SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP ORIENTATION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS –AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Joseph Regy* Dr. D H Malini **

*Research Scholar, Management, Pondicherry University, Karaikal, India. ** Assistant Professor, Pondicherry University, Karaikal, India.

Abstract

This paper studies social entrepreneurial intention of youngsters. What motivates them to start it, can we enhance it so that its becomes a facilitating factor even for the government with respect to upliftment of skills, income levels indirectly helping india achieve a positive impact in the lives of underrepresented, marginal people.

The present paper is based on empirical work by collecting data from different branches of college students. Data analysis was done on various independent parameters such as gender, age, educational level, work experience with the above mentioned -social entrepreneurial intention. The objective of the study is to measure social entrepreneurial intention level of college students and investigate the factors which enhance it. The results showed positive connection between empathy and intentions.

Key Words: - Social entrepreneurship, College students, Creativity, Empathy

Introduction

Entrepreneurs are people who start a venture with an aim of earning profits. But Social entrepreneurship is about creating a venture which achieves some objectives other than profit. For a social entrepreneur, primary motive is not making money but addressing a local issue, which his organization will help in doing like increasing the livelihood of local people. And identifying social entrepreneurial intention among different generations of people in a society is the need of the hour to help government achieve its targets of better standards of lives for its citizens.

Why is Social entrepreneurship needed

Social entrepreneurship is needed because india has a large population and limited budget. With its limited budget the government cannot cater to each and every needs of every section of the society. Hence it needs the support of people who can work hand in hand with government in uplifting the lives of its people by starting ventures who may not give very high economic prosperity but atleast something to sustain themselves where government finds itself tied due to resource constraints. These venturists who ignore the trappings of pure commercial units and dedicate their lives for other objectives what motivates them, what keep them going everyday. If theses can be taught or inculcated to youngster who in their own way can help the society by improving the lives of certain section, it shall greatly facilitate the governments objectives of improving people lives.

Need and significance of the study

In India there is a lot of population in rural villages who may not have the right technical skills or education to enter the organized workforce. Neither do they have the financial ability to seeks the required education as per the choices. Many such youngster instead of being unemployed can be given small trainings which enhance their skills which help them in seeking a decent livelihood. They may not have the intial capital to invest in business also. Hence they migrate to cities doing very menial jobs and continue to have same standard of living or below that also. If a person with a socialistic mindset starts an enterprise which utilizes the existing skills to run the enterprise or trains them on the job for different activities they can later on move on and become independent and improve their lives economically instead of being a dependent on government agencies for survival.

Hence the Social Entrepreneurship should be promoted in our country who can do a lots of work in this area like giving inputs for skill development or upgrading existing skills, promote local manufacture of goods from locally available material enhancing local economy etc to enhance indicators like improvement of living standards or preserving a particular art or tradition or make select sections of society independent and not become a burden to the state.

Theoretical underpinnings of social entrepreneurial intention

The intention why a person will start a social entrepreneurship is explained through norm activation theory . As per this social psychological theory , starting a SE venture is prosocial behavior(schwartz,1977) in which the entrepreneur thinks of the benefit of others more than his .

Prosocial behaviour results from the activation of personal norms.

Personal norm is a person own moral obligation to perform a behavior . The stronger the personal norm stronger is the intention to actually perform the behavior of starting the social enterprise to address an issue which the entrepreneurs wishes to.

According to Schwartz (1977) Problem awareness is the prior knowledge of the adverse consequences of not acting prosocially for others which is called as awareness of consequences. Next is onus of responsibility reflects that when an action is not taken the responsibility lies with the person who does not do prosocial actions ,which is termed as ascription of responsibility (AR). Based on this , the SE takes action of starting a venture to address a local issue which results in prosocial behavior.

This paper attempts to identify social entrepreneurial intention of college students. It tries to find out what makes a young person start a social venture instead of a purely commercial venture. How does the future generation of the country feel about joining hands with the government in tackling local and social issues? Can these factors be imbibed during college years when a youngster comes to deal with people from different backgrounds in his day to day life and is taking first steps towards independency or is it something which starts right from childhood or the environment in which they find themselves during formative years.

OBJECTIVES

- 1.To measure the level of social entrepreneurship orientation of college students.
- 2. To identify the factors which contribute to social entrepreneurial intention

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the academic literature, a number of definitions have been provided for the term social entrepreneurship

Dees (1998a: 4) states that social entrepreneurs, upon adopting a social mission, create social value by recognising and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities, continuously innovating, adapting, and learning, and by acting boldly without being limited by the resources at hand

As per Dees(1998a: 4) an entrepreneurship with a social motive always creates social value by identifying new opportunities ,innovating ,adapting, and learning, and by acting boldly without being limited by the resources at hand.

Leadbeater (1997) states that social entrepreneurs are entrepreneurial, innovative, and transformatory. They are able to perceive opportunities in under-utilised and discarded resources to use them in new ways to satisfy unmet needs

Nga and Shamugunathan (2010) investigate the personality traits that influence social entrepreneurial start-up intentions. The authors in their paper had proposed five social entrepreneurship dimensions These dimensions are: social vision, sustainability, social networking, innovation, and financial returns.

Noboa (2006) developed a theoretical framework of social entrepreneurial intentions and suggested that empathy, moral judgement, self-efficacy, and social support are the four antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions.

Hockerts (2017) extended Mair and Noboa's (2006) model by including one additional antecedent—prior experience with social problems. As per him the a student with these five dimensions like empathy, moral obligation, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, perceived social support, and prior experience with social problem will have more intention to start a social venture.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection: The present research is a cross sectional descriptive study and is based on primary data. The Primary data has been collected from a college having branches in Bangalore.

A structured questionnaire was adopted for collecting primary data as also the literature and interview has been conducted with students of a reputed colleges and branches of the college.

Secondary sources include information from the journals, periodicals, magazines and practioners articles.

The Tool:A detailed questionnaire is designed keeping in view the objectives of the study and administered among samplerespondents. The questionnaire has two sections, with five point Likert rating scale, ranging, 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=can't say, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.

The questionnaire consisting of 18 questions was made after referring to SEAS questions by Kai Hockert. .

Section A: Personal information of respondents was sought. It constitutes age group, experience, gender, marital status of therespondents.

Section B: This section is regarding factors for finding out social entrepreneurial orientation of students.

Sample Size: Samples of 130 responses was included for this study although questions were sent to 250 respondents. Hence response rate was 52 %. All the students of college was sent an online questionnaire through googledocs.

Sampling Method: Simple random sampling method was adopted. It is a probability sampling technique. Respondents considered for data collection were at various positions at graduation, post graduation level from the different branches of the college.

A personal visit to all the classrooms of college stores was made by the researcher meeting the students explaining the idea behind the survey. Afterwards interviews with select department heads hardcopy of the questionnaire was distributed for filling on the spot. Repeated follow-up through mail and telephone was done through to ensure maximum participation.

DATA ANALYSIS

Gender: Table 1.1:showing the frequency of gender

Gender of respondents	Numbers	(%)
Male	39	30%
Female	91	70%
Total	130	100%

Experience

Table 1.2: showing Work experience

Work experience	0	0-2 year	2-4 yrs	4-6	Total
				years	
Number	99	25	4	2	130
(%)	76%	19.2%	3.07 %	1.53%	100%

Designation

Table 1.3:showing the designation

Age group	Numbers	(%)
17-21yrs	48	36.9 %
22-26yrs	78	60 %
27-32yrs	4	3.07%
	130	100

Educational level

Table 1.4:showing educational level of students respondent

Education	Numbers	(%)
Postgraduate	73	56%
Undergraduate	57	44%
	130	100%

Table 1.5 Descriptive statistics for Social entrepreneurship orientation of college students .

	Tota	l(130)	Male(44)		Female(86)	
Items	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1)When thinking about socially	1.93	3.96	2.42	3.41	1.79	4.16
disadvantaged people, I try to put			/ /			
myself in their shoes.						
2)I don't care how people feel who	3	3.16	2.88	2.99	3.17	3.18
live on the margins of society.						
				1		
3)Seeing socially disadvantaged	1.99	3.88	2.42	3.41	1.86	4.06
people triggers an emotional response						
in me.	2.00	2.16	0.14	0.177	0.17	2.104
4)I do not experience much emotion	3.09	3.16	3.14	3.177	3.17	3.184
when thinking about socially						
excluded people.	2.11	3.73	2.33	3.49	2.09	3.76
5)I feel compassion for socially marginalized people.	2.11	3./3	2.33	3.49	2.09	3.76
marginanzed people.						
6)I find it difficult to feel	3.11	3.17	2.33	3.49	3.32	3.24
compassionate for people less	3.11	3.17	2.33	3.47	3.32	3.24
fortunate than myself.						
7)It is an ethical responsibility to help	2.02	3.84	2.3	2.29	1.96	3.92
people less fortunate than ourselves.						
8)We are morally obliged to help	1.97	1.714	2.23	3.60	1.93	3.96
socially disadvantaged people.						
			•	•	•	•
9)Social justice requires that we help	2.02	3.84	2.23	3.60	2	3.87
those who are less fortunate than						
ourselves.						

2.06	3.79	2.38	3.44	2.01	3.86
1.93	3.96	2	3.87	1.97	3.91
2.03	3.83	2.16	3.67	2.04	3.82
2.1	3.74	2.23	3.60	2.12	3.72
					•
2.11	3.73	2.64	3.26	3.1	3.17
2.15	3.68	2.09	3.76	2.26	3.56
2.3	3.52	2.33	3.18	2.37	3.46
2.06	3.81	2.09	3.76	2.12	3.72
2.7	3.23	2.47	3.37	2.9	3.170
	2.03 2.11 2.11 2.15 2.23	1.93 3.96 2.03 3.83 2.1 3.74 2.15 3.68 2.3 3.52 2.06 3.81	1.93 3.96 2 2.03 3.83 2.16 2.1 3.74 2.23 2.15 3.68 2.09 2.3 3.52 2.33 2.06 3.81 2.09	1.93 3.96 2 3.87 2.03 3.83 2.16 3.67 2.1 3.74 2.23 3.60 2.11 3.73 2.64 3.26 2.15 3.68 2.09 3.76 2.3 3.52 2.33 3.18 2.06 3.81 2.09 3.76	1.93 3.96 2 3.87 1.97 2.03 3.83 2.16 3.67 2.04 2.1 3.74 2.23 3.60 2.12 2.11 3.73 2.64 3.26 3.1 2.15 3.68 2.09 3.76 2.26 2.3 3.52 2.33 3.18 2.37 2.06 3.81 2.09 3.76 2.12

^{*}number in brackets denotes the number of respondents

Interpretation: The first question in the table shows the responses of respondents on factors related to socially disadvantaged people. Most of the respondents feel that they felt empathy for socially disadvantaged people with (mean=1.93).

The second question in the table show the responses of respondents on factors related to Peoples feelings. Respondents strongly agree with of (mean= 3).

The third question in the table indicates the responses for triggering an emotional response . Very less respondents agreed with (mean of = 1.99).

Many respondents feel strongly and do not experience much emotion when thinking about socially excluded people with (mean = 3.09).

Majority of the respondents feel that they have compassion for socially marginalized people having a (mean = 2.11) as shown by the fifth question.

The sixth question in the table indicates response to feel compassionate for people less fortunate than themselves.. The respondents do strongly agree this statement with (mean= 3.11).

In the seventh question, respondents also agree that its peoples ethical responsibility to help people less fortunate than themselves. The scored mean was = 2.02)

In the eighth question, few respondents agree that the people morally obliged to help socially disadvantaged people having scored a (mean of =1.97).

Most of the respondents, feel in the ninth question that they should help those who are less fortunate than ourselves. The students agreed with this statement with a (mean score of =2.02).

A very high percentage of respondents in the tenth question with (mean=2.06) feel that they one of the principles of our society that we should help socially disadvantaged people.

In the eleventh question, many respondents felt that solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to with a mean of 1.93

In the twelvth question, many respondents agree with the statement that they are convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it with a mean of 2.03.

In the thirteenth question, many respondents agree with the statement that they could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces with a mean of =2.1

In the fourteenth question many respondents strongly agreed with the statement that they do not believe it would be possible for them to bring about significant social change with a mean of 2.11

In the fifteenth question many respondents agreed that it is possible to attract investors for an organization that wants to solve social problems with a mean of 2.15.

In the sixteenth question many respondents agreed that if I wanted to start an organization to help socially marginalized people with mean of 2.3.

In the seventeenth question many respondents responded that if they planned to address a significant societal problem people would back them up with a mean of 2.06.

In the eighteenth question respondents strongly agreed that they do not expect that they would receive much support if they were to start a social enterprise with a mean of 2.7.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

As per the literature, very few percentage of students will venture into social entrepreneurship given the amount of intial hardship faced, lack of funding and marketability of the products made during the venture. Although some did want to do something about the marginal sections of society but dithered due to lack of organized pattern or due to uncertainties with respect to running a social enterprise compared to a purely commercial venture. Our empirical study taking a college as an example has affirmed it.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Respondents are limited only to Bangalore city, Karnataka. This study is confined only to student of only one college. It is assumed that the respondents have provided genuine inputs and reflect true experience. Responses were taken only from those who agreed to give their valuable inputs.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- 1. The study can also be done geographically across different Indian cities.
- 2. The study was conducted in 6 branches of one college taking response of ug and pg but can be extended to other colleges.
- 3. The study was conducted can be extended to different age groups to see the level of social entrepreneurial intention.
- 4. The study was conducted only in one sector but other sectors can also be studied and comparative studies can also be done across different verticals like vocational institutes, professional institutes for better representativeness.
- *The present work is part of research work undertaken by the first author in Pondicherry University.

REFERENCES

- 1)Brock, D. 2011. Social entrepreneurship education resource handbook. Ashoka U Global Academy for Social Entrepreneurship.
- 2)Cheng, P., & Chu, M. 2014. Behavioral Factors Affecting Students' Intentions to Enroll in Business Ethics Courses: A Comparison of the Theory of Planned Behavior and Social Cognitive Theory. Journal of Business Ethics, 124(35): 35–46.
- 3)Ching Yin Ip et. al., (2017) "Revisiting the Antecedents of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions in Hong Kong", IJEP International Journal of Educational Psychology
- 4)Chlosta, S., Patzelt, H., Klein, S. B., & Dormann, C. 2012. Parental role models and the decision to become self-employed: The moderating effect of personality. Small Business Economics, 38(1): 121–138.
- 5)Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. 2011. Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions. Organization Science.
- 6)Datta, P. B., & Gailey, R. 2012. Empowering Women Through Social Entrepreneurship: Case Study of a Women's Cooperative in India. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36(3): 569–587.
- 7)Hemingway, C. A. 2005. Personal Values as A Catalyst for Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Ethics, 60(3): 233–249.
- 8) Hockerts, K. 2007. Social Entrepreneurship. In W. Visser, D. Matten, M. Pohl, & N. Tolhurst (Eds.), The A-Z of Corporate Social Responsibility: 422. John Wiley & Sons.
- 9) Johanna Mair et.al. (2006), "Social entrepreneurship".
- 10) Kaiser, F. G. 2006. A moral extension of the theory of planned behavior: Norms and anticipated feelings of regret in conservationism. Personality and Individual Differences, 41(1): 71–81.
- 11)Kai Hockerts,(2017)" Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions"
- 12) Kautonen, T., Luoto, S., & Tornikoski, E. T. 2010. Influence of work history on entrepreneurial intentions in "prime age" and "third age": A preliminary study. International Small Business Journal, 28(6): 583–60