

An Analysis of Female Graduates Social Entrepreneurship in Zambia

Kayla Kalenga Yombwe¹ and Dr. Erastus Mwanaumo²

¹Graduate School of Business, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

²Graduate School of Business, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

¹Corresponding Author: kayla.yombwe@gmail.com

Received: 05-03-2024

Revised: 24-03-2024

Accepted: 08-04-2024

ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken among female university graduates in Zambia to analyze aspects of social entrepreneurship intention. The emergence of social entrepreneurship as a worthwhile approach for alleviating social problems and that women are more prone to social entrepreneurship, while universities offer entrepreneurship courses, motivated the study. Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour was used in the study. It assessed personal attitude, subjective norm, perceived behaviour control, prior entrepreneurship exposure and prior experience as predictors of social entrepreneurship intention among female university graduates in Zambia. Using the mixed methods design, a sample of 500 female graduate students was randomly derived and answered the Entrepreneurial Intentions Questionnaire (EIQ). Analysis by hierarchical multiple regression at 95% confidence level and *p*-value significant at 0.05, revealed that all the models were significant. Prediction of SEI among female Zambian university graduates was strongest when the variables of variables of PA, SN, PBC, PEE and PE were considered together. The study is consistent with Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour. Recommendations are made to government, educational institutions to adopt strategies to inspire SE.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, personal attitude, subjective norm, perceived behaviour control, prior entrepreneurship exposure and prior experience

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, social and women entrepreneurship have become two growing fields of entrepreneurship research. In the context of social entrepreneurship, earlier research indicates that women are a better fit for leading social enterprises. However, the relevance of gender in the field of social entrepreneurship is underexplored and calls for further research, framing the mainstay of this study (Rosca, Agarwal & Brem, 2020; Hobson, 2020). Market failure theory suggests social entrepreneurship (Mohammadi et al., 2020; McMullen, 2011) which has emerged as a tactic to solving societal problems as it directs entrepreneurial activities towards addressing unmet societal needs, conserving environment and facilitating the growth of the economy. On this background, under-developed nations including Zambia should embrace social entrepreneurship as it would help to mitigate the aforementioned social challenges and lessen the government's burden. (Tiwari, Bhat & Tikoria, 2017; Chell 2007)

Several studies have emphasized the importance of social entrepreneurship in addressing complex social problems (Rambe and Ndofirepi, 2021; Peredo and Mclean 2006; Wang and Aaltio 2017; Powell 2012; Mohammadi et al., 2020; McMullen, 2011) especially in developing nations (Tiwari, Bhat and Tikoria, 2017; Chell 2007). Still, certain locales in Africa are under-researched. This necessitates the need to conduct quantitative studies on social entrepreneurship in the African context (Rambe and Ndofirepi, 2021; Teise and Urban's, 2014).

There is an emerging trend among Zambian university students engaging in trading activities while pursuing their higher education. It is a growing phenomenon that female students are also forming up and being part of social entrepreneurship programs while at university. This gives an indication that these female students may graduate to pursue these social entrepreneurship programs apart from just seeking to be employed. However, the number of social enterprises in developing nations is stagnant and very low (Luc, 2020; Phan, 2018). In Zambia women participation in economic activities remains low (Trading Economics, 2020). In this light the above, the importance of embracing sustainable strategies such as social entrepreneurship is irrefutable considering that women have a higher social problems orientation than men, Reynolds, (2019). Since Women and youth unemployment still remains a key challenge in Zambia, their involvement in the creation social enterprises is equally crucial. Particular attention can be given to students who are in institutions of higher learning where they can learn entrepreneurial skills. "Students are at the brink of entering the labour market for the first time" (Wach et al., 2021: p2; Meoli et al. 2020) and attaining university education does not guarantee employability in African developing

countries (Mwiya et al., 2017; Mwiya, 2014). Against this backdrop, this study focuses on investigating the antecedents of social entrepreneurship intentions among female university students in Zambia who are involved in trading activities while attending university.

Statement of the Problem

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as an important avenue for alleviating social problems, yet little research has been conducted in Zambia to establish what factors influence female university graduates to take up social entrepreneurship. For this reason, this research was undertaken to as to establish the factors that influence social entrepreneurship among female university graduates.

Main Hypothesis

Consequently, the following hypotheses were shaped:

H1: The higher the level of personal attitude toward social entrepreneurship, the higher the level of social entrepreneurial intention.

H2: Subjective norms are positively related to social entrepreneurial intention.

H3: Perceived behavioural control is positively related to social entrepreneurial intention.

H4: Prior entrepreneurial exposure is positively associated with social entrepreneurial intention.

H5: Prior experience in social enterprises has a positive effect on social entrepreneurial intention.

II. EMPIRICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

The aspect of social enterprises has been recognized as reflective of social entrepreneurship intention. Kedmenec, Miroslav, and Polona, (2016) examined the association between social entrepreneurship and experience and the perceived desirability and feasibility of social entrepreneurship, basing on 512 students from Austria, Bosnia, Croatia, Herzegovina and Slovenia. The aspect of experience was found statistically significant with a positive association to social entrepreneurship feasibility. The results of the study suggest that entrepreneurship education needs to incorporate aspects of experience through such activities as volunteering, activism and donations. In this way focus would be on social problems and empowering them to find appropriate solutions.

Usman, et al, (n.d.) studied the impact of empathy, perceived social impact, social worth and social network on the social entrepreneurial intention in socio-economic. The researchers declared the need for further research to use more comprehensive individual descriptions by considering other dimensions such as emotions, religion, knowledge and experience. Also, researchers may study how these antecedents may further cause the mediating impact Social worth and social network. Also, researchers may study the moderating effect of workplace norms and cultural dimensions on social entrepreneurial intentions. Hassan (2020) used factor analysis and multiple regression to identify the relationship with SEI. The findings reveal that ISE is significantly affected by entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial education. On the other, perceived university and entrepreneurial network support insignificantly affect ISE. The need of further research on student preference and experience in SE in developing nations is critical for several reasons including understanding the views of students about SE and social business, ways by which social business could enhance the student experience, understanding the role of SE in social and economic development.

Tiwari, Bhat and Tikoria, (2017) analysed the factors affecting social entrepreneurial intentions. The result showed that the proposed model (Theory of Planned Behaviour) in this study explains 47% of the variance, explaining the social entrepreneurship intention. Creativity showed a strongest positive relationship followed by emotional intelligence. Lacap. (2018) revealed that the students' nationality and age showed no statistical significant difference with their social entrepreneurial intentions. On the other hand, sex, year level, and exposure to student leadership reflected significant differences with social entrepreneurial intentions. The findings suggest that nationality and age are insignificant factors affecting the respondents' social entrepreneurial intentions while sex, year level, and exposure to student leadership are significant variables.

The aspect of subjective norm in relation to social entrepreneurship intention has been assessed variously. **Gracia**, Turra, & Tina, (2019) assessed the variables of personal attitude (PA), subjective norm (SN), and perceived behavioural control (PBC) in relation to entrepreneurship intention and found that, among the 60 students in the study, subjective norm had the highest significance effect on students' entrepreneurial intention. Igwe, Ogbo, & Agbaeze, (2020) was concerned with self-efficacy and subjective norms as moderators in social entrepreneurial intentions. Using the survey method, 541 student entrepreneurs were incorporated into the study. The study results show a positive effect of subjective norm among the factors of entrepreneurial intention. Of the subjective norms, empathy and perceived social support were significant. The study was unique as it brought about the dimension of early entrepreneurs which earlier studies had not established among students. The

limitation was that the study was limited to a few students in a country where social entrepreneurship has received low empirical research on social entrepreneurship.

Shane, (2012) investigated the subject of prior knowledge as a factor of discovering entrepreneurial opportunities among eight sets of entrepreneurs. The study found that prior knowledge accounted for experience where respondents presented significant knowledge of customer problems, market conditions, service markets and society's problems. It was found that such knowledge was a component of individuals; experience. The study demonstrates that an individual's previous experience was a factor for influencing their entrepreneurial intention and that previous job experience provided better judgment and easier access to resources. This will also help potential entrepreneurs to be less impulsive. Rashid, et al., (2018) assessed the factors that influenced entrepreneurship intention among students. The study established that there was a strong relationship between prior experience and social entrepreneurship intention. The study findings could not be generalized beyond the Duta Jauhar as it was a specific program with its own variables not common to other learning institutions.

Preethi and Priyadarshini (2018) found that 5 personality traits have a great impact on the intention towards entrepreneurship whereas the educational background of that particular person does not affect to that extent. Big Five Model. Rashed, et al, (n.d.) focused their study on the effects of individual characteristics on women intention to become social entrepreneurs. The findings confirmed a positive and significant relation among problem-solving skills, networking ability, and entrepreneurial knowledge with social entrepreneurial intention. Moreover, data confirmed that self-efficacy mediates the relationship among problem-solving skills, networking ability, and entrepreneurial knowledge with social entrepreneurial intention. Social Entrepreneurial Intention theory was used. The study gave direction that studies may search for the antecedents and consequences of social entrepreneurial intention in different geographical locations. Moreover, future studies may also test the role of self-efficacy on increasing social entrepreneurial intention among other samples. Future researchers may use both qualitative and quantitative methods for better understanding of social entrepreneurial intentions.

Other subjective norm variables of moral obligation, society expectations; empathy, and social support are significant predictors of social entrepreneurial intentions, but studies of their interaction are still lacking (Esfandiar, Sharifi-Tehrani, Pratt, & Altinay, 2019). Hockerts (2017) conducted related studies with subjective norm as an antecedent of social entrepreneurial intention basing on the works of Mair and Noboa (2006) with insights from TPB (Ajzen, 2002). García-González & Ramírez-Montoya, (2021) assessed the aspect of teaching and promotion of social entrepreneurship in institutions of higher learning (HEIs). The study analysed pre-post results of earlier studies among 304 respondents. The findings of the study indicate the intergration of various social entrepreneurship aspects in university courses led the students to have greater confidence for their entrepreneurship potentials. The study adds value to the aspect of social entrepreneurship education and related research as extendable to other courses apart from business related courses.

Muchabaiwa & Msimango-Galawe, (2021) used the quantitative method to study the aspects of entrepreneurial self-efficacy; experience and entrepreneurial intention, focusing on female black South African youths. Using a questionnaire based on Qualtrics, 278 respondents were involved. The findings of the study confirmed the postulation that prior entrepreneurial exposure significantly positively impacted entrepreneurial intention. Hockerts, (2017) studied the determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions among second year Master of Science in Management students from Scandinavia and thirty two other countries. The study extended the earlier model by Mair and Noboa (2006) to include prior experience. Basing on data from 1,444 (257 valid) the study found that prior experience with social issues predicted social entrepreneurial intentions. The study demonstrates that students enrol in electives basing on their previous social exposures. The study extended the definition of prior experience as incorporating one's practical working experience in social sector organizations and awareness of the social problems that require solutions. As a weakness, the study recognizes that there were other determinants not incorporated but would be worth studying in future. The study contributes to the understanding that university students need interventional programs that would expose them to social phenomena that would elicit a desire for social entrepreneurial intention as they focus on solving those problems.

Lacap, et al, (2018) assessed the mediating effects of social entrepreneurial antecedents on the relationship between prior experience and social entrepreneurial intent. The results revealed that prior experience with social problems positively and significantly affects empathy, moral obligation, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy and perceived social support. Moreover, it was also found that social entrepreneurial self-efficacy and perceived social support positively and significantly affect social entrepreneurial intent, and these two antecedents mediate the positive relationship between prior experience with social problems and social entrepreneurial intent. The Theory of Planned Behaviour and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions were employed. The study recommends that researchers may test the framework in another locale.

Karla, Guillermo, Gutiérrez-Zepeda, & Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, (2017) assessed prior exposure and educational environment towards entrepreneurial intention among 351 business management students. The study hypotheses linked prior entrepreneurship exposure to families and relatives as entrepreneurs, and to one's actual prior work experience. Using the structural equations derived from Ajzen's Model, the study established that entrepreneurial intention was mediated by prior education in entrepreneurship and the environment within the learning institution. Florian, Zapkau, & Holger, (2015) used the

survey method to explore the impact that contextual factors had on entrepreneurial intentions among university level students. The results revealed that among other factors, prior entrepreneurship exposure was significant for entrepreneurship intention. In Zimbabwe, Rambe and Ndofirepi (2019) carried out a study to explain social entrepreneurial intentions among college students. Results suggest that only empathy, self-efficacy and social support had statistically significant relationships with social entrepreneurial intentions. Notably, social support had a negative predictive relationship with social entrepreneurial intentions. Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour was used in the study. The study recommends for future research to include other antecedents to social entrepreneurship such as social entrepreneurial passion, prior experience in social ventures and entrepreneurial exposure.

Hsu and Wang (2018) found that original creativity and bonding social capital positively affected social entrepreneurial conviction in both groups of students. Conscientiousness negatively affected and original creativity positively affected social entrepreneurial preparation in Taiwanese students, whereas openness negatively affected and original creativity positively affected social entrepreneurial preparation in students from Hong Kong. The Big Five Personality Traits Model was used as theoretical basis for the study. It was recognized that researching variables other than personality traits, creativity, and social capital would be appropriate. For instance, past work experience, self-efficacy, and moral courage. It was recommended that future studies should consider expanding questionnaire use to a wider range of universities. Aure and De La Salle University, (2018) explored the social entrepreneurial intentions of senior high school and college students in a Philippine University using A PLS-Sem Approach. Findings showed that for all respondents, the relationship of SEI with agreeableness were mediated by empathy, self-efficacy and perceived social support. Self-efficacy and social support mediated grit and SEL. The TPB and The Big Five Personality Traits were the theories applied to the study. The study noted that other background factors may be explored to have a better appreciation of the model.

Gawell, (2013) found that experience gives people adequate information that they can use in decision making to address common problems in their society. Experience is considered a way of learning in the real life. The application of experience was found to be a bottom-up approach for driving a population towards a solution. The study aligns social entrepreneur experience to the prior experience required in traditional entrepreneurship. Karimi, et al., (2013) explored the effect of role models as a mediator on EI as well as the moderator effect of gender in EI into the TPB model. No direct effect of role models on EI was found by the authors. These findings are consistent with previous research (Krueger, 1993). However, more research is needed to understand better the relationship between prior entrepreneurial exposure and entrepreneurial intention.

De Sousa-Filho, et al, (2020) found that there is a significant relationship between empathy, self-efficacy, perceived social support and experience on entrepreneurial intentions. The results also indicate that there is no significant relationship between moral obligation and entrepreneurial Intentions. Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour was employed. The research had to analyze and theorize about the longitudinal impact of such initiatives on the determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions in poverty contexts. Hockerts, (2015) indicate that individuals with prior experience of social issues tend to have higher social entrepreneurial intentions. This effect is mediated by the four variables suggested by Mair and Noboa (2006). Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions was employed in the study. The study recommends that future research efforts should provide a more fine-grained understanding of the different subtypes of S-ENT and their respective antecedents.

Darmantoa and Sri Pujiartia (2020) conducted their research on developing student's social entrepreneurial intention. Analysis of data was done using structural equation modelling (SEM) using AMOS v 21. The research sample consisted of 125 students who have some social experience and entrepreneurship from various universities in Semarang. The results show that emotional intelligence, social activities, previous entrepreneurial experience were significantly and positively associated with social entrepreneurial, self-efficacy and social entrepreneurial intention. Social cognitive theory, theory of planned behaviour approach and career development theory was applied to the study. It is recommended that a similar study can be done in a different context especially, a developing nation.

Ching, et, al (2017) used multiple regression analysis to determine causal relationship between the variables (social entrepreneurial intentions, personality traits, creativity, and social capital). The results revealed that openness negatively predicted social entrepreneurial intentions, whereas originality positively predicted social entrepreneurial intentions. However, no direct association was found between social capital and social entrepreneurial intentions. The study proposed for future studies to analyse how narrow personality traits affect social entrepreneurship and explore whether social capital can act as a mediator or moderator of the relationship between personality traits and social entrepreneurial intentions. Asma, et al. (2019) found that prior experience tends to have greater social entrepreneurial intent, empathy, self-efficacy, and moral obligation that have positive and significant impact on entrepreneurial intent. On the other hand, perceived social support puts negative impact on entrepreneurial intention. Business schools and policymakers can take advantage of this study. Future studies can increase the sample size and can add the variables of belief to study the entrepreneurial intention.

Cavazos-Arroyo, Puente-Díaz and Agarwal, (2016) conducted an examination of certain antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions among Mexico residents. Results indicated the positive influence of social values on social

innovation orientation, while taking into account the influence of financial interests. Social innovation orientation, an attitude toward social entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and subjective norms were identified as positive predictors of social entrepreneurial intentions. The Theory of Planned Behaviour was used. Shahverdia, Ismailb and Qureshic. (2018) considered the effect of perceived barriers on social entrepreneurship intention in Malaysian universities. The findings of this study showed that overall students consider the lack of competency, lack of self-confidence and lack of resources were the barriers that affect social entrepreneurial intentions. Results also indicated that the social entrepreneurial education moderated the relationship between the perceived barriers and social entrepreneurial intentions of the students

Brock & Steiner, (2009) used the Content analysis approach to study the challenges and best practices associated with social entrepreneurship. The study findings indicate that faculty employed various pedagogical approaches which included service learning; innovation; opportunity recognition; resource acquisition; social impact measurement; devising business models in line with social entrepreneurship and enterprise sustainability. Teaching innovativeness was the most significant challenge. The study contributes to the knowledge that pedagogy is an essential element for imparting knowledge for social entrepreneurship which enlightens the students about areas they may not have encountered in personal experiences. Politis, et al, (2016) employed the quantitative method to investigate social entrepreneurial intentions formation among South-East European postgraduate students. A web-based survey using 700 self-administered online questionnaires (Google forms) was conducted and the sample population consisted of postgraduates from two Colleges located in Greece, South-East Europe. Each respondent received an invitation to participate in the survey via email and the response rate was 16.4%. The study's key finding is that the chosen theory (Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour (TPB), can predict social and commercial entrepreneurial intentions (EIs). Furthermore, the personality trait theory was totally rejected because it failed to predict both kinds of intentions. Another key finding is that tensions in mission focus seem to be present in the early shaped intentions of potential social entrepreneurs. Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour (TPB) and the personality trait theory. The focal population sample was postgraduate students only. Future research should also include undergraduates. Another possible future research would be to examine the indirect effects of all the factors that were researched in the study to (S)EIs. Moreover, researchers may explore other factors that directly and/or indirectly affect (S)EIs.

Roberts, (2013) investigated the role of experience on social entrepreneurs. The study revealed that individuals with previous experience in entrepreneurship had higher social performance. The findings were found consistent over wider population groups. Xiaohong, (2012) undertook a study to devise constructs related to entrepreneurial intentions towards venture creation. The study found that previous experience in personal and cultural matters contributed to entrepreneurial intention. Prior experience or involvement in social networks were important to potential entrepreneurs if they could relate such experience to the current opportunities. The study contributes to the understanding that prior experience helps to identify and assign resources for entrepreneurial purposes.

In South Africa, (Urban & Kujinga, 2017) studied social entrepreneurship among high education students. The methodological survey based approach was used among 193 students who answered closed-ended questionnaires. The study affirms that the desire to pursue social entrepreneurship ventures is positively correlated with individual perceptions, desirability and feasibility. The study further suggests that skill-building activities should be targeted at this antecedent of social entrepreneurship intention in order to motivate students.

In a study of five countries, Kedmenec, Rebernik and Tominc, (2015) researched on social entrepreneurship education and its association with perceived desirability and feasibility of social entrepreneurship among business students from Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and The Former Yugoslav Republic (FYR) of Macedonia. The sample included 512 soon-to-graduate business students. The results indicate a statistically significant positive association between the "know what" component of social entrepreneurship education and both the desirability and the feasibility of social entrepreneurship. Experience in prosocial behaviour has a statistically significant positive association with both the desirability and the feasibility of social entrepreneurship. The theory of entrepreneurial event and the theory of planned behaviour. The researchers propose that future research should report on the effectiveness of the used teaching methods so as to facilitate the replication of those which prove to be successful. In order to address causality, future research should apply pre-test– post-test design.

III. THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

Ajzen's (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour

The TPB is a widely used behavioural model in predicting human behaviour. It was developed in 1991 as an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) by Icek Ajzen (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). The extension was due to the revelation that behaviour cannot be fully controlled and is nonvoluntary. As a result, perceived behavioural control was added to the model and with this addition, the TRA was renamed TBP (Arafat and Mohamed Ibrahim, 2018). The TPB is a psychology theory that is adapted and applied in various fields due to its wider and extensive applicability (Iakovleva and

Kolvereid 2009; Krueger 1993; Krueger and Carsrud 1993; Fink 2013). Krueger et al. (2000) postulate that the attractiveness of the TPB is based on the premise that it can be changed and adapted in harmony with the specific field of a study.

The TBP proposes that human action is guided by three considerations namely behavioural beliefs, normative beliefs and control beliefs (Arafat and Mohamed Ibrahim, 2018; Ajzen, 1991). Behavioural beliefs result in attitude toward behaviour, normative beliefs give rise to subjective norms and control beliefs produces perceived behavioural control. In view of the above, the TPB predicts an individual's intention to engage in a behaviour and proposes that individual behaviour is determined by behaviour intentions. As illustrated in Figure 3.1 below, Ajzen (1991) suggests that behaviour intentions are a function of three determinants:

1. Personal attitudes toward behaviour: This refers to the degree to which a person has positive or negative feelings of the behaviour of interest.
2. Subjective norms: This refers to an individual's perception of the social environment or the influence of social environment on an individual's behaviour.
3. Perceived behavioural control: This refers to the degree to which individuals think they are capable of controlling their behaviour.

Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure and Prior Experience in Social Enterprises

Prior entrepreneurial exposure and prior experience with social enterprises predict social entrepreneurial intention (Autio et al., 2001; Mueller, Zapkau and Schwens, 2014; Zapkau et al., 2015). Prior entrepreneurial exposure constitutes direct entrepreneurial experience and entrepreneurial role model experience. Firstly, individuals gain entrepreneurial experience through: working in a small or newly formed enterprise (Kautonen, Luoto, & Tornikoski, 2010) or establishing their own business. Both alternatives denote an individual's active engagement in entrepreneurial role. Secondly, individuals gain entrepreneurial role model experience by learning from models such as parents, colleagues, or friends who previously started a business (Bosma *et al.*, 2012). Prior experience in social enterprises signifies prior experience with social problems or the involvement of students in social activities, as a member or officer of social organization. An individual's experience or involvement in working with social enterprises exposes him or her to diverse social problems (Hockerts, 2017; Mulyaningsih and Veland, 2017). Exposure to different problems or working in social enterprises ultimately leads to increased prior experience in social problems/prior experience in social enterprises.

This research is innovative as it includes prior entrepreneurial exposure (PEE) and prior experience in social enterprises (PE) as antecedents of SEI. Besides, there is limited research on PEE and PE as antecedents of SEI.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The mixed research method was employed to obtain quantitative and qualitative data. This was used to obtain greater knowledge and understanding in a triangulated manner. This further made the findings more rigorous by converging the perceptions and behaviors of the respondents (qualitative) and objective facts using statistical computations (quantitative). This was sufficient to correlate to establish configurations generalizations based on the analysis of data (Williams, 2021). The approach has also been widely used by earlier researchers on social entrepreneurship. In line with (Creswell, 2014), mixed methods enabled the use of a questionnaire combining structured and semi-structured questions.

Population of the Study

The study targeted female public and private university students. The number was estimated at 20,000 female students graduating from Zambian universities (The State of Higher Education in Zambia 2020 Report). The focus was on graduating students who had experienced full university life and capable of or undertaking entrepreneurial activities.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The sample size was 500 calculated using Rao Soft sample calculator with margin of error at 5%; confidence level at 95%; and response distribution of 50% (Raosoft, 2021). Probabilistic simple random sampling technique was used to select female students who had either undertaken courses in entrepreneurship or been involved in actual entrepreneurship/social entrepreneurship activities.

Data Collection

Primary data from the sampled female university graduates was collected by an adapted 5-point Likert scale Questionnaire (Entrepreneurial Intentions Questionnaire by Liñán and Chen, 2009). The questionnaire was structured to collect data on the predictors of Social Entrepreneurial (EI, that is ATSE, SN, PBC, PEE and PE).s

Data Analysis

Data analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics. Data analysis was according to the table 1 below.

Table 1: Data Analysis Matrix

Objective	Format of questions	Method of analysis
Examine the relationship between PA toward SE and SEI among female student graduates in Lusaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 point Likert-scale questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive and inferential statistics
To investigate the influence of subjective norm on social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 point Likert-scale questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive and inferential statistics Thematic analysis
To assess the relationship between perceived behavioural control and social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 point Likert-scale questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive and inferential statistics
To determine the association between prior entrepreneurial exposure and social entrepreneurial intentions among female student graduates in Lusaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 point Likert-scale questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive and inferential statistics
To explore the relationship between prior experience in social enterprises and social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 point Likert-scale questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive and inferential statistics
Statistical significance was determined at 95% confidence level (p-value 0.05)		

V. RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics

1.1 Personal Attitude Toward Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurial Intention

Table 2: Personal Attitude toward Social Enterprise

Personal Attitude Statements	Mean
Social entrepreneurs are also job creators.	4.40
I would gladly take up social entrepreneurship as a career.	3.81
I want to contribute to wealth creating and social benefits for all	4.42
Having opportunity and resources, I'd start a social entrepreneurship	3.87
Being a social entrepreneur would bring great satisfactions for me.	3.80
Being a social entrepreneur has more advantages than disadvantages	3.79
<i>Personal attitude towards social entrepreneurship</i>	4.015

The means concerning the relationship between personal attitude toward social enterprise and social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka are given in table 1. The study found that respondents were most likely to desire to contribute to wealth creating and social benefits for all (mean 4.42); believed that social entrepreneurs are also job creators (mean 4.40) and that if they had the opportunity and resources, were likely to start a social entrepreneurship firm (mean 3.87). The female student graduates would gladly take up social entrepreneurship as a career (mean 3.81). By a mean of 3.80, the female student graduates affirmed that being a social entrepreneur would bring great satisfactions for them and that being a social entrepreneur implies more advantages than disadvantages to them (mean 3.79). A mean of 4.015 indicates that the female university graduates in the study had a personal attitude towards social entrepreneurship that made them likely to engage in social entrepreneurship. This indicates a positive social entrepreneurship intention.

1.2 Influence of Subjective Norm on Social Entrepreneurial Intention

Table 3: Influence of Subjective Norm on Social Entrepreneurial Intention

Subjective Norm Statements	Mean
Best friends think I can successfully run social entrepreneurship firm in the future.	3.57
Members of my community think I can create a social entrepreneurship firm	3.38
My fellow university graduates believe I can run a successful social enterprise	3.31
My closest family thinks I should create a social entrepreneurship firm in future.	3.08
My university faculty identify my social entrepreneurship abilities	2.77
Subjective Norm on Social Entrepreneurial Intention	3.22

Table 3 shows mean responses regarding the influence of subjective norm on social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka. The female student graduates in Lusaka perceived that their best friends thought they were likely to successfully run a social entrepreneurship enterprise in the future (mean 3.57). Community members were not sure if the female student graduates in Lusaka would create successful social entrepreneurship firms (mean 3.38). Fellow university graduates were not sure if the female students would run successful social enterprises (mean 3.31). The female student graduates in Lusaka were not sure if their closest family thought they should create social entrepreneurship firms in future (mean 3.08). They were not sure if the university faculty identified their social entrepreneurship abilities (mean 2.77). By a mean of 3.22 on subjective norm, it is concluded that female student graduates in Lusaka were indifferent regarding whether other people believed that they could successfully run social enterprises.

1.3 Relationship Between Perceived Behavioural Control and Social Entrepreneurial

Table 4: Relationship between Perceived Behavioural Control and Social Entrepreneurial

Perceived Behavioural Control Statements	Mean
To start a social entrepreneurship firm and keep it working would be easy for me	3.18
I can successfully handle the creation process of a new firm	3.52
I know the necessary practical details to start a social entrepreneurship firm	3.07
It would be easy for me to develop a social idea into a real business enterprise	3.44
If I tried to start a social entrepreneurship firm, I would highly succeed	3.82
Perceived Behavioural Control	3.406

In table 4, the computed means for the relationship between perceived behavioural control and social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka are presented. If the female graduates tried to start social entrepreneurship firms, they would have a high probability of succeeding (mean 3.82); were likely to successfully create new firms (mean 3.52) and develop social ideas into real enterprises (mean 3.44). However, they were indifferent regarding starting social enterprises and keep them working (mean 3.18) or whether they knew the necessary practical details for starting social entrepreneurship firms (mean 3.07). By a mean of 3.406 respondents were not sure of their success in their social entrepreneurial as female university graduates.

1.4 Association Between Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure And Social Entrepreneurial

Table 5: Association between Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure and Social Entrepreneurial

Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure Statements	Mean
I have observed the challenges and benefits of running a business enterprise	3.96
I have friends who are running successful business enterprises	3.94
I have observed how entrepreneurs start and run a successful business	3.82
I have role models who inspire me towards social entrepreneurship	3.76
I have former university graduates running successful business enterprises	3.60
I have relatives who are owners of successful enterprises	3.47
Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure	3.758

Table 5 shows the means concerning the association between prior entrepreneurial exposure and social entrepreneurial intentions among female student graduates in Lusaka. The female graduate students recognised the challenges and benefits of running a business enterprise (mean 3.96) and had friends who were running successful business enterprises (mean 3.94). The female university graduates observed how entrepreneurs start and run successful businesses (mean 3.82) and had role models in social entrepreneurship (mean 3.76). The respondents had former university graduates and relatives running successful business enterprises (mean 3.60 and 3.47, respectively). Female university graduates in the study had significant prior entrepreneurial exposure (mean 3.758).

1.5 Prior Experience in Social Enterprises and Social Entrepreneurial

Table 1: Relationship between Prior Experience in Social Enterprises and Social Entrepreneurial Intention

Prior Experience Statements	Mean
I have some experience working with Social problems in the community	3.27
I have obtained knowledge and skills to run a social entrepreneurship firm	3.05
I have volunteered or otherwise worked with Social Organizations	2.95
I practiced social entrepreneurship skills during my university years	2.74
I have been employed in a firm with a social entrepreneurship dimension	2.66
Prior experience	2.934

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics concerning the relationship between prior experience in social enterprises and social entrepreneurial intention among female student graduates in Lusaka. The female student graduates in Lusaka either had prior experience or not (mean 2.93 on prior experience items). Some respondents had experience working with social problems in the community while others did not (mean 3.27). Some respondents had obtained adequate knowledge and skills to run a social entrepreneurship firm, while some did not (mean 3.05). Some respondents had volunteered or otherwise worked with Social Organizations while others had not (mean 2.95). Some respondents had practiced social entrepreneurship skills during their university years while others had not (mean 2.74). Some respondents had been employed in a firm with a social entrepreneurship dimension, while others had not (mean 2.66).

Inferential Statistical Analysis

Using hierarchical multiple regression four models were created. The initial model of independent variables PA and SN was created, adding one at a time to the initial model. The entire model was built on the variables of PA, SN, PBC, PEE and PE. The model was developed according to table 5.

Table 7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.563 ^a	.317	.314	.648	.317	100.400	2	433	.000
2	.585 ^b	.343	.338	.637	.026	17.059	1	432	.000
3	.605 ^c	.366	.360	.626	.023	15.565	1	431	.000
4	.648 ^d	.420	.414	.599	.055	40.600	1	430	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude

b. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude, Perceived Behavior Control

c. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude, Perceived Behavior Control, Prior Entrepreneurship Exposure

d. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude, Perceived Behavior Control, Prior Entrepreneurship Exposure, Prior Experience

Table 7 is the model summary based on the hierarchical multiple regression model. There were three models developed for analysis. In model 1, the R2 of 0.317 gives an indication that SN and PA jointly accounted for 31.7% of the variance in Social Entrepreneurship Intention among female Zambian university graduates of Lusaka. By the addition of PBC (Model 2) the R2 value increased to 0.338, or 33.8% variance in SEI. When PEE was added in Model 3, the R2 increased to 0.366 or 36% of variance in SEI. When the final variable of PE was added, the R2 was 0.420 or 42% variance in SEI. All models were statistically significant with p-values of 0.000, <0.05. This is interpreted to mean that the addition of a variable statistically significantly increased variance in SEI. Thus the data was good enough for analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Table 8: Analysis of Variance

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	84.384	2	42.192	100.400	.000 ^b
	Residual	181.964	433	.420		
	Total	266.349	435			
2	Regression	91.297	3	30.432	75.102	.000 ^c
	Residual	175.052	432	.405		
	Total	266.349	435			
3	Regression	97.398	4	24.349	62.116	.000 ^d
	Residual	168.951	431	.392		
	Total	266.349	435			
4	Regression	111.974	5	22.395	62.379	.000 ^e
	Residual	154.375	430	.359		
	Total	266.349	435			

a. Dependent Variable: social entrepreneurial intentions

b. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude

c. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude, Perceived Behavior Control

d. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude, Perceived Behavior Control, Prior Entrepreneurship Exposure

e. Predictors: (Constant), Subjective Norm, Personal Attitude, Perceived Behavior Control, Prior Entrepreneurship Exposure, Prior Experience

Table 8 shows that all the four models had p-values <.05, therefore statistically significant at predicting SEI among female Zambian university graduates of Lusaka.

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

The study found that a combination of all the variables of SN, PA, PBC, SEI, PEE and PE contributed up to 42% of variance in SEI. Each model was statistically significant with p-values of 0.000, <0.05. The study demonstrates that female university graduates have confidence to run the social entrepreneurship for the benefit of all both as careers and profitable sources of income while social benefiting local communities as employers and solving social problems. The study affirms the

notion that women are more likely to take up social entrepreneurship as a way of bridging the gap in the male dominated economic enterprises spheres and meet the SDGs. The attitude of female university graduates at predicting social entrepreneurial intention is strongly influenced by the opinions of family members and friends. This aspect of subjective norm demonstrates that closest family ties were more significant than university faculty and community members. PBC was not independently significant at predicting entrepreneurial intention as the respondents were not sure of whether they would successful know how to start and run the enterprises. Although the respondents had adequate PEE with a positive relationship to entrepreneurial intention, their actual PE was lower but considered a positive determinant of entrepreneurial intention.

Conclusions

The study reveals significantly that female university graduates present themselves in a position to start and run social enterprises if they have a positive attitude, supported by family and friends; acquired relevant knowledge to start and run social enterprises; and utilize the knowledge, skills and experience from their previous entrepreneurship endeavours. The study is in agreement with Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour (TPB). The study contributes to the emerging field of study to demonstrate that social entrepreneurship is positively being adopted in Zambia.

Recommendations

- i. The Ministry of Small and Medium Enterprises can adopt a policy to inspire and support graduating university students to identify social problems they can solve within their communities.
- ii. Entrepreneurship associations need to have a platform for social entrepreneurs to share skills and knowledge so as to develop a network of practitioners who can both motivate and provide apprenticeship to upcoming social entrepreneurs. This would also provide a hoard of knowledge and information.
- iii. Universities need to include practical aspects that would provide hands-on experience to the students. This can be in form of internship programmes at social enterprises.
- iv. Future studies would consider each of the variables (PA, SN, PBC, PEE and PE) independently to establish how they individually impact social entrepreneurship, considering wider samples.

REFERENCES

1. Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2003). Innovation and technological change. In: *Handbook of entrepreneurship research*, pp. 55-79. Boston, MA: Springer.
2. Ajzen I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
3. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour: Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioural control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
4. Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behaviour. In: *Kuhl J, Beckman J, editors. Action control: From cognition to behaviour*. New York: Springer-Verlag. pp. 11–39.
5. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behaviour relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 888–918.
6. Ajzen, I., & Thomas, M. J. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed behaviour: Attitudes, intentions and perceived behavioural control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 426–435.
7. Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. Chicago: Dorsey.
8. Akhter, A., Hossain, M. U., & Asheq, A. A. (2020). Influential factors of social entrepreneurial intention in Bangladesh. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 645-651.
9. Allen, R. A. (2020). Sources of expertise in social enterprises. *Strategic Change*, 29(4), 447-458.
10. Anderson, B. B., & Dees, J. G. (2003). For-profit social ventures. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 2(1), 1-26.
11. Arafat, Y., & Ibrahim, M. I. M. (2018). The use of measurements and health behavioural models to improve medication adherence. In: *Social and administrative aspects of pharmacy in low-and middle-income countries*, pp. 53-69. Academic Press.
12. Ashraf, M. A., Alam, M. M. D., & Alexa, L. (2021). Making decision with an alternative mind-set: Predicting entrepreneurial intention toward f-commerce in a cross-country context. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*.
13. Asma, X., Peng, S., Hassan, S., & Akhtar, A. (2019). *Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions for educational programs*. Public Affairs, 19(2).

14. Aure, P. A. H., Lopez, C. J. B., Santana, A. M. C., Tan, L. N. S., Villafior, S. G. R., Dui, R. P., & Paredes, M. P. L. (2020). Determinants of purchase intention towards social enterprise personal care brands: A PLS-SEM approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 24(1), 1-18.
15. Austin, J., Wei-Skillern, J., Leonard H. B., & Stevenson H. H. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the Social Sector*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
16. Autio, E., Keeley, R. H., Klofsten, M., Parker, G. G. C., & Hay, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial intent among students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise & Innovation Management Studies*, 2(2), 145-160.
17. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
18. Blaga, S. I. (2020). A conceptual model of social entrepreneurial motivation. *Scientific Annals of Economics and Business*, 67(4), 453-471.
19. Borquist, B. R., & de Bruin, A. (2019). Values and women-led social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*.
20. Bosma, N., Hessels, J., Schutjens, V., Van Praag, M., & Verheul, I. (2012). Entrepreneurship and role models. *Journal of economic psychology*, 33(2), 410-424.
21. Brock, D., & Steiner, S. (2009). Social entrepreneurship education: Is it achieving the desired aims?. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
22. Campbell, D. T. (1986). Relabeling internal and external validity for the applied social sciences. In: Trochim, W. (Ed.), *Advances in Quasi-Experimental Design and Analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
23. Carr, J. C., & Sequeira, J. M. (2007). Prior family business exposure as intergenerational influence and entrepreneurial intent: A theory of planned behaviour approach. *Journal of business research*, 60(10), 1090-1098.
24. Carsrud, A. L. (1993). *Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour*. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 5(4), 315-330.
25. Carsrud, A., & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial motivations: what do we still need to know?. *Journal of small business management*, 49(1), 9-26.
26. Chang, Y. Y., & Wannamakok, W. (2019). *Understanding social entrepreneurial intentions: Entrepreneurship education, academic major and planned behaviors*. In: *Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology (PICMET)*, pp. 1-11. IEEE.
27. Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process. *International small business journal*, 25(1), 5-26.
28. Chikha, I. B., & Jarboui, A. (2017). Impact of incubators on social entrepreneurship intention: an empirical study related to Tunisia. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 4(4), 305-323.
29. Chinchilla, A., & Garcia, M. (2017). Social entrepreneurship intention: Mindfulness towards a duality of objectives. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 1(2), 205-214.
30. Ching, H. Y., & Kitahara, J. R. (2017). Impact of the exposure to entrepreneurship education on students' entrepreneurial intentions: A case-based study of the higher education in Brazil. *Business and Management Studies*, 3(4), 85-93.
31. 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.
32. Cordano, M., & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Pollution reduction preferences of US environmental managers: Applying Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(4), 627-641.
33. Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 635-659.
34. Crant, J. M. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Management*, 29(3), 62-74.
35. Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design*. New Delhi: SAGE.
36. Darmanto, S., & Pujiarti, E. (2020). Developing student's social entrepreneurial intention. *Management Science Letters*, 10(5), 1103-1106.
37. 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.
38. Davidsson, P. (2004). *Researching entrepreneurship*, 5. New York: Springer.
39. Dawkins, C. E., Jamali, D., Karam, C., Lin, L., & Zhao, J. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and job choice intentions: A cross-cultural analysis. *Business and Society*, 55(6), 854-888.
40. De Sousa-Filho, J. M., Matos, S., da Silva Trajano, S., & de Souza Lessa, B. (2020). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions in a developing country context. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 14, e00207.
41. Dee, g. (2021). *The four types of social entrepreneurship*. Net Impact.
42. Dees, J. G. (2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society-New Brunswick*, 44(3), 24.

43. Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2008). Social enterprise in Europe: Recent trends and developments. *Social Enterprise Journal*.
44. Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: Critique and the radical enactment of the social. *Social Enterprise Journal*.
45. do Paço, A. M. F., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviours and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 20-38.
46. Douglas, E.J., & Shepherd, D.A. (2002). Self-employment as a career choice: attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(3), 81-90.
47. Douglas, T. J. (2013). Entrepreneurship as a leap of faith. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 10(1), 37-65.
48. Duong, C. D. (2021). Exploring the link between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: The moderating role of educational fields. *Education + Training*.
49. Entrialgo, M., & Iglesias, V. (2016). The moderating role of entrepreneurship education on the antecedents of entrepreneurial intention. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(4), 1209-1232.
50. Ericsson, K. A., & Pool, R. (2016). *Peak: Secrets from the new science of expertise*. New York: Houghton mifflin harcourt.
51. Ernst, K. (2011). Social entrepreneurs and their personality. In: *Social entrepreneurship and social business*, pp. 51-64. Gabler Verlag.
52. Esfandiar, K., Sharifi-Tehrani, M., Pratt, S., & Altinay, L. (2019). Understanding entrepreneurial intentions: A developed integrated structural model approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 94, 172-182.
53. Espina, M. I., Phan, P. H., & Markman, G. D. (Eds.). (2018). *Social innovation and sustainable entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
54. Farooq, M. S., Salam, M., ur Rehman, S., Fayolle, A., Jaafar, N., & Ayupp, K. (2018). Impact of support from social network on entrepreneurial intention of fresh business graduates. *Education + Training*, 60(4), 335-353.
55. Fayolle, A. (2013). Is entrepreneurial intention stable through time? First insights from a sample of French students. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 5(1), 7-27.
56. Fayolle, A., & Liñán, F. (2014). The future of research on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 663-666.
57. Fernández-Guadaño, J. & Martín-López, S. (2023). Gender differences in social entrepreneurship: Evidence from Spain. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 96.
58. Fernández-Guadaño, J., & Martín-López, S. (2023). Gender differences in Social Entrepreneurship: Evidence from Spain. In *Women's Studies International Forum*, 96, 102663.
59. Fink, M. (2015). Robustness of the theory of planned behaviour in predicting entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(3), 655-674.
60. Florian, B., Zapkau, C. S., & Holger, S. R. (2015). Disentangling the effect of prior entrepreneurial exposure on entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(3), 639-653.
61. Forouharfar, A., Rowshan, S. A., & Salarzehi, H. (2018). An epistemological critique of social entrepreneurship definitions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(1), 1-40.
62. García-González, A., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2021). Social entrepreneurship education: Change maker training at the university. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 11(5), 1236-1251. Retrieved March 20, 2021, from Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-01-2021-0009>.
63. Gawell, M. (2013). Social entrepreneurship—innovative challengers or adjustable followers?. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 9(2), 203-220.
64. Gameda, H. K. (2015). Some selected factors as determinants of entrepreneurial career intentions among business students. *International Journal of Education and Management Studies; Hisar*, 5(3), 183-189.
65. Germak, A. J., & Singh, K. K. (2009). Social entrepreneurship: Changing the way social workers do business. *Administration in Social Work*, 34(1), 79-95.
66. Goethner, M., Obschonka, M., Silbereisen, R. K., & Cantner, U. (2012). Scientists' transition to academic entrepreneurship: Economic and psychological determinants. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 33(3), 628-641.
67. González-Serrano, M. H., Valantine, I., Hervás, J. C., Pérez-Campos, C., & Moreno, F. C. (2018). Sports university education and entrepreneurial intentions. *Education + Training*, 60(5), 389-405.
68. Gracia, M. S., Turra, & Tina, M. (2019). *Personal attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control: Differentiating factors of entrepreneurial intention of high school students who are joining and not joining the entrepreneurship education in an internmtion of high school students*. International School.

69. Greenslade, J. H., & White, K. M. (2005). The prediction of above-average participation in volunteerism: A test of the theory of planned behaviour and the volunteers functions inventory in older Australian adults. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*(2), 155-172.
70. Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., Vogus, T. J., & Miller, T. L. (2013). Studying the origins of social entrepreneurship: Compassion and the role of embedded agency. *Academy of management review, 38*(3), 460-463.
71. Hartwick, J., & Barki, H. (1994). Explaining the role of user participation in information system use. *Management Science, 40*(4), 440-465.
72. Hassan, H. K. (2020). Intention towards social entrepreneurship of university students in an emerging economy: the influence of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurship education. *On the Horizon*.
73. Herman, E., & Stefanescu, D. (2017). Can higher education stimulate entrepreneurial intentions among engineering and business students?. *Educational Studies, 43*(3), 312-327.
74. Hervieux, C., & Voltan, A. (2018). Framing social problems in social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 151*(2), 279-293.
75. Hobson, S. (2020). *Social entrepreneurship is a nascent sector, free from beliefs about what its leaders should look like or where they should come from*. School for Social Entrepreneurs. Available at: [https:// news. trust.org/ item/ 20200305145052-8pfg5/#:~:text= An% 20estimated% 2045% 25% 20of% 20the, four% 20national% 20 parliamentarians % 20are% 20women](https://news.trust.org/item/20200305145052-8pfg5/#:~:text=An%20estimated%2045%25%20of%20the, four%20national%20parliamentarians%20are%20women).
76. Hockerts, K. (2015). The social entrepreneurial antecedents scale (SEAS): A validation study. *Social Enterprise Journal, 11*.
77. Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41*(1), 105–130.
78. Hope, D. (2014). *Research methods*. P-Grave.
79. Hrubes, D., Ajzen, I., & Daigle, J. (2001). Predicting hunting intentions and behaviour: An application of the theory of planned behaviour. *Leisure Sciences, 23*(10).
80. Hsu, C. Y., & Wang, S. M. (2019). Social entrepreneurial intentions and its influential factors: A comparison of students in Taiwan and Hong Kong. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 56*(3), 385-395.
81. Hsu, L., & Wang, C. (2010) Clarifying the Effect of Intellectual Capital on Performance: The Mediating Role of Dynamic Capability. *British Journal of Management, 23*(10)
82. Hübner, G., & Kaiser, F. G. (2006). The moderating role of the attitude-subjective norms conflict on the link between moral norms and intention. *European Psychologist, 11*(2), 99–109
83. Huysentruyt, M. (2014). *Women's social entrepreneurship and innovation*.
84. Iakovleva, T., & Kolvereid, L. (2009). An integrated model of entrepreneurial intentions. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation, 3*(1), 66-80.
85. Igwe, A., Ogbo, A., & Agbaeze, E. (2020). Self-efficacy and subjective norms as moderators in the networking competence–social entrepreneurial intentions link. SAGE.
86. Ip, C. Y., Liang, C., Wu, S. C., Law, K. M. Y., & Liu, H. C. (2018). Enhancing social entrepreneurial intentions through entrepreneurial creativity: A comparative study between Taiwan and Hong Kong. *Creativity Research Journal, 30*(2), 132-142.
87. Jabareen, Y. (2009) Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*, 49-62.
88. Karimi, S., Biemans, H., Lans, T., Chizari, M., Mulder, M., & Naderi. (2013). Understanding role models and gender influences on entrepreneurial intentions among college students. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 94*, 204–214.
89. Karla, S.-B., Guillermo, H.-M., Gutiérrez-Zepeda, P., & Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, J. (2017). Prior exposure and educational environment towards entrepreneurial intention . *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation, 12*(2).
90. 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), 583–601. doi:10.1177/0266242610368592.
91. Kedmenec, I., Miroslav, R., & Polona. (2016). Tominc education and its association with perceived desirability and feasibility of social entrepreneurship among business students. *Croatian Journal of Education, 18*(4), 1035-1065.
92. Kedmenec, I., Rebernik, M., & Tominc, P. (2016). Social entrepreneurship education and its association with perceived desirability and feasibility of social entrepreneurship among business students. *Croatian Journal of Education: Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje, 18*(4), 1035-1065.
93. Khuong, M. N., & An, N. H. (2016). The factors affecting entrepreneurial intention of the students of Vietnam national university—a mediation analysis of perception toward entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 4*(2), 104-111.

94. Kimbu, A. N., & Ngoasong, M. Z. (2016). Women as vectors of social entrepreneurship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 60, 63-79.
95. Kivunja, C. (2018). Distinguishing between theory, theoretical framework, and conceptual framework: A systematic review of lessons from the field. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(6), 44-53.
96. Koe Hwee Nga, J., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of business ethics*, 95(2), 259-282.
97. Kolvereid, L. (1996). Predictions of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 21(1), 47-57.
98. Krueger Jr, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of business venturing*, 15(5-6), 411-432.
99. Krueger, N. (1993). The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(1), 5-21.
100. Krueger, N. (1993). The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(1), 5-21.
101. Krueger, N. F. (2009). The microfoundations of entrepreneurial learning and... education: the experiential essence of entrepreneurial cognition. In: *Handbook of University-Wide Entrepreneurship Education*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
102. Krueger, N.F. Jr, Reilly, M.D., & Carsrud, A.L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 411-32.
103. Kuckertz, A., & Wagner, M. (2010). The influence of sustainability orientation on entrepreneurial intentions—investigating the role of business experience. *Journal of Business Ventures*, 25, 524–539.
104. Kuhlmann, D. O., & Ardichvili, A. (2015). Becoming an expert: Developing expertise in an applied discipline. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(4), 262– 276.
105. Kummitha, H. R. (2021). Sustainable entrepreneurship training: A study of motivational factors. *International Journal of Management in Education*.
106. Lacap, J. P. G. (2018). Social entrepreneurial intentions of university students in Pampanga, Philippines. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business*, 6(1), 1-16.
107. Lacap, J. P. G., Mulyaningsih, H. D., & Ramadani, V. (2018). The mediating effects of social entrepreneurial antecedents on the relationship between prior experience and social entrepreneurial intent: The case of Filipino and Indonesian university students. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*.
108. Latham, G. P. & Saari, L. M. (1979). Application of social-learning theory to training supervisors through behavioural modelling. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 64(3), 239–246.
109. Leandro, d. S., & Salazar, V. S. (2020). On social enterprises and social entrepreneurship: An extension. *Brazilian Administration Review*, 17(2).
110. Lee, Y., & Kozar, K. (2005). Investigating factors affecting the anti-spyware system adoption. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(8), 72-77.
111. Li, L., & Wu, D. (2019). Entrepreneurial education and students' entrepreneurial intention: does team cooperation matter?. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1), 1-13.
112. Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593-617.
113. Liñán, F., & Javier Santos, F. (2007). Does social capital affect entrepreneurial intentions? *International Advances in Economic Research*, 13(4), 443-453.
114. Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593-617.
115. Liñán, F., Santos, F. J., & Fernández, J. (2011). The influence of perceptions on potential entrepreneurs. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(3), 373-390.
116. Luc, P. T. (2020). Outcome expectations and social entrepreneurial intention: Integration of planned behaviour and social cognitive career theory. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(6), 399-407.
117. Maes, J., Leroy, H., & Sels, L. (2014). Gender differences in entrepreneurial intentions: A TPB multi-group analysis at factor and indicator level. *European Management Journal*, 32(5), 784-794.
118. Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of world business*, 41(1), 36-44.
119. Mair, J., J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
120. Matthews, C., & Moser, S. (1995). Family background and gender: Implications for interest in small firm ownership. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 7, 365–377.
121. McMullen, J. S. (2011). Delineating the domain of development entrepreneurship: A market-based approach to facilitating inclusive economic growth. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 185-215.

- 122.Meoli, A., Fini, R., Sobrero, M., & Wiklund, J. (2020). How entrepreneurial intentions influence entrepreneurial career choices: The moderating influence of social context. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(3), 105982.
- 123.Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 124.Miralles, F., Giones, F., & Riverola, C. (2016). Evaluating the impact of prior experience in entrepreneurial intention. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12, 791–813.
- 125.Mohammadi, P., Kamarudin, S., & Omar, R. (2020). Do Islamic values impact social entrepreneurial intention of university students in Malaysia? An empirical investigation into the mediating role of empathy. *International Journal of Economics & Management*, 14(3).
- 126.Montero González, B., & Camacho Ballesta, J. A. (2019). Caracterización del emprendimiento femenino en España: Una visión de conjunto. *Ene*, 9, 34.
- 127.Muchabaiwa, H., & Msimango-Galawe. (2021). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy, experience and entrepreneurial intention among black South African female youth. *Academy Of Entrepreneurship Journal; Arden*, 27(4), 1-11.
- 128.Mueller, J., Zapkau, B. F., & Schwens, C., (2014). Impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on entrepreneurial intention — cross-cultural evidence. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 22(03), 251-282.
- 129.Müller, J., Zapkau, F. B., & Schwens, C. (2014). The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on entrepreneurial intention - cross-cultural evidence. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 22(3), 251–282. doi:10.1142/S0218495814500113.
- 130.Mulyaningsih, H. D., & Ramadani, V. (2017). Social entrepreneurship in an Islamic context. In: *Entrepreneurship and Management in an Islamic Context*, pp. 143-158. Springer, Cham.
- 131.Mwiya, B. M. K. (2014). *The impact of entrepreneurship education on the relationships between institutional and individual factors and entrepreneurial intention of university graduates: Evidence from Zambia*.
- 132.Mwiya, B., Wang, Y., Shikaputo, C., Kaulung'ombe, B., & Kayekesi, M. (2017). *Predicting the entrepreneurial intentions of university students: Applying the theory of planned behaviour in Zambia, Africa*. Africa (August 18, 2017).
- 133.Ndofirepi, T. M. (2020). Relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial goal intentions: psychological traits as mediators. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 1-20.
- 134.Omorede, A. (2014). Exploration of motivational drivers towards social entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*.
- 135.Otchengco Jr., A.M., & Akiate, Y.W.D. (2021), Entrepreneurial intentions on perceived behavioural control and personal attitude: moderated by structural support. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 14-25.
- 136.Paço, A. M. F., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviors and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 20-38.
- 137.Paço, A. M. F., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviors and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 20-38.
- 138.Park, J. H., & Kim, C. Y. (2020). Social enterprises, job creation, and social open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(4), 120.
- 139.Pauline, E. O., & T, P. (2019). Gender as a moderator between entrepreneurship intention and its predictors among university graduates in Nigeria and India. *African Journal of Business Management*, 13(18), 622-629.
- 140.Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of world business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- 141.Peterman, N. E., & Kennedy, J. (2003). Enterprise education: Influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(2), 129-144.
- 142.Politis, K. Ketikidis, P., Diamantidis, A. D., & Lambros, L, (2016). *An investigation of social entrepreneurial intentions formation among South-East European postgraduate*.
- 143.Politis, K., Ketikidis, P., Diamantidis, A. D., & Lazuras, L. (2016). An investigation of social entrepreneurial intentions formation among South-East European postgraduate students. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.
- 144.Politis, K., Ketikidis, P., Diamantidis, A. D., & Lazuras, L. (2016). An investigation of social entrepreneurial intentions formation among South-East European postgraduate students. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.
- 145.Powell, B. (2012). Praise and profits: Cultural and institutional determinants of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 27(2), 19.
- 146.Preethi, C. M., & Priyadarshini, R. G. (2018). The intention towards social entrepreneurship among students and its link with Big 5 model. In: *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 390(1), pp. 012057). IOP Publishing.

147. Puente-Díaz, R., & Cavazos-Arroyo, J. (2017). The influence of creative mindsets on achievement goals, enjoyment, creative self-efficacy and performance among business students. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 24, 1-11.
148. Quan, X. (2012). Prior experience, social network, and levels of entrepreneurial intentions. *Management Review*, 35, 945-957.
149. Rambe, P., & Ndofirepi, T. M. (2021). Explaining social entrepreneurial intentions among college students in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(2), 175-196.
150. Randolph, A. L. (2000). *Business in black and white: American presidents and black entrepreneurs in the twentieth century*. New York: New York University Press.
151. Raosoft, (2022). Raosoft Sample Size Calculator. Raosoft, Inc., Seattle. Available at: <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>.
152. Rashid, S. N., Yaacob, S. F., Mustapha, N. J., Jusoh, M., Hussain, N., & Azis, R. A. (2018). Factors influencing student's social entrepreneurship intention: A Case of duta Jauhar program. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 1285-1299.
153. Remeikiene, R., Startiene, G., & Dumciuviene, D. (2015). Assessment of the industry competitiveness of the Baltic States in the EU during the period of economic recession. *Technological and economic development of economy*, 21(1), 79-95.
154. Richardson, M. (2017). *The role of social enterprise in supporting women's empowerment*. The British Council.
155. Rivera-Santos, M. (2015). Social entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(1), 72-91.
156. Roberts, P. W. (2013). New Research Suggests Start-Up Experience Doesn't Help Social Entrepreneurs. *Harvard Business Review*.
157. Robinson, J.A. (2006). *Navigating social and institutional barriers to markets: how social entrepreneurs identify and evaluate opportunities*. In: Mair, J., Robinson, J.A. & Hockerts, K. (Eds), *International Perspectives on social entrepreneurship*, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndsmill, pp. 1-6.
158. Rodrigues, R. G., Dinis, A., do Paço, A., Ferreira, J., & Raposo, M. (2012). *The effect of an entrepreneurial training programme on entrepreneurial traits and intention of secondary students*. *Entrepreneurship—Born, Made and Educated*, 77-92.
159. Rosca, E., Agarwal, N., & Brem, A. (2020). Women entrepreneurs as agents of change: A comparative analysis of social entrepreneurship processes in emerging markets. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 157.
160. Ruhle, S., Mühlbauer, D., Grünhagen, M., & Rothenstein, J. (2010). *The heirs of schumpeter: an insight view of students' entrepreneurial intentions at the schumpeter school of business and economics (2010-004)*. Schumpeter Discussion Papers.
161. Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 70-95.
162. Satar, M. S., & Ghadah, A. (2021). Social entrepreneurship education: A conceptual framework and review. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(3).
163. Shahverdi, M., Ismail, K., & Qureshi, M. (2018). The effect of perceived barriers on social entrepreneurship intention in Malaysian universities: The moderating role of education. *Management Science Letters*, 8(5), 341-352.
164. Shane, S. (2012). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science*, 11(4), 448-69.
165. Shaper, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). *The social dimensions of entrepreneurship*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship.
166. Shi, Y., Yuan, T., Bell, R., & Wang, J. (2020). Investigating the relationship between creativity and entrepreneurial intention: The moderating role of creativity in the theory of planned behavior. *Front Psychiatry*, 11, 1209.
167. Shook, C. L., & Bratianu, C. (2010). Entrepreneurial intent in a transitional economy: an application of the theory of planned behaviour to Romanian students. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 6(3), 231-247.
168. Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 3(2), 161-194.
169. Sutherland, D. (1975). Halifax 1815-1914: "colony to colony". *Urban History Review*, 4(1-75), 7-11.
170. Swanson, L. A., & Zhang, D. D. (2012). *Social entrepreneurship*. *Entrepreneurship-Gender, geographies and social context*, 171-190.
171. Tan Luc, P., Xuan Lan, P., Nhat Hanh Le, A., & Thanh Trang, B. (2020). A co-citation and co-word analysis of social entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-16.
172. Tan, L. P., Le, A. N. H. & Xuan, L. P. (2020). A Systematic Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurial Intention. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), 241-256. doi: 10.1080/19420676.2019.1640770.

173. Teise, H. & Urban, B. (2015). Antecedents to social entrepreneurship intentions: An empirical study in South Africa. *Management Dynamics. Journal of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*, 24(2), 36-52.
174. Thompson, E. R. (2009). Individual entrepreneurial intent: Construct clarification and development of an internationally reliable metric. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(3), 669-694.
175. Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2017). An empirical analysis of the factors affecting social entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(1), 1-25.
176. Tran, A. T. P. (2017). Factors influencing social entrepreneurial intention: A theoretical model. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, (3), 2394–7926. Available at: <http://iraj.in>.
177. Tran, A. T., & 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*.
178. Tung, D. T., Hung, N. T., Phuong, N. T. C., Loan, N. T. T., & Chong, S.-C. (2020). Enterprise development from students: The case of universities in Vietnam and the Philippines. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(1).
179. Urban, B., & Kujinga, B. (2017). Towards social change: South African university students as social entrepreneurs. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 31(1), 243–25.
180. Usman, S. et al. (2022). Impact of empathy, perceived social impact, social worth and social network on the social entrepreneurial intention in socio-economic projects. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 14(1), 65–92. doi: 10.1108/JEEE-10-2020-0355.
181. Valliere, (2015). An effectuation measure of entrepreneurial intent. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 169(1), 131-142.
182. Vitiello, D., & Wolf-Powers, L. (2014). Growing food to grow cities? The potential of agriculture for economic and community development in the urban United States. *Community Development Journal*, 49(4), 508-523.
183. Wach, D., Kruse, P., Costa, S., & Antonio Moriano, J. (2021). Exploring social and commercial entrepreneurial intentions from theory of planned behaviour perspective: A cross-country study among Namibian and German students. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-22.
184. Wach, K., & Bilan, S. (2021). Public support and administration barriers towards entrepreneurial intentions of students in Poland. *Administrative Management Public*, 36, 67-80.
185. Wahid, S. D. M., Noor, A. A. M., Fareed, M., Hussain, W. M. H. W., & Ayob, A. A. (2021). Enriching student's social entrepreneurship intention: A measurement model. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 27, 1-13.
186. Wang, J. H., Chang, C. C., Yao, S. N., & Liang, C. (2016). The contribution of self-efficacy to the relationship between personality traits and entrepreneurial intention. *Higher Education*, 72(2), 209-224.
187. Wang, Q., & Aaltio, I. (2017). Social entrepreneurship discourses and contributions: A literature analysis. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*, 22(2).
188. Weick, K. E. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 516-531.
189. Williams, T. E. (2021). Why is quantitative research important?. *The Doctoral Journey*.
190. Winkel, D., Litzky, B., Hance, J., & Howell, R. (2020). Entrepreneurial intentions: personal and cultural variations. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.
191. Wolk, A. M. (2008). *Social Entrepreneurship & Government. A new breed of entrepreneurs developing solutions to social problems*. Cambridge, MA: Root Cause.
192. Xiaohong, Q. (2012). Prior experience, social network, and levels of entrepreneurial intentions. *Management Research Review*, 35.
193. Yurtkoru, S., Kuscu, Z., & Doganay, A. (2014). Exploring the antecedents of entrepreneurial intention on Turkish university students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 150(1), 841-850.
194. Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of business venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.
195. Zapkau F. B., Schwens C., Steinmetz H., Kabst R. (2015). Disentangling the effect of prior entrepreneurial exposure on entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 68, 639–653.
196. Zaremohzzabieh, Z., Ahrari, S., Krauss, S. E., Samah, A. A., Meng, L. K., & Ariffin, Z. (2019). Predicting social entrepreneurial intention: A meta-analytic path analysis based on the theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 264-276.