

# INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EXPERIENCE ON SOCIAL INNOVATION PROPENSITY OF HUMANITARIAN ORGANIZATIONS: A STUDY OF INNER WHEEL INTERNATIONAL, NIGERIA

Nwekpa Kenneth C PhD<sup>1</sup>; Okoli Ijeoma C<sup>2</sup>; Etebong Umana<sup>3</sup> Mbam John N<sup>4</sup> and Arisi-Nwugballa, E. APh.D<sup>5</sup>.  
<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

Corresponding email: [nwekpa.kenneth@ebsu.edu.ng](mailto:nwekpa.kenneth@ebsu.edu.ng)

## ABSTRACT

*This study examined the influence of social entrepreneurship experience on social innovation propensity of humanitarian organizations in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria. The purpose of the study was to examine the extent to which social business ownership affect social innovative behavior in Inner Wheel International, to examine the extent to which social business ownership affect social pro-activeness behavior in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria. The study employed primary sources of data and survey design, using semi-structured questionnaire instrument. A total of two hundred and fifty-seven copies of questionnaire was correctly filled and returned from the respondents. Simple linear regression was used to test the statistical significance effect of the variables of study using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Based on the results, the findings revealed that there is no statistical significant effect of social entrepreneurship on social innovation. The result also showed that there is no statistical significant effect of social entrepreneurship on social pro-activeness. Based on this, it was recommended that there is a need for the involvement of government in financing social entrepreneurs which will help to attract more individuals, organizations and institutions into social entrepreneurship for solving social challenges. Also, commercial business owners should be involved in social entrepreneurship as a way of giving back to the society through corporate social responsibility (CSR) policies.*

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurship Experience, Social Innovation and Propensity

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The field of entrepreneurship has evolved to become a developed field of research. This innovative behavior which involves linking together behaviors that may have been previously learned, has emerged not only from management and entrepreneurship literature but also from a variety of disciplines such as sociology, ethics, finance, politics and institutions, and psychology and education (Arend, 2020). This new field of academic inquiry describes entrepreneurial activity as a source of social value creation. It applies the concept of entrepreneurship to the context of social problem solving.

Social entrepreneurship and social innovation have well and truly made their entry in the international political arena as a sector for the production of welfare services combined with strong and often conflicting values with regard to social benefit, franchising, participation and volunteerism (Nordic Council of Ministers, 2015). Social entrepreneurship, as it is labeled, is briefly entrepreneurial activity that mainly serves a social objective. The concept emerged in the 1980s from the work of Bill

Drayton at Ashoka Foundation which provides funding to social innovators around the world, and Ed Skloot of New Ventures that helps the nonprofits to explore new sources of income (Abdulmelike, 2017). In spite of the newness of the term and the concept, the practice that employ entrepreneurial capacities to ease social problems has existed for decades. This pro-active behavior which involves taking initiatives to improve current circumstances or challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present condition involves some of the practices that specifically focused on the problems of poor and marginalized populations which have succeeded in transforming the lives of thousands of people around the world (Tsotsotso, 2020). Nonetheless, it has only been recently that social entrepreneurship became a widely discussed topic and increasingly mainstreamed among policy makers, civil society groups, businesses, financial institutions, and academics in the universities.

The emergence of social entrepreneurship stands on three pillars. Firstly, the growing interest to solve social issues has led to the continuous pursuit of effective, innovative and sustainable solutions to deal with the complexity of social problems and a means to relieve modern societies from its illnesses such as unemployment, inequalities in the access to health care and social services, squalor, poverty, crime, privation or social exclusion. Secondly, the rising concern on the growing range of service areas not addressed by the public sector, but where conditions are not attractive enough to attract the private sector. Under this circumstance, neither the government nor the private sector has the proper incentive to produce or provide a service. Thus, alternative is needed to sub-contract public services or to improve these services without increasing the government's intervention. Thirdly, a growing appreciation among commercial business owners and their involvement in social sector with the purpose to enhance social wealth globally and as a way of creating community wealth. As a result, social enterprise activities exist in space where public, private and voluntary overlap (Trigkas, Partalidou & Lazaridou, 2020).

The aforesaid reasons have contributed to the creation of gaps in a social sector that subsequently are being filled by non-profit organizations. Currently, though, non-profit organizations are facing two intensifying demands. Firstly, public discontentment with the management of charities, foundations and government administration of social services leads to a pressing need to improved effectiveness and employ sound business practice. Secondly, the need to sustain in the state of

diminishing traditional funding resources and increased competition for these scarce resources. As a result, the practice of social entrepreneurship with an emphasis on community or social goals is deemed necessary and timely to not only address the critical social issues but also to innovatively improve efficiency of non-profit organizations (Gandhi & Raina, 2018) especially with the growing social needs and social problems in most parts of the world, accompanied by reduced government ability to provide the funding necessary to effectively combat these social problems.

Inner Wheel International Nigeria as the case study is an organization that has been touching lives for fifty-six years now nationwide. Inner Wheel International Nigeria consists of three Districts (911, 913 and 914). They are a non-governmental organization and the motive of the organization is to promote love, friendship and ideals of selfless services to mankind. Inner Wheel International is one of the largest women's service voluntary organization in the world and they have existed for ninety-six years now. They currently exist in 105 countries of the world. The main thrust of this study is to examine the influence of social entrepreneurship experience on social innovation propensity of humanitarian organizations in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria.

The scarcity of funding and the resulted increased competition shaped the way non-profit sectors lead their activities. Consequently, the sector is now experiencing a professionalized approach having the objective of decreasing financial dependence on donors to realize economic stability that can enable them to continue their social mission unabated. Social movements over the last twenty years have begun promoting social entrepreneurship. Such enterprises include Inner Wheel International Organization. The positive outcome of social entrepreneurs in maximizing the social impact by addressing the social needs of people overlooked by other institutions has been supported by different studies (Abazi-Alili, Ramadani, Ratten, Abazi-Çausi& Rexhepi, 2016).

On the other hand, the outcome of business entrepreneurs can be explained as profit maximization and shareholder maximization. Thus, integrating the profit and social value in a single organization is the challenging task among many practitioners that has now become the priority of social enterprises. Also, the prior legal boundary that limits non-profit organizations from realizing profit has been the point of debate among many scholars. This ongoing debate on the notion whether the social mission of

not-for-profit organizations limit them from participating in other legal organizational forms other than the non-profit form and hence cannot distribute profit to investors calls for answers.

The main thrust of this study is to examine the influence of social entrepreneurship experience on social innovation propensity of humanitarian organizations in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria.

The main objective of this study is to appraise the influence of social entrepreneurship experience on social innovation propensity in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria. However, the specific objectives are to examine the extent to which social business ownership affect social innovative behavior in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria and to examine the extent to which social business ownership affect social pro-activeness behavior in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria.

## **2.0 REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **2.1.1 Concept of entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship as a discipline and area of study has increased significantly in the past decade as researchers, practitioners and public policy analysts encourage entrepreneurial activity. Entrepreneurship creates new wealth, improves competitiveness and stimulates the economy (Clausen, 2020). Entrepreneurship is the engine that drives the success of an economy (Boudreaux, Nikolaev & Klein, 2019). Most definitions of entrepreneurship refer to it in economic terms related to the entrepreneur (Akter, Jamal, Ashraf, McCarthy & Varsha, 2019). An entrepreneur is a person who uses all of the factors of production (e.g. physical, human and financial resources) together to make a good or service (Abazi-Alili, Ramadani, Ratten, Abazi-Çaushi & Rexhepi, 2016). Therefore, an entrepreneur is a person who locates and puts new ideas into effect and uses these factors of production to be profitable (Tauber, 2019).

Entrepreneurs are people who demonstrate initiative through the creation and recognition of opportunities (Wood & McKinley, 2018). Schumpeter (1965) defined entrepreneurs as a person who exploits market opportunity through technical or organizational innovation. These opportunities form part of entrepreneurship as they lead to innovation (Chatzichristos & Nagopoulos, 2020). Innovation is fundamental to entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship and is a defining characteristic (Dearing & Cox, 2018). Entrepreneurship involves the management and assumption of risk of a business or enterprise.

### 2.1.2 Concept of social entrepreneurship

The words 'social entrepreneur' and 'social entrepreneurship' have become buzzwords but there is still no universally accepted definition (Tan, Le & Xuan, 2019). According to Ayob, (2018), social entrepreneurship embraces the basic principles of entrepreneurship, but it is the process of recognizing and relentlessly pursuing opportunities to create social value. Similarly, Von Friedrichs & Wahlberg (2016) noted that social entrepreneurship is a kind of entrepreneurship motivated by social values rather than economic, as presumed in traditional entrepreneurship.

Social entrepreneurship is a fascinating phenomenon for many researchers, business professionals, policy makers and nonprofit organizations. According to Nordic Council of Ministers, (2015), social entrepreneurship is about developing solutions to complex problems that cut across sectors and disciplines. In particular, the global-scale growing interest is largely influenced by the remarkable actions of social entrepreneurs, e.g. Muhammad Yunus, a 2006 Nobel laureate who obtained the award for his work in a microloans concept the so-called Grameen Bank for the poor to achieve a better well-being (Abazi-Alili, Ramadani, Ratten, Abazi-Çausi & Rexhepi, 2016). Social entrepreneurs in recent decades have shown an outstanding contribution in solving social problems and creating societal changes by performing a lot of examples in the creation of social innovation (Ashraf, 2020).

The main challenge encountered in the literature on social entrepreneurship is on finding a definition that will set a framework on the characteristics of social enterprise. Here, we highlight some definitions found in the literature. Haugh, Fergus & Doherty (2018) define the scope, indicating that social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner. Trigkas, Papadopoulos, Karagouni & Lazaridou (2017) conclude that social entrepreneurship has become so inclusive that it now has an immense tent into which all manner of socially beneficial activities fit. Salavou & Cohen (2020) clearly state that social entrepreneurship appears to be a unique method that helps us rethink, reformulate and resolve human problems on the path to social progress. Although Hossain, Saleh & Drennan (2017) defines social

entrepreneurship as any attempt at new social enterprise activity or new enterprise creation such as self-employment, a new enterprise, or the expansion of an existing social enterprise by an individual, teams of individuals or established social enterprise, with social or community goals as its base and where the profit is invested in the activity or venture itself rather than returned to investors. Social entrepreneurship has been defined through a number of different domains or themes of interests, e.g. the purpose setting domain (not for profit, nonprofit/public sector and for profit), entrepreneurial trait and behavior in individual and organization and from the perspective of its emergence process (Ru, Wang & Yan, 2018). In particular, the establishment of social entrepreneurship definition is largely based on approaches in entrepreneurship context (Abazi-Alili, Ramadani, Ratten, Abazi-Çaushi & Rexhepi, 2016). During the last two decades the literature investigating social entrepreneurship has mainly been concerned with the determination of the conceptual framework rather than empirical research.

### **2.1.3 Concept of social innovation**

Social innovation seems to be at the heart of the social economy literature (Yun, Park, Im, Shin & Zhao, 2017). Social innovation rests on two pillars, institutional innovation (innovation in social relations, innovations in governance including empowerment dynamics) and innovation in the sense of the social economy (satisfaction of various needs in local communities) and both pillars are intimately related (Hossain, Saleh & Drennan, 2017). The relation of the two pillars seems empirically grounded, since the institutionalization of social enterprises across Nigeria has contributed to the development of new public schemes and legal frameworks, which in their turn became channels for social innovation (Olokundun, Moses, Falola, Ibidunni, Salau & Oluremi, 2018). This process of institutionalization is illuminated by the 'Institutional Entrepreneurship' theoretical strand, which was initially introduced by Chandra (2017). The term institutional entrepreneurship refers to the practices of agents 'who have an interest in particular institutional arrangements and who leverage resources to create new institutions or to transform existing ones' (Lee, Zailani & Rahman, 2020). Thus, social enterprises that become embedded to the institutional framework, trigger dynamics for institutional change and innovation.

Also, political and institutional innovation can trigger locally embedded innovation, in the sense of social economy. Two main lines of arguments describe the broader interaction between political

institutions and social economy organizations. First, there is the institutional void perspective, which assumes that social economy motivation increases when we have less active governance, abundant social problems and a greater demand for social enterprises (Shin, 2018). On the contrary, the institutional support perspective implies that countries with more active governments will support and thus enhance social economy (Mamabolo & Myres, 2019).

#### **2.1.4 The process of social entrepreneurship**

There are two coinciding and possibly contradictory conceptions of social entrepreneurship. The first element emphasizes on social outcomes, social change and social impact which puts the significance in social results of the activity. The other element emphasizes on generating revenue and demonstrating business prowess in the pursuit of social outcomes. Social entrepreneurs must reflect the proper balance between investment in the revenue-generating part of the firm and investment in the portion accountable for achieving social outcomes while paying attention to the challenge of running a social enterprise in the face of complexities. A framework for social entrepreneurship according to Foss & Klein, (2017) are:

- i. **Development strategy:** In the social entrepreneurial process, development strategy resides in producing a level playing ground for everybody. Unlike in the business development process where new product development is directed towards financial rewards, here it focuses on social benefits. The conventional approach to product development encompassing loose assessment of technology and market or in some cases a total lack of assessment still thrives in current development strategy of social entrepreneurship. Adding more to this situation, the basic problems inherent in new product development in the business world are still relevant in social entrepreneurship.
- ii. **Developmental objectives:** Effective incorporation of market and technology strategy is absent in current deployment of a framework for development strategy. Customer support is a weakening strand in current social entrepreneurship developmental effort. There is total deficiency of customer incorporation in the strategy front end. Usually entrepreneurs just launch products that they think will fulfil the need of customers without getting them

involved. It is important to know what the exact problem is and how accurately this problem affects people who will be our potential customers.

- iii. **Financing:** It can be done in two ways. Bootstrapping (a process of financing a small firm through innovative acquirement and use of resources without raising money from other traditional sources or a bank) and venture capitalists (donors and philanthropists organized as charities).
- iv. **The team:** Entrepreneurs are very passionate about their goals. Sometimes they are not experts in the field or sometimes they may belong to the domain but the desire for change is something that is very common to all of them.

#### 2.1.5 Entrepreneurship and Innovation

The rapid increase of rivals and the resulted competition among organizations has necessitated the inclusion of innovative approaches in their activities. According to Carvalho, Kindl da Cunha, Ferreira de Lima & Carstens, (2017), innovative approach is becoming a crucial factor, not only in for-profit organizations but also in the not-for-profit organizations for the development of societies. Additionally, the competitive environment along with the increased number of needed and scarce donations has forced not-for-profit organizations to find innovative ways that can fill the fund gap. This has led to entrepreneurship activities which is a systematic process of applying creativity and innovation to needs and opportunities in the marketplace. It also involves applying focused strategies to new ideas and new insights to create a product or a service that satisfies customers' needs or solve their problems (Boudreaux, Nikolaev & Klein, 2019).

Also, social entrepreneurship stems from the entrepreneurship concept to imply the innovative use and combination of resources to utilize opportunities to facilitate and/or address social change (Shirokova, Bogatyreva, Beliaeva & Puffer, 2016). While addressing and facilitating change within the society, social entrepreneurship activities can positively influence the economic growth and social development of the society through reducing poverty and improving large scale economic development (Anggadwita, Ramadani, Alamanda, Ratten & Hashani, 2017). However, this idea was challenged by McDonald, Weerawardena, Madhavaram & Mort (2015) who stated that the influence of social



entrepreneurship activity is at micro level and it does not have great impact on poverty reduction. The use of the term social entrepreneurship is gaining increased popularity in the world (Ugoani, 2019) in general and in Nigeria in specific. In Nigeria different initiatives have emerged in relation to the establishment of social entrepreneurship in recent years.

## 2.2 Empirical Review

Madu & Yusof (2015) investigated on social entrepreneurship as a veritable tool for sustainable rural development in Nigeria: a necessary agenda for government. The aim of the paper was to examine the role of social entrepreneurship as a measure to complementing sustainable rural development in Nigeria. The methodology adopted for this study was secondary sources of data obtained from literatures and internet sources that are having to do with the subject matter; social entrepreneurship and rural development generally and Nigeria in particular and content analysis method were used. The findings revealed that the Nigerian rural sub-sector has suffered so many years of neglect and deprivations, in spite of array of policy decisions and programs embarked by successive governments over time to bring socio-economic development and enhance the quality of life of the rural populace. The study concluded that, unless there are deliberate attempts by government to create enabling environment for smooth and successful engagements and collaborations with the social entrepreneurs to meeting the rural needs; all efforts and governmental strides to ensuring speedy rural transformation and sustainable development will remain slow and unattained. It was recommended that government should provide basic amenities and improved socio-economic life of the rural people for example: the road networks, health-care facilities, good education, and employment generation.

Olokundun, Moses, Falola, Ibidunni, Salau & Oluremi (2018) investigated on the role of social entrepreneurship and the state in propelling national development in Nigeria: a conceptual approach. The aim was to examine understanding of how social entrepreneurship and the activities of social entrepreneurs shape national development. The paper adopted conceptual analysis as research method. The study revealed that the government of Nigeria has at different dispensations initiated different policies, programs and schemes to ensure that adequate attention is given to the populace of the nation. However, considering the

complexities of the social challenges in Nigeria, the task seems too enormous to be effectively tackled solely by the government. It was concluded that social entrepreneurship may serve as a spring board for the achievement of national development in Nigeria owing to the fact that creating social impacts by changing systems that combat social challenges is the focal point of social entrepreneurship. It is therefore recommended that government programmes in Nigeria should be designed to create enabling environments to stimulate the emergence of highly enthused social entrepreneurs who will become creative and innovative in finding solutions to socio-economic problems facilitating the achievement of national development.

Ugoani (2019) investigated on social entrepreneurship and sustainable development: The Nigerian Conservation Foundation phenomenon. The aim of the study was to explore the relationship of social entrepreneurship and sustainable development in Nigeria using the NCF as the point of analysis. The case study method was used for this study which enables the researcher to explore issues from multiple sources of information including personal experience, case studies, observations, interviews, documents and records. In the study, the collection and analysis of data were done concurrently. It was revealed that social entrepreneurs are social change agents who often possess the competences to do a new thing for the social good and also deploy the appropriate competencies to pursue their objectives to a logical conclusion. The study recommended that government should give support to SEOs seeking to promote environmentally and socially sustainable environment. This will help in realizing the UNs target to combat climate change and its impacts by 2030

Uchehara (2019) investigated on the impact of social entrepreneurship on wealth creation in Nigeria: A case study of selected non-for-profit organizations (NPOS). The aim of the study was to ascertain the role of social entrepreneurship on job creation, and to determine the effect of social entrepreneurship on wealth creation in Nigeria. The study was based on descriptive survey. Primary and secondary sources of data were employed. Copies of questionnaire were used to get responses for the study. The population were 40 and 288 for the founders and clients respectively of the sampled NGOs. Simple percent was used to analyze the research questions and Chi-Square was used to test the

hypotheses. The study revealed that social entrepreneurship creates employment. The research findings indicated that there is a positive relationship between social entrepreneurship and wealth creation. The paper concluded that there is need to develop this important sector of the economy as social entrepreneur do not only respond to the needs of the society but also earn money at the same time.

### 2.3 **Theoretical framework**

This study anchored on the resource-based theory postulated by Barney 1991. The assumptions of this theory includes the following:

1. that sustained competitive advantage is generated by the unique bundle of resources at the core of the firm. In other words, the resource-based view describes how business owners build their businesses from the resources and capabilities that they currently possess or can acquire. The term “resources” was conceived broadly as “anything that can be thought of as a strength or a weakness” of the firm.
2. that the possession of strategic resources (i.e. resources that are valuable, rare, difficult to imitate and non-substitutable) provides an organization with a golden opportunity to develop competitive advantages over its rivals. These competitive advantages in turn can help the organization enjoy strong profits, especially over time.
3. That superior performance can be attained relative to other firms in the same market and posits that superior performance results from acquiring and exploiting unique resources of the firm. Implicit in the resource-based perspective is the centrality of the venture’s capabilities in explaining the firm’s performance. These would imply that firms can achieve sustainable competitive advantage from such resources as the knowledge and skills of employees, the reputation of the firm and the organizations culture which are all a function of its inherent qualities.

The implication of this theory to the study bothers on the fact that the sole purpose of social entrepreneurship is to be socially innovative or proactive in solving pressing social problems while also making profit which could ultimately be achieved by gaining sustainable competitive advantage over competitors in the market.

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

The descriptive survey design of research was adopted for this study. The justification for this method is that it assisted the study to map out a broad view of the research question and provide themes and areas for investigation in more depth through interview. This study mainly relied on primary data which were collected by use of a semi-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire contained structured questions. The population of three hundred and ninety-six (396) members based on the organizational record for Inner wheel international, Nigeria. However, for this study, the sample size was drawn from the entire population, implying census sampling. Of the 396 respondents, those in attendance during the time of questionnaire administration were 257, which were studied. Data were gathered from primary sources (questionnaire). The study used Likert scale measure which ranged mode of responses for the respondents from strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), disagree (D) to strongly disagree (SD). This was basically structured for the respondents for easy understanding. The data collected were analysed for easy comprehension. The question item for the level of social entrepreneurship had to do with either social innovation (4 items) or social pro-activeness (3 items).

### 4.0 Data presentation

The study adopted the use of construct validity or factor analysis. To show that the data was valid, the data were to show that the question items loaded appropriately according to the various constructs. The table below shows that the loadings did not just load accordingly, but also loaded well above the standard threshold of 0.5.

**Table 1: Construct Validity**

	Social Innovativeness	Social Pro-activeness	Social Entrepreneurship
SI4	.787		
SI3	.723		
SI1	.717		
SI2	.557		
SP1		.807	
SP2		.769	
SP3		.605	
BizOwn_1			.959

To test the reliability of the research instrument, the Cronbach alpha was used. The tables below show that the alpha levels for the group constructs of social innovation and social pro-activeness are above 0.5, being 0.681 and 0.611 respectively.

**Table 2a: Results**

<b>Constructs</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>N of Items</b>
Social Innovativeness	.681	4
Social Pro-activeness	.611	3

**Table 2b: Item statistics**

<b>Constructs</b>	<b>Labels</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
Social Innovativeness	SI1	4.24	.903	257
	SI2	4.21	.897	257
	SI3	4.31	.866	257
	SI4	4.22	.806	257
Social Pro-activeness	SP1	4.06	.974	257
	SP2	4.01	1.004	257
	SP3	4.35	.806	257

**Table 2c: Total item statistics**

<b>Constructs</b>	<b>Labels</b>	<b>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</b>	<b>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</b>	<b>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</b>
Social Innovativeness	SI1	12.74	3.728	.466	.613
	SI2	12.77	3.943	.398	.658
	SI3	12.67	3.786	.484	.601
	SI4	12.75	3.896	.510	.588
Social Pro-activeness	SP1	8.36	2.114	.472	.431
	SP2	8.41	2.118	.436	.490
	SP3	8.07	2.775	.363	.590

#### 4.1 Method for Data Analyses

In order to analyse the data gathered from the questionnaire, simple linear regression (to test the statistical significance effect of the two variables) was used to test the hypotheses stated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. SPSS was also employed to conduct preliminary data analysis including frequencies, mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum value, as well as the median and quartile conducted for research variables as needed to gain preliminary

information about the sample. In addition, other statistical techniques were used to support the findings of the propositions' tests such as frequency distributions and descriptive statistics.

**Model Specification**

Model 1:

$$SI = a + bi (\text{BizOwn}) + \mu \dots\dots\dots 1$$

where:

- SI = Social Innovativeness
- BizOwn = Ownership of a social enterprise.
- a = Constant of the equation
- bi = Coefficient of the independent variable
- μ = Error Term

Model 2:

$$SP = a + bi (\text{BizOwn}) + \mu \dots\dots\dots 2$$

where:

- SP = Social Pro-activeness
- BizOwn = Ownership of a social enterprise.
- a = Constant of the equation
- bi = Coefficient of the independent variable
- μ = Error Term

**4.2 RESULTS**

**Result on Hypothesis One**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.221	1	.221	.036	.850 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1578.561	255	6.190		
	Total	1578.783	256			

a. Dependent Variable: Social Innovativeness

b. Predictors: (Constant), BizOwn\_1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	17.094	.649		26.349	.000
	BizOwn_1	-.065	.343	-.012	-.189	.850

a. Dependent Variable: Social Innovativeness

**Discussion on Hypothesis One**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** Social entrepreneurship does not have a statistically significant effect on the level of social innovation at Inner Wheel International, Nigeria

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Social entrepreneurship has a statistically significant effect on the level of social innovation at Inner Wheel International, Nigeria

The hypothesis stated above was set to establish the effect of social entrepreneurship which is measured by the level of business ownership or whether one owns a business, on the measure of social innovation. It should be noted that while the measure of business ownership was just a single question, the measure of social innovation was made up of four question items. The reliability score or Cronbach's alpha coefficient for these four question items measuring social innovation was 0.681, which is above the 0.5 threshold. The factor loadings for the four question items were all above 0.5, actually ranging from 0.548 to 0.778, with the fourth question item loading at 0.778, and the least being the second question item, which loaded at 0.548. The aggregated sum of these question items shows the score of social innovation amongst the study respondents.

For the regression test, the result on the effect of social entrepreneurship on social innovation showed that there is a statistically significant constant of 17.094 @  $p < 0.05$ , which implies that when social entrepreneurship is at zero (0), the level of social innovation would be 17.094, or put differently, an absence of social entrepreneurship still implies a high level of social innovation. On the other aspect of the linear model, the result shows that there is a statistically no significant effect of social entrepreneurship on social innovation, with  $\beta = -0.065$ ;  $p > 0.05$  (0.850);  $n = 257$ . The p-value being above 0.05 implies the absence of any level of significant effect, this implies that the increase, decrease or change in social entrepreneurship does not lead to any corresponding change in the level off social innovation amongst the study respondents.

### Result on Hypothesis Two

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.937	1	.937	.212	.645 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1125.404	255	4.413		
	Total	1126.341	256			

a. Dependent Variable: Social Pro-activeness

b. Predictors: (Constant), BizOwn\_1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	12.175	.548		22.227	.000
	BizOwn_1	.133	.290	.029	.461	.645

a. Dependent Variable: Social Pro-activeness

## Discussion on Hypothesis Two

**H<sub>0</sub>:** Social entrepreneurship does not have a statistically significant effect on the level of social pro-activeness at Inner Wheel International

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Social entrepreneurship has a statistically significant effect on the level of social pro-activeness at Inner Wheel International

Like the first hypothesis above, the hypothesis stated was set to establish the effect of social entrepreneurship which is measured by whether one owns a business, on the measure of social pro-activeness. It should be noted that while the measure of business ownership was just a single question, the measure of social pro-activeness was made up of three question items. The reliability score or Cronbach's alpha coefficient for these three question items measuring social pro-activeness was 0.611, which is above the 0.5 benchmark. The factor loadings for the three question items were all above 0.5, actually ranging from 0.596 to 0.804, with the first question item loading at 0.804, and the least being the third question item, which loaded at 0.596. The aggregated sum of these question items shows the score of social pro-activeness amongst the study respondents.

For the regression test, the result on the effect of social entrepreneurship on social pro-activeness showed that there is a statistically significant constant of  $\alpha = 12.175$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 257$ , which implies that when social entrepreneurship is at zero (0), the level of social pro-activeness would be 12.175, or put differently, an absence of social entrepreneurship still implies a high level of social pro-activeness. On the other aspect of the linear model, the result shows that there is a statistically non-significant effect of social entrepreneurship on social pro-activeness, with  $\beta = 0.133$ ;  $p > 0.05$  (0.645);  $n = 257$ . The p-value being above 0.05 implies the absence of any level of significant effect, this implies that the increase,



decrease or change in social entrepreneurship does not lead to any corresponding change in the level of social pro-activeness amongst the study respondents.

## **5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **5.1 Conclusions**

Based on the finding, it was concluded that there is no significant effect of social entrepreneurship on social innovativeness in Inner Wheel International, Nigeria which implies that the increase, decrease or change in social entrepreneurship does not lead to any corresponding change in the level of innovativeness amongst the study respondents. Also, there is no significant effect of social entrepreneurship on social pro-activeness which implies that the increase, decrease or change in social entrepreneurship does not lead to any corresponding change in the level of social pro-activeness amongst the study respondents.

### **5.2 Recommendations**

In the light of the research findings and conclusions above, the researcher hereby recommends the following suggestions:

1. There is need to have many more social entrepreneurs to take up the challenge of social needs in Nigeria considering the enormous social needs crying for attention.
2. There is a need for the involvement of the government in financing social entrepreneurs in Nigeria which will help to attract more individuals, organizations and institutions into social entrepreneurship for solving social challenges.
3. Commercial business owners should be involved in social entrepreneurship as a way of giving back to the society through corporate social responsibilities (CSR) policies.
4. There should be government programs in Nigeria designed to create enabling environments to stimulate the emergence of highly enthused social entrepreneurs who will become creative and innovative in finding solutions to socio-economic problems facilitating the achievement of national development.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abazi-Alili, H., Ramadani, V., Ratten, V., Abazi-Çausi, B. & Rexhepi, G. (2016). Encouragement factors of social entrepreneurial activities in Europe. *International Journal of Foresight and Innovation Policy*, 11(4), 225-239.
- Abdulmelike, A. (2017). Social entrepreneurship: literature review and current practice in

- Ethiopia. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(31), 86-93.
- Akter, S., Jamal, N., Ashraf, M. M., McCarthy, G. & Varsha, P. S. (2019). The rise of the social business in emerging economies: a new paradigm of development. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 3, 1–18.
- Anggadwita, G., Ramadani, V., Alamanda, D. T., Ratten, V. & Hashani, M. (2017). Entrepreneurial intentions from an Islamic perspective: a study of Muslim entrepreneurs in Indonesia. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(2), 165–179.
- Arend, R., J. (2020). Modelling social entrepreneurship: consideration of the reacting forces. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 11-18. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2020.1718744
- Ashraf, M. A. (2020). “Is old gold?” The role of prior experience in exploring the determinants of Islamic social entrepreneurial intentions: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-26. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2019.1702580.
- Ayob, A. H. (2018). Diversity, trust and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 1–12. doi:10.1080/19420676.2017.1399433.
- Boudreaux, C. J., Nikolaev, B. N. & P. Klein. (2019). Socio-cognitive traits and entrepreneurship: the moderating role of economic institutions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(1), 178–196.
- Carvalho, A., Kindl da Cunha, S., Ferreira de Lima, L. & Carstens, D. D. (2017). The role and contributions of sociological institutional theory to the socio-technical approach to innovation theory. *RAI Revista de Administrac , ~ ao e Inovac , ~ ao* 14(3), 250–259.
- Chandra, Y. (2017). Social entrepreneurship as institutional-change work: A corpus linguistics analysis. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 14–46
- Chatzichristos, G. & Nagopoulos, N. (2020). Regional institutional arenas for social innovation: a mixed methods research. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-23 DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2019.1705378
- Clausen, T., H. (2020). Entrepreneurial thinking and action in opportunity development: A conceptual process model. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* 38(1), 21-40.
- Dearing, J. W. & Cox, J. G. (2018). Diffusion of Innovations Theory, Principles, and Practice. *Health Affairs*, 37(2), 183–190
- Foss, N.J. & Klein, P.G. (2017). Entrepreneurial discovery or creation? In search of the middle ground. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(4), 733–736.
- Gandhi, T. & Raina, R. (2018). Social entrepreneurship: the need, relevance, facets and constraints. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(9), 1-13.
- Haugh, H., Fergus, L. & Doherty, B. (2018). Social entrepreneurship: entrepreneurship and social value creation. In *The SAGE Handbook of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, edited by Robert, B., Clercq, D. D. & Heinonen, J. 125–142. London: SAGE.
- Hossain, S., Saleh, M. A. & Drennan, J. (2017). A critical appraisal of the social entrepreneurship paradigm in an international setting: A proposed conceptual framework. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(2), 347–368.
- Lee, Y. N., Zailani, S. & Rahman, M. K. (2020). Determinants of customer intention to purchase social enterprise products: A structural model analysis. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-22. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2020.1718742.
- Madu, A. Y. & Yusof, R. (2015). Social entrepreneurship as a veritable tool for sustainable rural development in Nigeria: A necessary agenda for government. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 17(5), 115-121.
- Mamabolo, A. & Myres, K. (2019). Performance measurement in emerging market social enterprises using a balanced scorecard. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1 –23. doi:10.1080/19420676.2018.1561499.
- McDonald, R. E., Weerawardena, J., Madhavaram, S. & Sullivan Mort, G. (2015). From

- “virtuous” to “pragmatic” pursuit of social mission: a sustainability-based typology of nonprofit organizations and corresponding strategies. *Management Research Review*, 38(9), 970–991. doi:10.1108/MRR-11-2013-0262.
- Nordic Council of Ministers, (2015). Social entrepreneurship and social innovation Initiatives to promote social entrepreneurship and social innovation in the Nordic countries. doi.org/10.6027/TN2015-562
- Olokundun, M. A., Moses, C. L., Falola, H. O., Ibidunni, S. A., Salau, O. P. & Oluremi, O. A. (2018). The role of social entrepreneurship and the state in propelling national development in Nigeria: a conceptual approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 22(1), 1-6.
- Ru, X., Wang, S. & Yan, S. (2018). Exploring the effects of normative factors and perceived behavioral control on individual’s energy-saving intention: An empirical study in Eastern China. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 134, 91–99
- Salavou, H. & Cohen, S. (2020). Towards a typology of social enterprises based on performance: Some new evidence. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-19. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2020.1718743
- Shin, C. (2018). How social entrepreneurs affect performance of social enterprises in Korea: The mediating effect of innovativeness. *Sustainability*, 10, 2643; doi:10.3390/su10082643
- Shirokova, G., Bogatyreva, K., Beliaeva, T. & Puffer, S. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in different environmental settings: contingency and configurational approaches. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 23, 703–727. doi:10.1108/JSBED-09-2015-0132.
- Tan, L. P., Le, A. N. H. & Xuan, L. P. (2019). A systematic literature review on social entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 3, 1–16. doi:10.1080/19420676.2019.1640770.
- Tauber, L. (2019). Beyond homogeneity: Redefining social entrepreneurship in authoritarian contexts. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 10(3), 1–19. doi:10.1080/19420676.2019.1668829.
- Trigkas, M., Papadopoulos, I., Karagouni, G. & Lazaridou, D. (2017). Social entrepreneurship in selected areas the “AITHIKOS” project in Greece. *Australian Academy of Accounting and Finance Review*, 3(1), 28–36.
- Trigkas, M., Partalidou, M. & Lazaridou, D. (2020). Trust and other historical proxies of social capital: do they matter in promoting social entrepreneurship in Greek rural areas? *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-20. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2020.1718741
- Tsotsotso, K. (2020). Is programme evaluation the same as social impact measurement? *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-20. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2019.1683877
- Uchegara, F. O. (2019). The impact of social entrepreneurship on wealth creation in Nigeria: A case study of selected non-for-profit organizations (NPOS). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(6), 915-938.
- Ugoani, J. N. (2019). Social entrepreneurship and sustainable development: The Nigerian conservation foundation phenomenon. *American Journal of Business and Society*, 4(1), 16-31.
- Von Friedrichs, Y. & Wahlberg, O. (2016). Social entrepreneurship in the rural areas – A sports club’s mobilization of people, money and social capital. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 29(2), 199–216.
- Wood, M.S. & McKinley, W. (2018) The entrepreneurial opportunity construct: Dislodge or leverage. *Academy of Management Perspectives*. DOI: 10.5465/amp.2017.0162
- Yun, J.J.; Park, K.; Im, C.; Shin, C. & Zhao, X. (2017). Dynamics of social enterprises—shift from social innovation to open innovation. *Sci. Technol. Soc.*, 22, 425–439.