

*Irena Kedmenec**
*Miroslav Rebernik***
*Julia Perić****

UDK 334.012.44:330.161(497.5)
JEL Classification M13, D64
Original scientific article

THE IMPACT OF INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS ON INTENTIONS TO PURSUE SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Social entrepreneurship is a growing phenomenon, both in practice and in the scientific community. The main goal of this research is to examine specific personal characteristics that might support one's decision to pursue social entrepreneurship as a career choice. The research sample consisted of 114 students of two graduate entrepreneurship programs: Economics of Entrepreneurship at the Faculty of Organization and Informatics in Varaždin, University of Zagreb; and Entrepreneurship at the Faculty of Economics, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek.

Based on the scientific literature, we identified several potentially important personal characteristics: creativity, proactivity, compassionate love for humanity, hardship in life and moral judgement competence. These characteristics were adequately measured and compared between three groups of students: those that want to become commercial entrepreneurs, those that want to become social entrepreneurs, and those who have no entrepreneurial intentions. The methods we used were one-way ANOVA and factor analysis. Our results showed that the factor that differed the most between the observed groups was compassionate love for humanity. This factor might be the main driving force behind social entrepreneurial activities.

* Irena Kedmenec, B. Sc., Faculty of Organization and Informatics, University of Zagreb. (E-mail: irena.kedmenec@foi.hr).

** Miroslav Rebernik, Ph. D., Professor, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor. (E-mail: rebernik@uni-mb.si).

*** Julia Perić, Ph. D., Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics, University of Osijek. (E-mail: julia@efos.hr).

Key words: social entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial intention, individual characteristics

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship has been recognized as a driving force of economic growth and development. Therefore many scholars devoted their time to researching entrepreneurship in the fields of economics, strategic management, psychology and sociology (Mitchell et al., 2002). Entrepreneurship research can be classified into three main categories: trait (personality), behavioural and functional approaches (Cope, 2005). The trait approach tries to identify individual psychological traits that define an entrepreneur. The behavioural approach deals with the process of how an entrepreneur perceives and acts on presented opportunities, while the functional approach investigates rational outcomes within the economic theory. Shane and Venkataraman developed the individual-opportunity nexus model of entrepreneurship, which defines entrepreneurship as a combination of a context in which an opportunity arises and a set of personal characteristics required to identify and pursue an opportunity (Shane, 2003).

“Social entrepreneurs are one species in the genus entrepreneur” (Dees, 2001, p. 2). According to Mair (2010), social entrepreneurship refers to a process of catering to locally existing basic needs that are not addressed by traditional organizations. This process usually involves the provision of goods and services, and/or the creation of missing institutions or the reshaping of inadequate ones. The main objective is to change those social and/or economic arrangements that create the situation of failure to satisfy basic needs.

In Croatia social entrepreneurial ventures have been developing in two ways (Vidović, 2012). First, by importing the concept of social entrepreneurship under the influence of international organizations. Second, through spontaneous economic activities that occur in order to satisfy certain unaddressed social needs and are not perceived as social entrepreneurship by their initiators.

Factors that positively influence the dynamics of social entrepreneurship development in Croatia are: the activation of other actors in the social sphere besides the state, the perspective of entrepreneurship as an economic activity with the greatest potential for fast economic growth and development, the inclination of civil society organizations toward financial sustainability, the tendency of transferring the responsibility for socio-economic security to the individual level (Vidović, 2012).

However, the lack of understanding of this phenomenon, the lack of information and the lack of social entrepreneurship education programs are slowing down

the development of social entrepreneurship (Gvozdanović, Potočnik and Sočo, 2009; Perić and Delić, 2014). In 2014, the Ministry of Labour and Pension System drafted the Strategy of social entrepreneurship development (Ministry of Labour and Pension System, 2014). It proposes the collection of data on the existing social entrepreneurial ventures, which would enable the monitoring of social entrepreneurship development.

In a suboptimal equilibrium, social entrepreneurs see an opportunity to provide new solutions, whereas many others see only an inconvenience that has to be tolerated. This difference stems from the unique set of individual characteristics that an entrepreneur brings to the situation (Martin and Osberg, 2007). In 2001, Dees wrote about social entrepreneurship as a set of behaviours that “should be encouraged and rewarded in those who have the capabilities and temperament for this kind of work” (p. 5). Intentions routinely prove to be the best single predictor of behaviour (Krueger and Brazeal, 1994) because they represent “indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert in order to perform the behaviour” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 181). Thus, our goal is to detect those individual characteristics that might support the development of social entrepreneurial intentions, especially the ones that might differentiate between the creation of social entrepreneurial intention and commercial entrepreneurial intention.

2. Individual characteristics of social entrepreneurs

Below we give an overview of the individual characteristics that the literature lists as likely to contribute in the development of social entrepreneurial intention: creativity, proactivity, compassionate love, hardship in life and moral judgement competence.

2.1. Creativity

Entrepreneurship literature uses creativity and innovation as key characteristics that identify entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial organizations (Covin and Slevin, 1991). Shaw and Carter (2007) interviewed social entrepreneurs and asked them for the words that best described the culture of their enterprises. The most common responses were “open” and “creative”. What is more, when asked about the difficulties their enterprises had experienced, the respondents emphasized various creative and innovative approaches they had applied to overcome them. When solving social problems, social entrepreneurs apply the same kind of de-

termination, creativity and resourcefulness that we can find in business entrepreneurs (Dees, 2007). Also, they are highly pragmatic, while striving for innovation (Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort, 2006).

Leadbeater (1997) even goes so far as to argue that it is quite possible to be a successful entrepreneur in the private sector without being at all innovative. However, in the social sector an entrepreneur is most likely to also be an innovator, bringing together different approaches which have traditionally been kept separate. Perhaps social entrepreneurs exhibit greater creativity in comparison with traditional entrepreneurs because they face problems and situations that are less common. Unlike commercial entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs rarely allow external factors to determine whether or not they should start an enterprise, which makes them more likely to develop creative mechanisms of circumventing environmental barriers (Dacin et al., 2010). Therefore, we pose the following hypotheses:

H1a: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions have higher levels of creativity compared to people who have commercial entrepreneurial intentions.

H1b: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions have higher levels of creativity compared to people who do not have entrepreneurial intentions.

2.2. Proactivity

Bargsted et al. (2013) conceptualize proactivity as a mobilization of one's personal resources to launch some project. Proactivity refers to an orientation towards initiating and maintaining actions that have effects on the environment (Sanchez, 2010 referenced in Bargsted et al., 2013). These actions may include opportunity seeking, overcoming barriers, anticipating difficulties, and avoiding bad habits (Moriano, 2005 referenced in Bargsted et al., 2013). Both commercial and social entrepreneurship include such actions. Thus, we pose the following hypotheses:

H2a: There is no statistical difference in the level of proactivity between people who have social entrepreneurial intentions and people who have commercial entrepreneurial intentions.

H2b: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions have higher levels of proactivity compared to people who do not have entrepreneurial intentions.

2.3. *Compassionate love*

Social entrepreneurs help change people's lives because they embrace important social causes and act more as the caretakers of society than as businessmen making money (Thompson, 2002). They possess many of the qualities of business entrepreneurs, but differ in their strong commitment to help others in some way (Leadbeater, 1997). They come from different parts of society and cover a wide range of ages and backgrounds, but what they have in common is the drive to satisfy social needs, which gives them personal satisfaction (Shaw and Carter, 2007; Thompson, 2002).

Since the concept of *helping behaviour* is related to the spirit of social entrepreneurship (Cho, 2006), empathy might be positively associated with perceived social venture desirability. Empathy is an ability to intellectually recognize and emotionally share the emotions of others (Cho, 2006). Social entrepreneurs have a strong desire to help others because they can feel their pain (Vega and Kidwell, 2007).

Compassionate love is more encompassing and more enduring than empathy. It is more encompassing because it includes various aspects of empathy, such as tenderness, caring and others, but also includes various behavioural predispositions, such as self-sacrifice. It is more enduring because it is likely to be experienced independently of a specific target eliciting the experience, whereas empathy may occur specifically in response to someone's suffering (Sprecher and Fehr, 2005). "Compassionate love is an attitude toward other(s), either close others or strangers or all of humanity; containing feelings, cognitions and behaviours that are focused on caring, concern, tenderness, and an orientation toward supporting, helping and understanding the other(s), particularly when the other(s) is (are) perceived to be suffering or in need" (Sprecher and Fehr, 2005). As a more enduring state, compassionate love may contribute to sustained prosocial behaviour, such as social entrepreneurship.

Sprecher and Fehr (2005) distinguish compassionate love for close others from compassionate love for humanity, with the latter more likely leading to prosocial behaviour. On average, people score significantly higher in compassionate love for close others than for strangers and humanity (Sprecher and Fehr, 2005). Social entrepreneurs "...aim to create sustainable improvements and are willing to draw on self-interest, as well as compassion to do it" (Dees 2007, p.27). Thus, we may pose the following hypotheses:

H3a: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions exhibit higher levels of compassionate love for humanity compared to people who have commercial entrepreneurial intentions.

H3b: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions exhibit higher levels of compassionate love for humanity compared to people who do not have entrepreneurial intentions.

2.4. Hardship in life

Social entrepreneurs have deeply rooted beliefs, which Barendsen and Gardner (2004) ascribe to some kind of trauma early in life. Several social entrepreneurs that they investigated reported some kind of traumatic event, such as a mother's suicide, parents' divorce or being a victim of violence. "Priorities suddenly become clear when life seems short or when one faces a stark choice. Under such circumstances, a calling may be discovered" (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004, p. 44). Others, who do not experience extreme trauma, report some kind of deeply transformative experience, such as living abroad, combating depression or addiction, or working with troubled youth (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004). People who start hospices usually have one trait in common – some previous experience with cancer or a similar "killer" disease (Johnson, 1998 referenced in Thompson et al., 2000).

Social entrepreneurs frequently have a great understanding of specific social needs because they were (or are) members of the same disadvantaged population (Murphy and Coombes, 2009). This may give them the necessary knowledge and social resources that facilitate the discovery of social entrepreneurship (Murphy and Coombes, 2009). Thus, social entrepreneurs have an ability to see that something positive can emerge from a painful situation (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004). This brings us to the following hypotheses:

H4a: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions had more hardship in life compared to people who have commercial entrepreneurial intentions.

H4b: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions had more hardship in life compared to people who do not have entrepreneurial intentions.

2.5. Moral judgement competence

Most of the literature that deals with social entrepreneurs' moral judgements actually refers to their ethical values. Mair and Noboa (2006) claim that moral judgement, defined as a cognitive process that motivates an individual to help oth-

ers in search of a common good, is relevant for distinguishing social from commercial entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurs give the highest priority to ethical behaviour when rating the behavioural traits that social entrepreneurs are expected to possess (Vasakarla, 2008).

Although some suggest that social entrepreneurs have strong ethical values, Barendsen and Gardner (2004) find that volunteers who provide social services question their own actions in terms of ethical issues, whereas social entrepreneurs are primarily concerned with running their organizations. For example, financial obstacles represent the greatest challenge for social entrepreneurs (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004), and many describe the process of fundraising as restrictive and frustrating. Thus, they sometimes “adjust” the truth or revise the goals of their venture so the funders would find it attractive. However, in the sample of social entrepreneurs that Barendsen and Gardner (2004) interviewed, a small number of entrepreneurs that have crossed ethical lines believed they had broken the law to support a higher ideal, as a form of civil disobedience.

Moral judgement competence includes the following abilities (Hinman, 1985; referenced in Lind, 2000): the ability to recognize one’s own complex, conflicting moral feelings; the ability to submit those feelings to reflective reasoning; and the ability to engage in ethical discourse with friends, experts and authorities. Since the concept of social entrepreneurship is related to ethical behaviour, we pose the following hypotheses:

H5a: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions exhibit higher levels of moral judgement competence compared to people who have commercial entrepreneurial intentions.

H5b: People who have social entrepreneurial intentions exhibit higher levels of moral judgement competence compared to people who do not have entrepreneurial intentions.

3. Methodology

Our research sample consisted of the students of Economics of Entrepreneurship at the Faculty of Organization and Informatics in Varaždin, University of Zagreb, and the students of Entrepreneurship at the Faculty of Economics, University of Osijek. The sample included the students of the 1st and 2nd year of graduate studies. The total number of students enrolled in graduate entrepreneurship programs at the two faculties was 268. We managed to collect 133 questionnaires.

On average, the students of entrepreneurship have greater entrepreneurial intentions and a better understanding of the differences between commercial and social entrepreneurship compared with the general population. That is why they were chosen as an appropriate sample for this research, whose main goal is to examine the individual differences that might determine whether a person wants to become a commercial or a social entrepreneur. The students were in their final years of study. In entrepreneurship programs, entrepreneurship is taught not only as an economic activity, but also as a way of thinking in different contexts (not only in the sense of starting a company). According to the Recommendation of the European Parliament and the European Council (2006), the European Union has recognized a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship as one of the eight key competencies for lifelong learning. Thus, some students enrol in an entrepreneurship program without a clear intention to engage in entrepreneurship. Also, some students might use the knowledge gained through entrepreneurship education for their future careers in the entrepreneurial infrastructure (agencies, incubators, etc.) without themselves becoming entrepreneurs. Also, there are always some students who really wanted to study something else, but ended up in an entrepreneurship program only because they met the enrolment criteria and the costs of studying were acceptable. Therefore, the chosen sample also made it possible to investigate the subsample of students that did not have entrepreneurial intentions of any kind.

We distributed our questionnaire to the students after the lecture and their participation in the survey was voluntary. After discarding the incomplete questionnaires, our sample consisted of 114 respondents, 71.9% of whom were women. The average age of the respondents was 23.8 years. This was appropriate in view of the fact that these individuals would soon become a part of the population group most social entrepreneurs belong to – a population of highly educated people aged 25 to 34 (Vasakarla, 2008).

Respondents' entrepreneurial intention, social entrepreneurial intention, creativity, perceived level of hardship in life and compassionate love were measured using a list of statements that the respondents had to rate on a five-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 – strong disagreement with the statement, to 5 – strong agreement with the statement). Entrepreneurial intention was measured using the commonly employed statements from similar studies (Lepoutre et al., 2011; Liñán et al., 2011). Social entrepreneurial intention was measured by using the three statements that incorporated the main characteristics of social entrepreneurship (i.e., solving some social problem, investing most of the profit in a particular social mission and taking into consideration the needs of all the stakeholders). Respondents' creativity was measured using the scale proposed by Hmieleski and Corbett (2006), while their proactivity was measured with the propensity to act scale (Lepoutre et al., 2011). Compassionate love for humanity was measured with the scale proposed by Sprecher and Fehr (2005).

Hardship in life was measured by using three statements that referred to our respondents' perceptions of how hard their life was in comparison with other people their age. Existing measures of objective hardship in life are very time consuming because they list many possible traumatic events, which respondents have to mark if they experienced them in their lives. A classroom environment is probably not the best place to use such a method, since there is a possibility of students seeing other students' questionnaires and invading their privacy. Therefore, we decided to measure students' self-perceptions about the hardships in their lives. However, one limitation of this method is that two people might perceive exactly the same event quite differently when it comes to the traumatic experience it has caused. Thus, we decided to ask the respondents to compare their life events with the life events of other people their age and assess whether they had more or less hardship in life. This comparison was emphasized in order to increase the objectivity of the assessment. However, when we make comments about the hardship in life variable, it must be stressed that we were actually measuring the self-perception of one's hardship in life.

An index for each construct was calculated as the arithmetic mean of our respondents' evaluations of the corresponding statements. The reliability of each index was measured with Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Nunnally, 1978), which has to be at least 0.7 to confirm a factor's internal consistency. The following indices were calculated (with their respective Cronbach's alpha coefficients shown in brackets): entrepreneurial intention (0.867), social entrepreneurial intention (0.831), creativity (0.693), compassionate love (0.927), hardship in life (0.877).

Moral judgement competence was measured using the Moral Judgement Test (MJT), developed by Lind (2008), which assesses one's moral judgement competence independently of one's moral attitudes and expresses it as an index of pure moral judgement competence (the C-score). The C-score shows a degree to which a person is able to rate judgements on the basis of universally valid moral principles, in spite of the tendency to rate other people's arguments according to one's own opinion (Lind, 2000). In order to arouse counter-tendencies, the MJT asks the respondents to rate the arguments which oppose their opinions about a moral decision. A high C-score is achieved when a person rates the counter-arguments according to the same moral criteria used in rating the supportive arguments. The C-score can range from zero to 100. The value of zero indicates the absence of any moral judgement competence, while the value of 100 indicates perfect judgement competence – when rating the acceptability of an argument, the subject is solely concerned with the moral quality of that argument (Lind, 2000).

The standard version of the MJT consists of two stories, each containing a dilemma, and questions about the stories. In the first question, a person has to answer whether the decision made by the protagonist of the story is wright or wrong.

Subsequently, the subject rates the acceptability of presented arguments, both in favour and against the decision made in the story. All arguments are constructed so as to represent one of Kohlberg's six stages of moral development (Kohlberg, 1976). The C-score (Lind, 2000) is then calculated as the proportion of variance in the subjects' ratings resulting from their level of concern for the pure moral quality of the arguments, rather than the closeness to subjects' personal opinions.

Based on their entrepreneurial intention and social entrepreneurial intention index scores (ranging from 0 to 5), the respondents were divided into three groups. Those whose entrepreneurial intention index was higher than 3 and social entrepreneurial intention index lower or equal to 3 were considered to have commercial entrepreneurial intentions. The respondents whose entrepreneurial intention index was higher than 3 and social entrepreneurial intention index higher than 3 were considered to have social entrepreneurial intentions. There were no respondents with a social entrepreneurial intention index higher than 3 and an entrepreneurial intention index lower than 3, which indicates that the students perceive social entrepreneurship as one type of entrepreneurship. The third group consisted of those respondents whose entrepreneurial intention index and social entrepreneurial intention index were both either lower or equal to 3.

In testing the hypotheses, we used the Levene test, one-way ANOVA and the Welch test to determine whether our variables show statistically significant differences among the students with different entrepreneurial intentions. Also, we used the Tukey and Games-Howell test in the post hoc analysis to identify the groups which differ.

4. Results

Our results show that the students of entrepreneurship have substantial entrepreneurial intentions. Almost 70 percent of the respondents intend to start a venture in the next ten years. One half of those respondents show a tendency toward commercial entrepreneurship, while the other half prefers social entrepreneurship.

Table 1 shows the means of tested variables, with the corresponding standard deviations in brackets, for each of the three groups of respondents: respondents with commercial entrepreneurial intentions, respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions, and students with no entrepreneurial intentions. All the variables, with the exception of moral judgement competence, range from 0 to 5. Moral judgement competence ranges from 0 to 100.

Table 1.

ARITHMETIC MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TESTED
 VARIABLES BY GROUPS WITH DIFFERENT ENTREPRENEURIAL
 INTENTIONS

	Students with commercial entrepreneurial intention (n=37)	Students with social entrepreneurial intention (n=41)	Students without entrepreneurial intention (n=35)
Creativity	3.56 (0.65)	3.70 (0.55)	3.35 (0.79)
Proactivity	3.83 (0.59)	3.68 (0.55)	3.29 (0.66)
Compassionate love	3.28 (0.53)	3.82 (0.45)	3.39 (0.67)
Hardship in life	2.26 (1.08)	2.59 (1.12)	2.39 (1.05)
Moral judgement competence	12.48 (6.62)	9.39 (6.93)	14.17 (12.05)

Source: Authors.

On average, students seem to be neutral when assessing the tested variables. However, they see themselves as possessing moderate amounts of creativity, proactivity and compassionate love; whereas they slightly disagree that they had hardship in life. In general, a C-score between 0 and 9 can be interpreted as “very low”, between 10 and 29 as “medium” (which is where most people seem to be), and all scores above 30 can be considered as “high moral competence” (Lind, 2014). On average, moral judgement competence scores are medium, closer to the lower end of the “medium” range.

Next we tested the proposed hypotheses. The Levene test results (Table 2) showed the appropriateness of using the one-way ANOVA for the variables of creativity, proactivity and hardship in life; and also of using the Welch test for the variables of compassionate love and moral judgement competence.

Table 2.

LEVENE TEST RESULTS

	Levene statistics	p (significance level)
Creativity	1.139	0.324
Proactivity	0.317	0.729
Compassionate love	4.443	0.014
Hardship in life	0.449	0.640
Moral judgement competence	3.146	0.047

Source: Authors.

The ANOVA results for creativity are shown in Table 3. Although the respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions exhibit the highest levels of creativity among the observed groups, the difference is not statistically significant. Thus, we cannot accept H1a and H1b.

Table 3.

ANOVA RESULTS FOR CREATIVITY BY GROUPS WITH DIFFERENT
ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between groups	3.278	2	0.669	1.721	0.184
Within groups	54.808	108	0.389		
Total	58.085	110			

Source: Authors.

Table 4 shows the results of testing H2a and H2b, which suggest that these hypotheses should both be accepted. In the post-hoc analysis, the Tukey test was performed. Our results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the level of proactivity between the respondents with commercial entrepreneurial intentions and those with social entrepreneurial intentions (Sig. = 0.908). There is a statistically significant difference between the respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions and those without entrepreneurial intentions (Sig. = 0.004).

Table 4.

**ANOVA RESULTS FOR PROPENSITY TO ACT BY GROUPS WITH
 DIFFERENT ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS**

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between groups	5.280	2	2.640	7.773	0.001
Within groups	37.017	109	0.340		
Total	42.297	111			

Source: Authors.

Table 5 shows the results of testing H3a and H3b, which suggest that there are significant differences in the level of compassionate love between the observed groups. In the post-hoc analysis Games-Howell's test was performed. The results showed that the respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions express higher levels of compassionate love compared both to the respondents with commercial entrepreneurial intentions (Sig. = 0.000) and the respondents without entrepreneurial intentions (Sig. = 0.003). Thus, H3a and H3b are both confirmed.

Table 5.

**WELCH TEST RESULTS FOR COMPASSIONATE LOVE BY GROUPS
 WITH DIFFERENT ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS**

	Statistic, Asymptotically F distributed	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	12.216	2	68.944	0.000

Source: Authors.

The ANOVA results for hardship in life are shown in Table 6. Although the respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions exhibit the highest levels of hardship in life among the observed groups, the difference is not statistically significant. Thus, we cannot accept H4a and H4b.

*Table 6.*ANOVA RESULTS FOR HARDSHIP IN LIFE BY GROUPS WITH
DIFFERENT ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between groups	2.174	2	1.087	0.971	0.382
Within groups	123.209	110	1.120		
Total	125.384	112			

Source: Authors.

Table 7 shows the results of the Welch test, performed for moral judgement competence. There is no statistically significant difference between the observed groups in the level of moral judgement competence. Thus, H5a and H5b cannot be accepted. However, it is interesting that the group of respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions has the lowest level of moral judgement competence.

*Table 7.*WELCH TEST RESULTS FOR MORAL JUDGEMENT COMPETENCE BY
GROUPS WITH DIFFERENT ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS

	Statistic, Asymptotically F distributed	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	3.049	2	64.987	0.054

Source: Authors.

5. Conclusion

This research focused on the several individual characteristics found in the relevant literature which might support the development of social entrepreneurial intentions. The chosen individual characteristics – creativity, proactivity, compassionate love, hardship in life and moral judgement competence – are neither exhaustive, nor definitive. Rather, they provide us with a theoretical frame that could be useful in further analyses of the concept of social entrepreneurial intention.

Although it was hypothesized, the difference in creativity between the groups with different entrepreneurial intentions was not statistically significant. However,

since the reliability of the creativity construct was only marginally acceptable, we recommend that other available measures of creativity be used in further studies.

Our results show that people with social entrepreneurial intentions have roughly the same levels of proactivity as people with commercial entrepreneurial intentions, and these levels are higher than those of people without entrepreneurial intentions. These results are in accordance with our hypotheses regarding proactivity levels.

Convincingly, the factor that differs the most between the observed groups is compassionate love for humanity, which might be the main driving force behind social entrepreneurial activities. The respondents with social entrepreneurial intentions expressed higher levels of compassionate love compared both with the respondents having commercial entrepreneurial intentions and the respondents having no entrepreneurial intentions, as was initially hypothesized in the paper. Thus, if we would like to have more social entrepreneurs in the society, we should support the strengthening of compassionate love.

Hardship in life did not significantly differ between the groups, although the group with social entrepreneurial intentions had the highest level of hardship in life. However, this research measured the perception of one's hardship in life, which means that different results would probably be obtained if the objective hardship in life was measured. This problem should be dealt with in future research.

One of the most interesting results belongs to the domain of moral judgement competence. It is true that there was no statistically significant difference in moral judgement competence between the observed groups. However, the lowest C-index score was actually found in the group of people with social entrepreneurial intentions. This may be connected with their high willpower and passion – the two often quoted characteristics of social entrepreneurs (Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010). Successful social entrepreneurs are leaders, storytellers, people managers, visionary opportunists and alliance builders (Leadbeater, 1997). In order to act with determination, they need to believe in their social mission with great intensity, which may in turn obstruct their ability to regard different counter-arguments of the same moral weight as equally important. This is certainly an area that requires further research that would measure and compare the levels of moral judgement competence between the groups of actual commercial entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs and volunteers. In addition, one's moral judgement competence might change during the process of running a social entrepreneurial venture. Thus, a longitudinal study of moral judgement competence that would follow social entrepreneurs from their beginnings to maturity could also prove to be a fertile research area.

In Croatia, there is a recognition of the lack of competent human resources for the development of social entrepreneurship and the ensuing need for quality social entrepreneurship education. This research contributes to better understand-

ing the beginnings of social entrepreneurial processes, seen through the element of social entrepreneurial intention. Thus, this paper is the beginning of the process of developing a model of social entrepreneurial intention that would enhance our understanding of the early stages of social entrepreneurial process, improve social entrepreneurship education and enable more successful career advising. Since compassionate love was the most pronounced differential factor, it indicates the importance of feelings as motivational factors for social entrepreneurship. Therefore, social entrepreneurship education should include stories that encourage the development of empathy in students.

In Croatia, where the national strategy for social entrepreneurship is currently being developed, the concept of social entrepreneurship is still misunderstood. In the process of promoting social entrepreneurship as a career path, Croatia is missing a significant component – the educational one. Our research sample consisted of entrepreneurship students, who gained some basic insights into social entrepreneurship as part of their entrepreneurship courses. The students have expressed substantial social entrepreneurial intentions, which indicates that an increased emphasis on social entrepreneurship education in their curricula possibly has great effects on social entrepreneurial intentions. This proposition requires a more detailed analysis in the future.

Since social entrepreneurship is a multi-dimensional concept with different meanings in different institutional settings, one must be careful when making conclusions based on the findings from one country and comparing them with the findings of other countries. In the future, the authors plan to develop the model of social entrepreneurial intention and test it in different institutional and cultural surroundings. One of the more interesting results of this research was the fact that the entrepreneurship students in the sample perceived social entrepreneurship as one part of entrepreneurship, which might not be the case in other countries or with the students of other programs. Further studies should test the obtained results on larger samples, including international comparisons. Also, future studies should apply a longitudinal design in order to explore the relationship between social entrepreneurial intention and behaviour.

LITERATURE

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). «The theory of planned behaviour», *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, (50), 179-211.
2. Barendsen, L., Gardner, H. (2004). «Is the social entrepreneur a new type of leader?», *Leader to Leader*, 43-50.

3. Bargsted, M., Picon, M., Salazar, A., Rojas, Y. (2013). «Psychosocial characterization of social entrepreneurs: A comparative study», *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, (4), 331-346.
4. Cho, J. (2006). «Politics, values and social entrepreneurship: A critical appraisal». In: Mair, J., Robinson, J., Hockerts, K. (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 34-56.
5. Cope, J. (2005). «Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship», *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, (29), 373-397.
6. Covin, J.G., Slevin, D.P. (1991). «A Conceptual Model of Entrepreneurship as Firm Behavior», *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, (16), 7-25.
7. Dacin, P.A., Dacin, M.T., Matear, M. (2010). «Social Entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here», *Academy of Management Perspectives*, (24), 37-57.
8. Dees, J.G. (2001). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. http://www.case-atduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf (accessed 24.09.2013)
9. Dees, J.G. (2007). «Taking social entrepreneurship seriously», *Society*, (44), 24-31.
10. Gvozdanović, A., Potočnik, D., Sočo, A. (2009). Sam svoj majstor - Istraživanje socijalnog poduzetništva u neprofitnom sektoru mladih. www.mmh.hr/files/ckfinder/files/SSMistraživanje.pdf (accessed 16.02.2014)
11. Hmieleski, K.M., Corbett, A.C. (2006). «Proclivity for improvisation as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions», *Journal of Small Business Management*, (44), 45-63.
12. Kohlberg, L. (1976). «Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach», *Moral development and behaviour: Theory, research, and social issues*, 31-53.
13. Krueger, N.F., Brazeal, D.V. (1994). «Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs», *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, (18), 91-104.
14. Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The rise of social entrepreneurship*. London: Demos.
15. Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S., Bosma, N. (2011). «Designing a global standardized methodology for measuring social entrepreneurship activity: the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor social entrepreneurship study», *Small Business Economics*, (40), 693-714.
16. Liñán, F., Urbano, D., Guerrero, M. (2011). «Regional variations in entrepreneurial cognitions: Start-up intentions of university students in Spain», *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, (23), 187-215.
17. Lind, G. (2000). «Moral regression in medical students and their learning environment», *Revista Brasileira de Educacao Médica*, (24), 24-33.

18. Lind, G. (2008). «The meaning and measurement of moral judgment competence revisited—A dual-aspect model», *Contemporary philosophical and psychological perspectives on moral development and education*, 185-220.
19. Lind, G. (2014). Scoring and Interpreting the Moral Judgment Test (MJT). *Psychological Pedagogy: Moral-Democratic Competence*. <http://www.uni-konstanz.de/ag-moral/mut/mjt-intro.htm> (accessed 18.08.2014)
20. Martin, R.L., Osberg, S. (2007). «Social entrepreneurship: the case for definition», *Stanford social innovation review*, (5), 27-39.
21. Ministry of Labour and Pension System. (2014). Nacrt Strategije razvoja socijalnog/društvenog poduzetništva u Republici Hrvatskoj za razdoblje od 2014. do 2020. godine. rasprava.mrms.hr/bill/prijedlog-strategije-razvoja-socijalnog-drustvenog/ (accessed 05.06.2014)
22. Mitchell, R.K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P.P., Morse, E.A., Smith, J.B. (2002). «Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cognition: rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research», *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, (27), 93-104.
23. Murphy, P., Coombes, S. (2009). «A Model of Social Entrepreneurial Discovery», *Journal of Business Ethics*, (87), 325-336.
24. Nga, J.K.H., Shamuganathan, G. (2010). «The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions», *Journal of business ethics*, (95), 259-282.
25. Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
26. Perić, J., Delić, A. (2014). «Social entrepreneurship in Croatia: Do regional disparities influence young people's perception of social entrepreneurship as a potential career path? », *Ekonomski Vjesnik / Econviews: Review of contemporary business, entrepreneurship and economic issues*, (27), 81-92.
27. Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning (2006) L 394/10
28. Shane, S. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship, The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
29. Shaw, E., Carter, S. (2007). «Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes», *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, (14), 418-434.
30. Sprecher, S., Fehr, B. (2005). «Compassionate love for close others and humanity», *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, (22), 629-651.
31. Thompson, J., Alvy, G., Lees, A. (2000). «Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential», *Management decision*, (38), 328-338.

32. Thompson, J.L. (2002). «The world of the social entrepreneur», *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, (15), 412-431.
33. Vasakarla, V. (2008). «A Study on Social Entrepreneurship and the Characteristics of Social Entrepreneurs», *ICFAI Journal of Management Research*, (7), 32-40.
34. Vega, G., Kidwell, R.E. (2007). «Toward a typology of new venture creators: similarities and contrasts between business and social entrepreneurs», *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, (10), 15-28.
35. Vidović, D. (2012). «Social Entrepreneurship in Croatia». PhD thesis. Zagreb: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb.
36. Weerawardena, J., Sullivan Mort, G. (2006). «Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model», *Journal of World Business*, (41), 21-35.

UTJECAJ INDIVIDUALNIH KARAKTERISTIKA NA NAMJERU BAVLJENJA SOCIJALNIM PODUZETNIŠTVOM

Sažetak

Socijalno poduzetništvo je rastući fenomen, kako u praksi tako i u znanstvenoj zajednici. Glavni je cilj ovog istraživanja ispitati individualne karakteristike koje mogu podržati socijalno poduzetništvo kao karijerni izbor. Uzorak je obuhvatio 114 studenata dvaju diplomskih studija poduzetništva: Ekonomske poduzetništva na Fakultetu organizacije i informatike Sveučilišta u Zagrebu te Poduzetništva na Ekonomskom fakultetu Sveučilišta J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku.

Na temelju znanstvene literature identificirano je nekoliko potencijalno važnih individualnih karakteristika: kreativnost, proaktivnost, suosjećajna ljubav prema čovječanstvu, životne poteškoće i moralna kompetencija. Te su karakteristike adekvatno izmjerene i uspoređene između triju skupina: studenata koji se žele baviti komercijalnim poduzetništvom, studenata koji se žele baviti socijalnim poduzetništvom i studenata koji nemaju nikakve poduzetničke namjere. Korištene su metoda faktorske analize i jednosmjerna ANOVA. Rezultati su pokazali da je faktor koji se najviše razlikuje između analiziranih grupa suosjećajna ljubav prema čovječanstvu. Ona bi mogla predstavljati glavnu pokretačku silu iza aktivnosti socijalnog poduzetništva.

Ključne riječi: socijalno poduzetništvo, poduzetnička namjera, individualne karakteristike