Psychological factors predicting social entrepreneurial intention among final year undergraduates

Wakil Ajibola Asekun
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos

Abstract

The need to attract more young people into social enterprise has become necessary considering the numerous social problems confronting many societies in the world today. This study examined the psycho-social variables that motivate young men and women to engage in social enterprise, thus, It investigated the extent to which personality traits, self-efficacy and social capital influence social entrepreneurial intention. The sample of the study was made of 248 final year students randomly selected in one of the public universities in south west of Nigeria with a mean age of 24 and a standard deviation of 1.50. Participants responded to questionnaires that measured entrepreneurial intention, personality traits, self-efficacy and social capital. Collected data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study found a significant relationship between personality traits and social entrepreneuship intention. Moreover, self-efficacy was found to account for significant variances in participants' social entrepreneurial intention. The study also found that social capital has a significant influence on social entrepreneurial intention. The study discussed the implications of the findings on the training needs of prospective entrepreneurs.

Keyword: Entrepreneurship, social capital, personality traits, self-efficacy

Introduction.

Conventional Entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship may look somewhat the same however, the difference between the two has been pointed out clearly in literature. The two are similar in the sense that they both describe processes of organisational emergence (Mthembu & Bernard 2019; Garteber etal., 1992) or processes of seizing opportunities about resources available in the creation of new products and services, however, the distinction between entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship lies in the former being more concerned with economic value while the latter is basically concerned with social value. While the conventional entrepreneurs are more interested in the monetary gains arising from their investment and growing their businesses, the social entrepreneurs are focused on meeting individual and social needs. (Welsh & Krueger, 2013). Social entrepreneurs hold the view that there is more to life than just making money, thus they provide goods and services to care for people and making the world thereby making the world a better place

Social entrepreneurship is becoming increasingly important to the people in government, members of the public, and the global communities (Mair & Marti, 2006). The reason for this interest is obvious, there is a wide gap in the provision of social services by government and development agencies for people of communities, particularly in developing countries, this is due to other competing priorities, thus, social entrepreneurs come in to fill this important gap. It has also been observed that social entrepreneurship is now playing the role of developing new markets and helping in poverty reduction particularly in low-income countries. (Lall & Park, 2020; Power et al., 2012). This positive trend has been seen as a welcome development and need to be supported by international development partners Castresana, 2013). The aroused interest in social entrepreneurship among people in governments and other relevant bodies has consequently led to the formation and implementation of an array of public policies as well as the emergence of associations and organizations, with the aim of encouraging citizens to start social enterprises (Mazzei & Roy, 2017). In spite of the attention that social entrepreneurship has gained which has also invariably influenced curriculum development and its teaching in the universities, the actual social enterprises appear to be on the decline (Abrahmson et al., 2019), this may be due to dearth of knowledge in terms of competencies and skills that students need in this field Faseyiku & Asekun, 2012). It thus becomes imperative to investigate the psychological attributes that are cursors to social entrepreneurial intention that may be made to become integral part of any training.

In Africa, although there are no figures for how many social enterprises have been started across the continent, it is nonetheless a growing sector which is making visible impact in the life of the people and the economies of the countries. For example, in a published data from Entrepreneurship Monitor's (EM) Social Entrepreneurship Report, about 3.2% of the world's population is starting social ventures and they are in Africa. The co-operatives account for 45% of Kenya's gross domestic product, generating more revenue than either public or private sectors. (British Council, 2019). Similarly, in Sierra Leone a social enterprise was founded by a youth to provide pay-as-you-go solar-powered lighting and charging systems to people with no electricity access in the country and has successfully provided the needed access to the underserved 15 of the 16 districts in the nation and also extending this service to Liberia. Also, in Ghana, a social enterprise manages prescription inventory for pharmacies to make medicines more affordable for people of Ghana. It grew into acquiring Kenya's second-biggest pharmacy chain in 2019 and it

recently launched new initiatives including a financing programme for breast cancer treatment in Nigeria (Peyton, 2019). And finally, Peyton also reported in his study a social enterprise founded in Nigeria which created a digital platform that connects farmers with small investors who could fund their farming activities during farming season and collect small profits when they harvest.

The aim of the scheme was to reduce hunger and poverty by increasing food production with well over 25,000 small-scale farmers in the scheme. According to the results from a recent study in Nigeria social entrepreneurship and technology diffusion would have a significant impact on future employment. In fact social entrepreneurship may contribute approximately 21% to the employment level in the future (Osabohien et al, 2022). These are just a few instances in Africa, the list is growing and the prospects look very promising.

Theoretical framework

Theory of Planned Behaviour

Ajzen (1991) proposed in his theory of Planned Behaviour, that a planned behaviour is a product of an individual's perceived intention, which is usually influenced by three factors that includes attitude towards behaviour, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control, these factors are considered to be the hypothetically impetus that determine intentions to perform a behaviour. Further, Mair and Noboa (2006) observed that if a society wants more social entrepreneurs, higher educational institutions should design a curriculum that aims at enhancing social entrepreneurship desirability and social entrepreneurship feasibility. Hockert's (2017) study confirmed the model in which he called attention, however, to *prior experience* as a variable that represents a starting point in social entrepreneurial intention formation.

These are thus the two intention-based models which have been well embraced in entrepreneurial intentions and behaviour studies (e.g., Chen et al, 2015; Farooq, 2016; Farooq & Radovic-Markovic, 2016).

Literature Review.

Personality and social entrepreneurship.

Personality as a psychological construct is often described in multiple ways; typically, it depicts a pattern of behavioural, emotional, mental, and personal characteristics (Costello, 1997). Schultz and Schultz (2005) defined personality as "the unique, relatively enduring internal and external aspects of a person's character that influence behaviour in different situations" (p. 10). Due to an assumption that entrepreneurs are people with peculiar attributes or traits, there is a consensus among entrepreneurship scholars about the critical role of personality traits as determinants of entrepreneurial decisions and behaviours, this is responsible for its long tradition in the field of research in entrepreneurship. Farrukh et al., 2018). Thus, studies have shown how personality traits influence entrepreneurial intent. (e.g., Collins et al., 2004; Zhao & Seibert, 2006; Rauch and Frese, 2007; Zhao et al., 2010)

The relationship between personality and entrepreneurial intention can also be understood from a career choice perspective (e.g., Holland, 1997; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) and person – environment fit theory (Judge & Kristof-Brown, 2004). Holland describes one of his classifications of personality-based careers as a social personality, according to him this personality prefers activities that involve helping and developing others; an individual with such

a personality is sociable, friendly, cooperative, and understanding. These attributes may describe social entrepreneurs but may not describe non-social entrepreneurs who view enterprise strictly from economic point of view.(Luc, 2020a) The perspective is based on the empirical evidence that people chose a career that is congruent with their personality traits, values, needs and interests. Starting and managing a social enterprise require a social entrepreneur to engage in a number of special roles and tasks, e.g., as innovator, risk taker and bearer, marketer, executive manager, relationship builder, risk reducer, and goal achiever (Porter & Kramer, 2020; Chipeta & Surujlal, 2017). This view of entrepreneurial work is widely shared within the general population (e.g., Baron, 1999; Locke, 2000). Thus, based on sufficient evidence in literature personality constructs could be considered as an important determinant of the intention to become a social entrepreneur as well as the subsequent performance of the entrepreneurial firm (Bazkiaei et al., 2020; Murugesan & Jayavelu, 2017; Şahin et al., 2019).

Therefore**,** to capture the essence of personality as a construct, researchers decided to find clusters of common traits or factors that relate together (Eysenck 1994 & Eysenck, 1994). Although, there has been a controversy over whether there exists the appropriate number of factors it takes to adequately describe personality; scholarly efforts have brought up five broad personality factors which are commonly labelled as the "Big Five model" of personality (McRae & Costa, 1997), the five traits represent Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. These five traits are classified as 'broad' because they have been found to incorporate multiple facets or domains (Digman, 1990). A high volume of studies has been carried out by researchers in psychology and other allied disciplines to ascertain the appropriateness of the five-factor model on personality as a construct and quite interestingly, most of the studies found evidences corroborating the view that personality has five dimensions. Therefore, five factors revealed almost invariably in all researches led to the label "Five Factor Model" or "Big Five Personality Model." The five traits are discussed below:

Openness to experience: This personality trait describes individuals who are imaginative and who usually show the willingness to accept new ideas, they appear adventurous and curious. Past studies also show that people with high scores on openness dimension are unconventional in approach and independent in their thinking. This innovative pattern of thinking makes them prone to easy boredom particularly with what they consider as common or regular. They may be perceived by others as being selfish as they come across as people who always seek for exciting experiences (Burger, 2006). According to Costa and McRae (1997), people who are high on openness are never aversive to taking of risks, this willingness to take risk remains what distinguishes social entrepreneurs from others. Although the outcome of the activities conducted in social entrepreneurship is obtained after a longer period of time compared to normal entrepreneurship (Iregun & Arikogba, 2015; Preethi & Priyadarshini, 2018).

Conscientiousness: People who are high on this trait have been described as having a tendency of showing self-discipline consistently; they act dutifully, and strive for excellence. They are people considered as organized, determined, and behave as planned. Therefore, they are very meticulous and love to play by the rules. (Burger, 2006). Higher levels of conscientiousness could play a crucial role in the ability to show resilience in face of obstacles and tough situations that usually characterise the non-social and social enterprises.

Agreeableness: Agreeable people tend to be helpful, trustworthy, altruistic, affectionate and forgiving (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). They would rather cooperate than to compete, they avoid

conflicts as much as they can and love a tension-free work environment. (Eisenhardt & Schoonhoven, 1990; Shane & Cable, 2002). They are listener and empathetic (Caliendo, Kritikos, 2008). Agreeable people can also be considered as simple and devoted individuals. There is no gainsaying that scial entrepreneurs need to establish a mutual trust with others but he is liable to the failure or otherwise of the business when faced with tough situations, which sometimes requires the social entrepreneur to be self-centred or even manipulative (Zhao and Seibert, 2006). Some studies suggested that agreeableness is negatively related to becoming an entrepreneur (Wooten et al., 1999), similarly Zhao et al. (2010) in a meta-analysis reported that there was no significant correlation between the agreeableness construct of the Big Five model and social entrepreneurial intention.

Extroversion This trait describes people who are warm, positive and sociable. Rauch & Frese (2007) reported in their meta-analysis that entrepreneurs scored higher on extraversion than did managers. A similar result was reported in an earlier study (see Nordvik, 1998) Also, in a more recent study, entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs differed significantly on extraversion and openness to experience traits (Antoncic et al., 2015). Zhao et al. (2010) in their meta-analysis also found a positive relationship between extraversion and social entrepreneurial intention. In addition, it is claimed that people whose extraverted traits are dominant approach incidents from a positive angle, they are energetic, dominant, assertive and more interested in others whereas introverted people are timid, calm and they prefer solitude. As a result, being outgoing has positive impact on success of entrepreneurships (Caliendo, &Kritikos, 2008). It is also pointed out that the extroverted have high expectations for reward (Zhao, Seibert, 2006). Social entrepreneurs attend to problems they aim to solve in a determined way. Therefore, it can be stated that social entrepreneurs' extraversion personality trait should is expected to be at high level (Hwee & Shamuganathan, 2010).

Neuroticism: This personality trait shows the extent to which a person is emotionally stable concerning affective processes such as anger, anxiety, or vulnerability (Burger, 2006; Llewellyn, Wilson, 2003). Studies show that people who have the tendency of feeling such emotions are also inclined to having depressive emotions and sudden mood changes, they are found to be lacking in self-confidence. (Iregun & Arikogba, 2015). Social entrepreneurs by their nature are interested in providing solutions to people's problems although, this goal appears similar to non-social entrepreneurs who are also often confronted with diverse pressures. Anyone interested in social or non-social entrepreneurship are therefore expected to be emotionally stable, i.e., less neurotic to be able to carry on entrepreneurial activities well. Thus, it is logical to state that persons high in neuroticism may not be favourably disposed to starting a social enterprise or may not be successful as a social entrepreneur**.**

Social capital and social entrepreneurship

Social capital can be referred to as the social network that an individual have an access to, which if deployed to achieve a goal can lead to a favourable outcome. (Neergaard et al., 2005). Social capital is thus an outcome of human relationships that have been developed and kept through interactions.(McKeever et al., 2014). There are different social networking relationships that may be needed for starting or keeping a social enterprise, some individuals easily access such network while others may not (Acquaah, 2011). Size of social network refers to the number of individuals in the network and its composition refers to the degree to which the network consists of either

family members or friends (Allen, 2000). An individual must take active interest in gaining access to wide variety of sources of information which help to develop the enterprise. (Chamlee & Mayer, 2008). This is so because familial relationships have been found to play important role in business formation process, therefore, their relevance in social entrepreneurship should never be undermined (Hoang Antoncic, 2003). It offers a wide range of resources which includes emotional support among many others (Anderson et al, 2005).

A social entrepreneur also derives social capital from his affiliation to trade unions, business networks or friendships with business people, which help the social entrepreneur to become informed about the business he is about to engage in (Leek & Mason 2009). There is a strong argument canvassed by Kwanghui and Brain, (2010) that network connections and structure facilitate the flow of information and create the mutual trust and cooperation needed to have the courage to start a social enterprise. There are two types of social capital; bonding and bridging capitals, the bonding networks are connections among people who have close and personal relationships in important areas of life such as family and friends while bridging social networks connects individual with external relations and linkages (Gross & Putnam, 2004). Putnam and colleagues (2010) believed that we can accomplish more in life in a community with a high level social capital. In such a community, innovative ideas can be birthed and successfully translated to tangibles that can solve social problems thereby demonstrating the resilience of the people of a community. (Asekun & Ikihimoya, 2019). Similarly, Yuan and Gay, (2006) emphasised the role of a cohesive team in the development of bonding capital which in turn affects performance. Lancee (2016) found a strong association between bridging capital and individual economic performance. Moreover, social capital indicators showed a significant positive effect on subjective well-being and a critical resource for the promotion of individual and community well-being

Self – efficacy and social entrepreneurship

The belief in the self to succeed on a task motivates one's behaviour to make some efforts in order to attain success on the task. This is what self-efficacy as a construct is about. Although it is a multidimensional construct that varies depending on the area of interest (Zimmerman, 2000), and therefore needs to be examined at a level that is specific to the domain and the outcome. (Bandura, 1986; Pajares, 1996). Different theories and measures have been developed to explain this construct; of particular note is the Bandura's social cognitive theory; (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1982; Bandura, 1997, Lent et al., 1994; Lent et al., 2002). Going by his conceptualisation, a person would be willing to engage in a social enterprise if she thinks of succeeding in the pursuits of goals related to the venture. Young people will be willing to stake their youthful time, energy and resources in pursuit of social enterprises if they believe that their efforts would lead to desirable outcomes. For example, self-efficacy beliefs to career interests and choices, were found to have a high correlation in a meta-analysis in a social psychology study (Sheu et. al. 2010), Similarly, Schlaegel and Oenig (2014) found smaller average correlations values with entrepreneurship intention, and perceived behaviour control, when applied within the theory of planned behaviour, thus, integrating self-efficacy into a framework of entrepreneurial behavior will help our understanding of the entrepreneurial process much better (Jones, 1997). Again, self-efficacy was found to have a relationship with starting and persisting at behaviour in tough and uncertain conditions. (Bandura,1986). This may account for why some individuals launch growth-oriented firms in a turbulent economic situation and others

do not. In the same vein, Shane et al. (2003) also submitted that an entrepreneur who is high in self-efficacy is likely to strive to attain success at a greater length of time, despite setbacks, and grow better than an entrepreneur rated as low on the measure of self-efficacy. In explaining the sources of self-efficacy, Bandura (1977) stated that they are derived from four main sources and they include: performance achievements, dangerous past experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. Although these are also largely mediated by other cognitive antecedents (Ajzen, 1991).

Hypotheses

1. There would be a significant relationship between Personality traits and social entrepreneurial intention.
2. Self efficacy would have a significant influence on social entrepreneurial intention
3. Social capital would have a significant influence on social entrepreneurial intention.

Methodology

Participants and Setting

The survey was conducted among 248 participants who were final year students of a public University located in Lagos, South West Nigeria. 130 (52.4%) were males and 118 (47.6%) were females. The respondents were with the mean age of 24 and standard deviation of 2.5. As regards religion, 139 (56.0) participants indicated that they were Christians while 109 (44%) participants indicated that they were Muslims. Also, 195 (78.6%) responded that they were from a family where someone was an entrepreneur, while 53 (21.4%) responded that they were from a family where no one was an entrepreneur.

Measures

Social Entrepreneurial Intention Measure is a scale that was developed by Carraher, et al. (2016). It has a total of 11 items. The reliability coefficient alpha was estimated at 0.94 by the author. The scale taps the 3 components of intention (choice intention, commitment, and perceived behavioural control. The sample of the items include: "I am adopting a mission to create social value"," I am recognising new opportunities to serve my mission" All items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "1 = total disagreement" to "7 = total agreement." Cronbach alpha of this scale in this study is .83. A high score on an item indicates a high degree of agreement with the statement and translates to high social entrepreneurial intention.

Self-efficacy scale: Self-efficacy was measured by the General Self-efficacy scale adapted from Schwartzer and Jerusalem (1995). It has a total number of 10 items, the sample items are : I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want. It is a 5 point Likert scale ranging from "not well at all" to "very well" The Cronbach alpha for the study is 0.70. The author reported a Cronbach of 0,89. The higher the score on the measure, the greater the self-efficacy or confidence in the perceived ability to successfully manage or follow through with a social entrepreneurial effort.

Personality Measure: A version of the Big Five Personality Inventory Big Five Inventory‑10 (BFI‑10) adapted from Rammstedt, and John (2007) was used for the study. It is a 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English. The author reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.91.
The scale is on a 5-point Likert format which asks participants to respond to questions on: how well the following sample statements describe their personality: "I see myself as someone who is reserved "I consider myself as someone who is generally trusting". "I am relaxed, "I handle stress well" Participants select from these options for each of the statements: (1)"strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) strongly agree, A high score on an item in each of the dimension indicates a high level of the personality type.

Personal social capital scale was used to measure social capital; it consists of 10 composite items, based on 42 sub-items, with 5-point Likert scale. The measure was developed by Chen et all (2009). The Cronbach alphas are 0.83. The higher the score on the scale the more social capital the participant has an access to.

Procedure

The class representatives of the selected departments of the institution provided the researchers with the telephone numbers of students who showed interest in participating in the study. The link to the questionnaire was sent to the selected participants through WhatsApp. In all, 300 telephone contacts were gotten and all were contacted to help respond to the questionnaires sent to them. It took a period of three weeks to end the data collection process. Only 248 of the 300 students completed the survey. Collected data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Students were assured of confidentiality. They also gave their informed consent before participating in the study.

Data Analysis

SPSS version 23 was used in the analysis of collected data. Pearson Correlation analysis was employed to determine whether there would be a significant positive relationship between personality traits and social entrepreneurial intention, further, the study ran a regression to determine if social capital will predict social entrepreneurial intention.

Result

Demographics

Table 1.
Showing scores of participants' demographic characteristics

Category	Sub category	N	%
Gender	Male	130	52.4
	Female	118	47.6
Total		248	100
Age	20-25yrs	184	74.1
	26 and above	64	25.8
Total		248	100
Religion	Christianity	139	56.0
	Islam	109	44.0
Total		248	100
Entrepreneural Bavckground	Yes	195	78.6
	No	53	21.4
Total		248	100

The table above shows the demographic characteristics of the sample. There were more male respondents, approximately 52%, than female respondents, 48% who participated in the survey. About 74% of respondents fell into the age category of 20 and 25 years, while about 26% remaining were 26 years and above. The majority of the respondents, 78% said they had entrepreneurial background

Hypothesis 1:

There would be a significant relationship between self efficacy, personality traits social capital and social enentrepreneurial tention

Table 2.
Correlation matrix between, personality traits social entrepreneuship intention

	Entr. Int.	1	2	3	4	5	
p-value		-					
Openness to Exp.							
Pearson's r		0.810***	-				
p-value		<.001					
Agreeableness							
Pearson's r		0.858***	-0.672***	-			
p-value		<.001	<.001				
Conscietousness							
Pearson's r		0.511	-0.349***	0.438***	-		
p-value		<.001	<.001	<.001			
Extroversion							
Pearson's r		0.671***	-0.500***	0.618***	0.640***	-	
p-value		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		
Neuroticm							
Pearson's r		-0.075	-0.013	0.142	0.097	-0.059	-
p-value		0.467	0.909	0.210	0.397	0.606	
N		248	248	248	248	248	

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 2 displays the correlation matrix between personality traits (Openness to experience, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extroversion and Neuroticm, Whereas openness to experience trait correlate positively and significantly with social entrepreneurial intention at r = 0.81, p < .001 (n = 248), the relationship between agreeableness and social entrepreneurial intention was also positive and significant at r = 0.86, p < .001 (n = 248) and Conscientiousness = 0.67, p < .001 (n = 248) recorded significant and positive correlation with social entrepreneurial intention. Furthermore, the relationship between extroversion and social enterepreneural intention was equally positive and significant at r = 0.68, p < .001 (n = 248). However there was a negative relationship between neuroticm and social entrepreneurial intention.(r= -0.08, p<.001 (n=248)

Hypothesis 2:

Self efficacy would have a significant influence on social entrepreneurial intention

Table 3: Influence of social capital on entrepreneurial intention

Variables	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	S.E	Df	P
Social Capital Entrepreneurial Intention	0.101	0.10	0.06	5.1192	246	0.01

Table 3 reveals a significant influence of social capital on entrepreneurial intention. The result yielded a coefficient of regressions R = 0.10, and Adjusted R^2= 0.06. This suggests that the independent variable accounted for 60% of variance. (Adj. R^2=0.06) variation in the prediction of entrepreneurial intention. Social capital thus has a significant influence on entrepreneurial intention at 0.01 level of significance.

Hypotheis 3:
Social capital would have a signigficant influence onsocial entrepreneurial intention.

Table 4: Influence of self-efficacy on entrepreneurial intention

Variables	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	S.E	Df	P
Social Capital	0.25	0.65	0.040	-0.0452	246	< .001
Entr. Intention						

Table 4 reveals a significant influence of self -efficacy on entrepreneurial intention. The result yielded a coefficient of multiple regressions R = 0.25, and Adjusted R^2= 0.040. This suggests that the independent variable accounted for less than 40% (Adj. R^2=0.040) variation in the prediction of entrepreneurial intention. Social capital thus has a significant influence on entrepreneurial intention at 0.01 level of significance.

Discussion

The present study shows that the big 5 personality traits which include conscientiousness, openness to experience, and agreeableness positively and significantly correlate with entrepreneurial intention, with the exception of neuroticm, this confirms the notion that a person's personality attributes are critical to one's decidedness on whether to take on social entrepreneurship. This result is consistent with earlier findings, for conscientiousness, (e.g. Collins et al., 2004; Zhao and Seibert, 2006; Stewart and Roth, 2007; Zhao et al., 2010) for openness to experience (e.g. Zhao and Seibert, 2006; Zhao et al., 2010). That is notwithstanding, the finding of this present research gives a support for the understanding of critical psychological determinants of intention to become a social entrepreneur.

The result of a second hypothesis shows self-efficacy as a predictor of social entrepreneurial intention; this result suggests that people may tend to engage in social entrepreneurial enterprise if they are optimistic of attaining success in their efforts as social entrepreneurs. Ordinarily, people fear failure and would avoid any activity in which they are not sure of attaining success, but internal motivation arising from assurances of reward to efforts is a necessity for young people to take up entrepreneurship role. The result is consistent with other results who have also found this relationship, (e.g., Jones, 1997; Krueger. & Carsrud, 1993). The meta-analysis reported by Schlaegel and Koenig's (2014) also gave a credence to this result.

The result of the third research question suggests that social capital has a significant influence on entrepreneurial intention. This indicates that individuals with a strong social network will find it easier to take initiative to start social enterprise (Jabeen et al., 2008). The solidarity that individuals receive through social network enables them to sacrifice self-interests and act in the interests of the collective (Coleman, 1988). Similarly, a study in South Africa offered a similar result, (see Malebana, 2016). The author reported that social capital is significantly correlated with entrepreneurial intention and its antecedents (attitude towards becoming an entrepreneur and perceived behavioural control creation of these ventures are reinforced by social support, status, honour, and other rewards that generally contribute to individual's work aimed at public good.

Conclusion

The finding in this study can guide in policy formulation or review on curriculum development of entrepreneurship in post-secondary institutions, presently, traditional entrepreneurship get all the attention, i.e. entrepreneurial training majorly focuses on entrepreneurship for profit, whereas there are individual with the disposition of making a difference in life through offering of social enterprises that would help their community or their society, this category of people needs to be carried along in our training opportunities, and studies like this can provide the needed impetus to provide the needed knowledge and guidance. We can identify potential social entrepreneurs who can benefit from training using the variables of this study as basis for selection. This study has also brought up the need to improve the contexts like other entrepreneurs in which social enterprises are created, social entrepreneurs would thrive well in an atmosphere of social capital where they can build the needed resilience competence to weather the storms and achieve the aims of their enterprise. The study therefore recommends the need to do more in helping young people to develop and improve their psycho-social competencies for social entrepreneurship.

Study Direction and Limitation

The thin line between traditional entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship in terms of personality needs and other psychosocial requirement pose a challenge to the study of this nature, moreover, the test of a relationship between personality traits and entrepreneurial intention does not translate to a cause and effect relationship, the questionnaires used was a self-report, it is possible that participants over-estimate or underestimate their perceptions while responding to the questionnaires. Moreover using one setting also limit the result generalisation Future studies should endeavour to investigate how distinctively personality attributes affect traditional entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship for more clarification.

References

Acquaah, M., Gyampah, K., & Jawaram, J. (2011). Resilience in family and non-family firms: an examination of the relationships between manufacturing strategy, competitive strategy and firm performance. *International Journal of Production Research, 49,* (18)

Africa.com (2019). Social enterprises gather in Africa to address global problem. Retrieved from :https://www.africa.com/social-enterprises-gather-in-africa-to-address-global-problems/

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 50*. (2) 179-211.

Allen, W. (2000). Social networks and self - employment. *Journal of Socio-Economic* 29, 487-501

Anderson, A., Jack, S & Dodd, S., (2005). The role of family members in entrepreneurial networks: beyond the boundaries of the family firm. *Family Business Review 13,* (2)

Antoncic, B., BratkovicKregar, T., Singh, G. and DeNoble, A.F. (2015). The big five personality – entrepreneurship relationship: Evidence from Slovenia. *Journal of Small Business Management, 53* (3), 819-841.

Asekun, W.A, & Ikhimoya, S. (2019). Influence of social capital on resilience capacity of young adults residing in marginalized neighbourhoods in Lagos state. Published in *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2 (2), 309-321

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review, 84* (2) 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982), Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist 37* (2) 122-147.

Bandura. A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice- Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997), *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*, W.H. Freeman.

Baron, R. A. (1999). Perceptions of entrepreneurs: Evidence for a positive stereotype. Unpublished manuscript, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

British Council (2019). Kenya: Transforming an NGO to a social Enterprise. https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/skills-employability/what-we-do/entrepreneurial-africa/news-events/kenya-transforming-ngo.

Burger J.M (2006). *Personality:* Kaknus Publications.

Chandra, Y., & Paras, A. (2020). Social entrepreneurship in the context of disaster recovery: Organizing for public value creation. *Public Management Review, 1*-22.

Caliendo, M.,& Kritikos, A.S. (2007). Is Entrepreneurial Success Predictable? An Ex-Ante Analysis of the character-based approach, *Iza Discussion Papers*, 2687

Carraher, S.M., Welsh, D.H.B. and Svilokos, A. (2016) Validation of a measure of social entrepreneurship. *European Journal of International Management, 10*(4) 386–402.

Castresana, J.C. (2013). Social enterprise in the development agenda: opening a new road map or just a new vehicle to travel the same route? *Social Enterprise Journal. 9* (3) 247-268.

Chamlee, E., & Mayer, W (2008). Discovery and social learning in non-period environments: An Austrian view of social network theory, *Journal of Austrian Economics, 2*1, 151-166

Chen, X, Stanton B, Gong, J, Fang X & Li X (2009). Personal social capital scale: An

Instrument for heath and behavioural research, *Health Education Research*, 24, 2 306-317 http//doi.org/10.1093/her/cyn020

Chen, S.-C., Hsiao, H.C., Chang, J.-C., Chou, C.M., Chen, C.-P. & Shen, C.-H. (2015). Can the entrepreneurship course improve the entrepreneurial intentions of students? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 11* (3) 557-569.

Chipeta, E. M., & Surujlal, J. (2017). Influence of attitude, risk taking propensity and proactive personality on social entrepreneurship intentions. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 15(2), 27–36. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2017.15.2.03

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology 94*: S95–S120.

Collins, C. J., Hanges, P., & Locke, E. A. 2004. The relationship of need for achievement to entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis. *Human Performance, 17*: 95-117.

Costa, P.T. Jr., Mccrae, R.R. (1997) The NEO personality inventory manual. Odessa

Costello, R.B (1997). American Heritage College Dictionary (3 rd Edition) Mifflin

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417–440. https://.

Eisenhardt, K.M. & Schoonhoven, C.B. (1990). Organizational growth: linking founding team, strategy, environment, and growth among US semiconductor ventures, 1978-1988. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35* (3). 504-529.

Eysenck HJ (1994a). The importance of theory in the taxonomy of personality. In: De Raad B, Hofstee WKB, Van Heck GL, Eds. *Personality psychology in Europe*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, The Netherlands 1994a (5) 6-13. [11]

Eysenck HJ. (1994b). The Big Five or Giant Three: Criteria for a paradigm. In: Halverson CF, Kohnstamm GA, Martin RP, Eds. The developing structure of temperament and personality from infancy to adulthood

Faseyiku, O, & Asekun, W.A, (2012). Determinants of entrepreneurship in Nigeria. *Journal of Social sciences and Humanities. 1*. (1). 211-225

Farooq, M.S. (2016). Social support and entrepreneurial skills as antecedents of entrepreneurial behaviour", PhD thesis, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS), Sarawak. F

Farrukh, M., Alzubi, Y., Shahzad, I.A., Waheed, A. & Kanwal, N. (2018). Entrepreneurial intentions: The role of personality traits in perspective of theory of planned behavior. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. 12(3), 399-414. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-01-2018-0004

Gross, S. Putnam. (2004). Context and ontology. *Canadian. Journal of Philosophy. 34* (4), 507-53.

Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial Intentions. *entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41* 1), 105–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12171 9

Hwee Nga, J.K & Shamuganathan (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship starts up intentions. Journal of Business Ethics 95(2)259-282

Jabeen , M Ghulam, Z, & Ijaz, M. 2008 Social networking a source for developing entrepreneurial intentions among entrepreneurs: a case of Multan *Asian Economic and Financial Review 2*(8):1072-1084

Jones, K. (1997), An Exploration of The Relationship between male and female perceptions of opportunity for occupational goal attainment and propensity for entrepreneurship, *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal,* 2 (2), 30-43.

Holland, J. L. 1997. Making vocational choices. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources Hoang, H., and Antoncic, B. (2003). Network-based research in entrepreneurship: A critical Review. *Journal of Business Venturing, 18,* (2) 165–187.

Judge, T. A., & Kristof-Brown, A. 2004. Personality, interactional psychology, and person-organization fit. In B. Schneider & D. B. Smith (Eds.), *Personality and organizations: 87*-109. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kannampuzha M.,& Hockerts K. (2019). Organizational social entrepreneurship: scale development and validation. *Social Enterpreneurship. J.* 15, 290–319. doi: 10.1108/SEJ-06-2018-0047/FULL/XML

Krueger, N. F. & Carsrud, A. L. (1993), Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of Planned Behavior, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 5 (4), 315-330.

Lall, S. A., & Park, J. (2020). How social ventures grow: understanding the role of philanthropic grants in scaling social entrepreneurship. *Bus. Soc.* 61, 3–44. doi: 10.1177/0007650320973434

Lancee, B. (2016). Job search methods and immigrant earnings. A Longitudinal analysis of the role of bridging social capital. *Ethnicities*, 16(3), 349-367

Leek, S., & Mason, k., (2003), Network pictures: Building an holistic representation of a dyadic business-to-business relationship. *Industrial Marketing Management, 38, (*6) 599–607

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*: 79-122.

Lent, R.W.,Brown,S.D.,Hackett, G.& Brown D.(2002). Social cognitive career theory in Brown, S .D. and Lent, R.W. (Eds), Career choice and development, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 255-311

Luc, P. T. (2020b). Outcome expectations and social entrepreneurial intention: Integration of planned behavior and social cognitive career theory. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 7(6), 399–407. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no6.399

Mair J, & Noboa, E. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *and Social Entrepreneurship* 121–136). New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Malebana, M.J (2016). The influencing role of social capital in the formation of entrepreneurial intention. *Southern African Business Review 20,* 51-65

Mazzei, M., & Roy, M. J. (2017). From policy to practice: Exploring practitioners' perspectives on social enterprise policy claims. Voluntas: *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 28,* 2449–2468.

McKeever, E., Anderson, A. & Jack, S. 2014. Entrepreneurship and mutuality: Social capital in processes and practices', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 26* (5–6): 453–477.

Mthebu, A. & Bernard, B (2019). Social Entrepreneurship; Objectives, innovation, implementation and impact on entrepreneurship. E*xpert Journal of Business Management* 7(1), 147-177.

Neergaard, H., Shaw, E. & Carter, S. (2005). The impact of gender, social capital and networks on business ownership: A research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, 11*(5): 338–357

Murugesan, R., & Jayavelu, R. (2017). The influence of big five personality traits and self-

efficacy on entrepreneurial intention: The role of gender. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies*, 3(1), 41–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/2393957516684569

Osabohien, R., Worgwu, H., Adediran., O, & Soomro J.A (2019). Social entrepreneurship and future employment in Nigeria *International Social Science Journal* 73, 250. 927-937

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research 66*(4): 543–578.

Peyton N. (2019). Six African social enterprises that had people talking in 2019. https://www.howwemadeitinafrica.com/six-african-social-enterprises-that-had-people-talking-in-2019/64020/

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M.R. Creating Shared Value. (2020). *Harvard Business Review. Special Issue. Spring.* 54-69

Power, G.W, B.Brandenburg,M.,Melia-Teevan,K. and Lai, J. (2012) ,A Framework for Action: Social Enterprise and Impact Investing, June 2012, United Nations Global Compact Office, New York.

Preethi, C., & Priyadarshini, R. (2018). The intention towards social entrepreneurship among students and its link with big 5 model. Paper presented at the 3rd international conference on materials and manufacturing engineering 2018, Tamilnadu, India. IOP Publishing

Putnam, R.D. (2011*). Bowling Alone*: *The collapse and Revival of American community*: Simon & Schuster

Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*, 203–212.

Rauch, A., & Frese, M. 2007. Born to be an entrepreneur? Revisiting the personality approach to entrepreneurship. In J. R. Baum, M. Frese, & R. A. Baron (Eds.), *The psychology of entrepreneurship: 41*-65. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rauch, A. and Frese, M. (2007). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: a meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*.16 (4).353-385.

Ridha, R.N. and Wahyu, B.P. (2017), "*Entrepreneurship intention in agricultural sector of young generation in Indonesia*", Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 76-89, available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-04-2017-0

Schlaegel, C. & Koenig, M. (2014), Determinants of entrepreneurial intent: a meta-analytic test and integration of competing models", Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, *38* (2) 291-332.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). *General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests.https://doi.org/10.1037/t00393-000.

Welsh, D.H.B. & Krueger, N.F. (2013) The evolution of entrepreneurship: what have we learned?', Jo Wennekers, S., Van Wennekers, A., Thurik, R., & Reynolds, P. (2005). Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development. Small Business Economics, 24(3), 293–309. *Zahraurnal of Technology Management in China. 7*, (3), .270–290.

Wooten, K. C. Timmerman, T.A. & Folger, R.(1999), The use of personality and the five-factor model to predict new business ventures: From outplacement to start-up, J*ournal of Vocational Behavior, 54* (1). 82-101.

Yuan, Y.C. & Gay, G. (2006). Homophily of network ties and bonding and bridging social capital in computer mediated distributed Teams. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communit*y. 11, 1062–1084. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00308.x

Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. 2006. The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*: 259-271

Zhao, H., Seibert, S.E. and Lumpkin, G.T.(2010). The relationship of personality to entrepreneurial intentions and performance: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management, 36 (* 2). 381- 404.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. Contemporary *Educational Psychology 25* (1): 82–91.