran, A.T.P. (2017). Factors influencing social entrepreneurial intention: a theoretical model. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science, 3*(12), 38-44.

Trivedi, C. (2010). Towards a social ecological framework for social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, 19*(1), 63-80.

Urban, B, & Kujinga, L. (2017). Towards Social Change: South African University Students as Social Entrepreneurs. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 31*(1), 243-59.

Van der Westhuizen, M, & Swart, I. (2015). The struggle against poverty, unemployment and social injustice in present-day South Africa: Exploring the involvement of the Dutch Reformed Church at congregational level. *Stellenbosch -Theological Journal, 1*(2), 732-59.

Waddock, S.A, & Post, J.E. (1991). Social Entrepreneurs and Catalytic Change. *Public Administration Review, 51*(5), 393-401.

Walker, M. (2015). Advancing student well-being and agency: Outline of a 'capabilities-friendly' approach. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 29*(5), 279–96.

Wongnaa, C.A, & Seyram, Z.K. (2014). Factors influencing polytechnic students' decision to graduate as entrepreneurs. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research, 2*(2), 1-13.

Wood, S. (2012). Prone to Progress: Using Personality to Identify Supporters of Innovative Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 31*(1), 129-141.

Zakaria, M.N, & Bahrein, A.B.A. (2018). Formation of Social Entrepreneurship Intention in Malaysia. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Social Science & Innovation, 2*(2), 57-69.