

**SOCIAL ENTRENEURSHIP AND COMMUNITY RESILENCE**

**BY**

**OSAGIE SOLOMON**

**MSG1908203**

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF  
ENTREPRENEURSHIP, FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCE,  
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF MANAGEMENT  
SCIENCE (B.Sc.) DEGREE IN ENTRENEURSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**JULY, 2024**

## **DECLARATION**

I, OSAGIE SOLOMON, hereby declare that this project was undertaken by me in the Department of Entrepreneurship, University of Benin under the supervision of Mrs. Iyore Asemota. This work has not been previously submitted for the award of degree elsewhere. All ideas and views are products of my personal research and where the views of others have been used and expressed they were duly acknowledged.

---

Osagie Solomon

---

Date

## CERTIFICATION

We the undersigned certify that the project work was carried out by **OSAGIE SOLOMON** with matriculation number **MGS1908203** of the Department of Entrepreneurship, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City for the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of B.SC in Entrepreneurship.

---

**MRS. IYORE ASEMOTA**

*Project Supervisor*

---

**DATE**

---

**DR. S.E. OBEKI OBEKI**

*Project Coordinator*

---

**DATE**

---

**DR. S.E. OBEKI OBEKI**

*Head of Department*

---

**DATE**

## **DEDICATION**

This project work is solemnly dedicated to God Almighty, The One Who Is, Was and Is to come, and also to my wonderful parents for their endless love and support.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I desire above all things to express my profound gratitude to God Almighty for His unconditional love and graciousness to me.

My deepest appreciation goes to my parents Mr. Osagie and Mrs. Joyce for their love and great support financially, emotionally and physically towards me, and also my lovely siblings who have contributed in shaping the person I am today.

I express my unreserved appreciation to my project supervisor Mrs. Iyore Asemota, who has been my guide and without whose direction, guidance and assistance I won't be able to complete this project. I also extend my appreciation to all my lecturers in the Faculty of Management Science especially the Department of Entrepreneurship that has imparted me.

Special thanks to my friends Daniel, Emmanuel, Olamide, David, Gloria, Blessing and my coursemates for their various assistance, God bless you all.

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background to the Study

Many regions of the world are being impacted by climate change events, including heat waves, droughts, floods, and storms (Bushell, Buisson, Workman, & Colley, 2017; Nkoana, Verbruggen & Hoge, 2018). The severity of the hazard, along with the community's susceptibility to the shock and ability to endure it, determine the impact of any particular shock at the community level. A shock has the capacity to totally overwhelm a community to the point of collapse in the worst-case scenarios. This is because sensitivity and adaptive capability differ among nations and regions, rather than because of variations in expected changes, climate change impacts developing countries significantly, particularly the natural resources they control and rely on (IPCC, 2007). Because of their significant reliance on agriculture, a sector that is sensitive to climate change, and their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Gross National Income (GNI), developing nations are more vulnerable to and most affected by the effects of climate change (IPCC, 2014). Furthermore, a large portion of the population in these nations is impoverished, making them more susceptible to the consequences of climate change.

Climate change affects Nigeria, just like it affects any other developing nation, and it is a serious danger to both sustainable development and the end of poverty (Ebele & Emodi, 2016). Nigeria has over 95.6 million vulnerable rural residents that rely on climate-sensitive natural resources for their livelihood (Ogbuabor & Egwuchukwu, 2017). Preston,

Bank, Hargreaves, Kamierczak, Lucas, Mayne, Downing and Street (2014) note that social groupings and rural areas are most likely to suffer the uneven consequences of climate change. In addition, Nigeria's natural ecosystems, such as its freshwater and coastal resources, are extremely vulnerable to the effects of climate change. As a result, the World Bank (2017) ranked Nigeria among the ten most vulnerable nations in the world. Most importantly, those who are most at risk—elderly people, kids, homeless people, members of ethnic minorities, low-income communities, and those living in high-risk areas—do not understand the effects of climate change or have the means to adjust to its disruptions (Lindley et al., 2011). Different societal classes, income groups, occupations, ages, and genders will be impacted differently by climate change (Amobi & Onyishi, 2015). Women will be disproportionately impacted by the effects of climate change on the agricultural sector because most of them are poor farmers who depend on small-scale, rain-fed agriculture (Onwutuebe, 2019). This is because women's duties are traditionally divided in society. Women are mostly reliant on natural resources; they gather wood for cooking, collect the water used in the home, and make sure the family has enough food. Children are also impacted since floods may cause them to miss school, especially in areas with limited food and transportation, which could result in hunger and impair kids' capacity to study (Amanchukwu et al., 2015).

One of Nigeria's biggest challenges is that the nation has not yet developed a cohesive policy framework to address the climate change issue (Apata, 2011; Choko, Olabisi, Onyeneke, Chiemela, & Liverpool-Tasie, 2019). The Federal Ministry of

Environment, which helps to develop capacities and facilitate policy adoption and implementation at state and local government levels, is currently in charge of most of the coordination of policy development and implementation at the federal level (Choko et al., 2019). Less focus is placed on what impacted communities can do for themselves and how to strengthen them because of the complexity of the policy measures (IFRC, 2012). Similarly, the notion of community resilience is essential to comprehending how communities can both develop and preserve vital community functions in the face of climate change, as well as adapt to it (Choko et al., 2019). The globe is confronted with a never-before-seen range of social, environmental, and economic issues that need for creative responses and coordinated efforts from many stakeholders (Sauer mann, 2023). Communities with low incomes are particularly susceptible to these issues because they frequently have restricted access to basic goods and services, high rates of poverty and inequality, and a lack of employment prospects. It poses an issue for the community as a whole regarding what to do and how to handle all of the risks that we face. Fortunately, social entrepreneurship (SE) has the potential to be the most effective remedy for our society because it is the simultaneous pursuit of economic, social, and environmental goals by enterprising ventures" and "is the first and foremost a practical response to unmet individual and societal needs (Tran & Korflesh, 2016) . Social entrepreneurship "mobilises the ideas, capacities, resources, and social arrangements required for sustainable social transformations and creates innovative solutions to immediate social problems. According to Durieux and Steb bins (2010), social entrepreneurs "use the

principles of enterprise - business principles and even capitalism itself - to create social change through the establishment and management of a venture. Due to its pursuit of "the double (or triple) bottom line (social, financial, and environmental)," SE has undoubtedly been a topic of discussion in business, society, and politics. Robinson (2006) notes social entrepreneurship which combines entrepreneurial principles with an emphasis on generating social value and advancing sustainable development has emerged as a viable approach to solving these urgent problems.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The environmental aspect of sustainable development emphasises the significance of safeguarding ecosystems and natural resources, tackling climate change, and reducing environmental degradation. This calls for the adoption of sustainable practices that lessen pollution, conserve resources, and promote biodiversity, as well as the creation of efficient environmental policies and regulations that support sustainable patterns of production and consumption. In recent years, the concept of sustainable development has expanded to include new dimensions, such as technological innovation, governance, and cultural diversity (Sachs, 2015), reflecting the growing understanding that achieving sustainability necessitates an integrated and holistic approach. The ability of a population to foresee, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and effective manner has been characterized and measured by the concept of community resilience. By including social subjective factors like perceptions and beliefs

along with the larger institutional environment and governance settings that shape communities' capacities to build resilience, this understanding of resilience goes beyond a purely social-ecological systems understanding. There are numerous studies that examine social entrepreneurship (Aloulou& Algarni,2022; Barua,2016). There is scarce o the relationship between social entrepreneurship and community resilience. The study fills this gap in the literature

### **1.3 Research questions**

The following research questions have been stated to address the problem

1. To what extent does social entrepreneurship intention affect community resilience?
- 2.What is the relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience?
- 3.To what extent does social entrepreneurship outcome expectation affect community resilience?

### **1.4 Objectives of the Study**

The broad objective of the study is to examine the relationship between social entrepreneurship and community resilience. The specific objectives of the study are to:

- 1.examine the relationship between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience;

2.investigate the relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience; and

3.evaluate the relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience.

### **1.5 Hypotheses of the Study**

The following hypotheses have been stated in null form

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience.

Ho3: There is no relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience.

### **1.6 Scope of the Study**

The topic of the study is social entrepreneurship and community resilience.

**Variable Scope:** The independent variables of the study are social entrepreneurship intention, social entrepreneurship self-efficacy, and social entrepreneurship outcome expectation while dependent variable is and community resilience.

**Geographical Scope:** This study was conducted in Ekosodin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

**Time Scope:** The study covers a period from February –April 2024.

### **1.7 Significance of the Study**

By enhancing social entrepreneurship managers' capacity to record the types and quantities of social change they are bringing about, the study's findings provide a significant contribution to the field of social change. This could therefore make it easier for them to obtain the funding they require to grow their services and produce even better social results. This is presuming that the majority of observers and field advocates are correct when they state that enhanced capacity to measure, record, and report on social outcomes will boost investor confidence and enable both public and private investors to provide social entrepreneurship with significantly more financial resources.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Conceptual Review**

##### **2.1.1 Community Resilience**

Many communities around the world have suffered from climate hazards, with growing financial losses over the last three decades, stemming from environmental and socio-economic changes. The impacts of many climate-related threats are expected to be magnified by future climate change, especially in rural communities, which often depend heavily on ecosystem services and functions to meet their livelihood needs( Trung,2016). With roots in the science of physics, the term “resilience” is originally used to describe the ability of a material to return to equilibrium after a displacement by bending or bouncing back rather than breaking. Since then it has been widely used as an important concept in various disciplines to obtain insight into the capacity of various systems such as ecosystems or communities to absorb disturbance while retaining their basic structure and functions. When applied to a human community, resilience is defined as the capacity of individuals, groups of people, or the community as a whole to cope with disturbances as a result of social, political and environmental change such enhancing community resilience (CR) is increasingly recognized as a promising solution to reduce climate risks and it is widely assumed that resilient communities are far less vulnerable to the changing climate( Trung,2016).

Community resilience has emerged as a new concept over the last decade and has gained in importance as a key concept in reducing vulnerability in the face of growing natural hazards (Lopez-Marrero and Tschakert, 2011) although this concept had previously existed in many traditional societies (Berkes, 2007). Studies on such societies worldwide which found that community recovery from natural disasters often necessitated only small changes in the traditional ways of life in order to adapt to the new environmental, economic, social, and political changes resulting from the disasters( Chacowry,2014).

Community resilience has become an important concept for characterizing and measuring the abilities of populations to anticipate, absorb, accommodate or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner( Kruse et al.,2017). This goes beyond a purely social–ecological systems understanding of resilience by incorporating social subjective factors, e.g. perceptions and beliefs as well as the wider institutional environment and governance settings that shape the capacities of communities to build resilience. Community resilience is described as a process comprising a series of both structural and non-structural actions that can be undertaken by the communities through different steps to generate a set of capacities to reduce risks from environmental threat (Trung,2016).Community resilience can be evaluated by the use of indicators that relate to the type of resilience (social, economic, environmental, infrastructure, and community competence( Chacowry,2014). Community resilience describes the collective ability of a neighborhood or geographically defined area to deal with stressors and efficiently resume the rhythms of daily life through cooperation following shocks ( Aldrich& Meyer,2014).

## **2.2 Social Entrepreneurship**

Social entrepreneurship is a subcategory of a bigger field called entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is a well-developed field that has a long history, both practically and theoretically. However, social entrepreneurship is considered relatively opposite (Rahim & Lajin, 2014). Social entrepreneurship is a relatively young term and very much pursued in the business world, nonetheless it is still considered as a concept at its infancy stage in academic arena. The concept of social entrepreneurship has gained significant traction in recent years, sparking the interest of scholars and practitioners alike. While the term itself has been around for decades, its definition and conceptualization remain a topic of debate, often focusing on its unique combination of social and entrepreneurial elements. Social entrepreneurship a process, that includes: the identification of a specific social problem and a specific solution (or a set of solutions) to address it; the evaluation of the social impact, the business model and the sustainability of the venture; and the creation of a social mission-oriented for profit or a business-oriented nonprofit entity that pursues the double (or triple) bottom line (Tran & Vorflesch, 2016). Barua (2016) posits that. Social entrepreneurship is ‘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 (Canestrino et al., 2020). Social entrepreneurship is regarded as a species in the genus of entrepreneur. Although social entrepreneurs (henceforth, SEs) have presumably existed for a considerable amount of time, it was not until three decades ago that academic literature

started considering them as a distinct group of entrepreneurs. A social entrepreneur plays the role of a change agent in the social sector by adopting a mission to establish and maintain social value by identifying and pursuing new opportunities, engaging in a mechanism of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning( Andikko,2017). Social entrepreneurship as the act of deliberate and intentional inclusion of entrepreneurial strategies and theories in the quest of social change(Rahim,2016).Martin&Osberg (2015) note that social entrepreneurship has two important distinctive features. First, actions: direct and indirect. Direct action is where an individual becomes personally involved with the purpose of realizing a specific desired outcome. Indirect action is where an individual convinces another person or entity to take a particular action that will bring about the desired result. Second, outcome: maintenance improvement of an existing system; or transformation of the current system into an optimized system.In business world, the rise of social entrepreneurship signals the realization on the need for social change and how it has a positive long-lasting impact on transformational benefit to society. The popularity was gained due to the appeal of social entrepreneurs on their selfless stories (Rahim,2016). The continual development of new businesses and the enhancement of the goods and services provided by already-established firms have a significant impact on a nation's ability to increase economic activity (Osiri et al., 2020). Social entrepreneurship has the ability to bridge the gaps created by governments' and the public sector's failure to address a substantial portion of these social concerns (Letsoalo&Rankhumise, 2020). This is why research supports this theory. Furthermore,

scholars are concentrating on social entrepreneurship in an attempt to increase awareness of the idea within academia. According to Akhter et al. (2020), this includes programs to strengthen institutional capacity for expanding research knowledge and developing curricula.

### **2.2.1 social entrepreneurship intention**

The willingness to take action that could lead to the creation of a new company or the formulation of new organizational guiding principles is one method to define entrepreneurial intents. SEI is the aspiration of an individual to launch a new social enterprise (Tran and Von Korfflesch, 2016; Ip et al., 2017). The notion that someone has the ambition to launch their own company is known as entrepreneurial intention. That being said, the main focus of social entrepreneurship intention is the desire to pursue a career in social entrepreneurship. Bosma et al. (2016) state that within the last 10 years, practitioners, lawmakers, and academics have all given social entrepreneurship more attention. Real-world behaviors and activities typically reflect an individual's personality. Nga and Shamuganathan (2010) looked into the personalities of social entrepreneurs. They asserted that some personality traits that affect social entrepreneurship are conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness. In order to ascertain the degree of social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial intention among Malaysian higher education students, Radin A. Rahman et al. (2016) conducted a study. Students in higher education institutions were shown to have very low entrepreneurial aspirations, notwithstanding

their rising interest in social entrepreneurship efforts. It's thought that university students in Malaysia are more engaged with and enthusiastic about social issues and events. This is consistent with the long-term global trend of college students turning activist. Students are able to think up original and creative ways to solve social entrepreneurship problems. Their degree of awareness, or attitude toward social entrepreneurship, influence, the subjective norm, the social entrepreneurship program, or perceived behavioral control, were some of the factors that affected them. The organization can help the pupils comprehend that, as opposed to concentrating only on profit, social entrepreneurship entails founding a business that accomplishes both financial and social goals (Jabar&Asung 2016). Therefore, in order to increase the likelihood that students will select social entrepreneurship as a job after graduation, institutions should work to increase knowledge of the benefits that social entrepreneurship offers society ( Rahman et al. 2016).

Understanding and studying the factors that drive an individual's purpose is crucial to influencing social entrepreneurship, which in turn leads to social entrepreneurship activities. As a result, concepts and models proposed to explain the goal of social entrepreneurship will be looked at in the section that follows.

One of the most important instruments for using SE to accomplish its social objective and provide social value is entrepreneurial ambition. Entrepreneurial goals can predict entrepreneurial activities, as demonstrated by Hassan (2021) and Fatoki (2018). To do

this, the authors employ the idea of planned behavior. According to Saebi, Foss, and Linder (2019), the concept of social entrepreneurship has been around since the 1950s, but it has only recently attracted scholarly attention as a growing body of literature. Global social inequality persists despite several attempts by developing economies to address issues like poverty and youth unemployment, which includes unemployment among recent graduates. The public has called on the government to address the gap as a result of these differences in public support services (Chipeta et al., 2020). Ip, Liang, Lai, and Chang (2020) conclude that as entrepreneurship is, at its core, a planned activity, understanding entrepreneurial objectives and the variables influencing them is essential to forecasting entrepreneurial behavior. Planned activity can logically result from entrepreneurial goal. Lu et al. (2021), in contrast, provide multiple definitions of objective, from the more pragmatic method of assessing the outcome of the entrepreneurial activity before launching, to the initial attempt at establishing a firm that includes planning, testing, and concept generation. According to Lu et al. (2021), a person's process-based mental mindset is what enables them to pursue entrepreneurship. The intention behind an entrepreneurial venture. According to Hassan (2020), the goal is to create entrepreneurship chances by providing a conceptual framework such as desire, motivation, and aspiration.

Ip et al. (2020) posit that intentions have been categorized in various ways, but they all agree that motivation is a mental state that drives an individual to complete a task. They conclude that the intention of an entrepreneur guides a planned behavior, such as

beginning a firm as a future action. Numerous research has shown the function and significance of entrepreneurial intention as a predictor of entrepreneurial behavior, according to Urban and Kujinga (2017). The socioeconomic and political background, personality, and skills of the individual all influence this aim (Urban and Kujinga, 2017; Ndofirepi, 2020). Mai, Ngoc, Linh, Lan, and Quynh (2018) reaffirm that the mentioned activity—beginning a business, for example—is a critical first step in promoting entrepreneurial behavior. They conclude that intentions are a reliable indicator of planned behavior for future business-related actions. Conversely, studies indicate that students are more motivated to start future businesses, however Mai et al. (2018) warn that many intentions are wasted and not realized as intended because they are created at a young age. The cognitive psychology that links attitudes, value systems, and beliefs about a behavior and its actual conversion into future behavioral action is where the intention theory has its roots (Ip et al., 2017). This approach, when applied to entrepreneurship, encourages people to adopt a new way of thinking that centers on possibilities rather than risks. The determinants and precursors of entrepreneurial intentions have been found to include situational and cognitive factors like politics, economic context, personality, and perceived ability to take action (Chipera et al. 2020). Rambe and Ndofirepi (2019) use spatial context to illustrate these determinants.

Urban (2020) asserts that the decision to launch a social enterprise at a later time is the goal of social entrepreneurship. According to Elliot (2019), social entrepreneurial intention is the deliberate response to and obsession with starting a new company venture

that addresses social issues. To put it briefly, SEI is the notion that arises when someone decides to use entrepreneurial concepts to offer unique answers for society problems (Usman, Masood, Khan, & Khan, 2022). Wach et al. (2021) state that turning an idea into a social firm is a rigorous and intricate process that calls for the assessment of numerous factors that influence the conversion of entrepreneurial intents into entrepreneurial activities. De Sousa-Filho et al. (2020) state that two elements that have been found to have an impact on determinants in previous research done in industrialized countries are perceived social support and prior experience. The examination of entrepreneurship as a modern phenomenon is centered on these elements. According to Kruse et al. (2018) and Chipera et al. (2020), the model to predict social entrepreneurial intention and identify its antecedents is the main theoretical orientation to have developed during the periodic review of the SEI.

According to Bacqand Alt (2018), SE intentions can be generally understood as the intent to pursue a social mission by starting a business or launching a social venture. The entrepreneurship literature is becoming more and more interested in SE intentions (Linan&Fayolle, 2015). Among the first to investigate the causes and precursors of intentions to launch a social venture were Mair and Noboa (2003, 2006), who helped to paint a more complete picture of SE aspirations. Mair and Noboa's (2003) model of SE intention draws from Shapero and Sokol's seminal work on the genesis of entrepreneurial events (Shapero and Sokol, 1982) and Ajzen's work on the origins of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991).Hockerts (2017) states that perceived social support, past experience,

empathy and moral obligation, and social entrepreneurship self-efficacy are the direct antecedents of social entrepreneurs' self-efficacy (SEI). Moreover, empathy, moral responsibility, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and perceived social support operate as mediators in the relationship between prior experience and SEI.

Hockerts (2017) states that perceived social support, past experience, empathy and moral obligation, and social entrepreneurship self-efficacy are the direct antecedents of social entrepreneurs' intention (SEI). Moreover, empathy, moral responsibility, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and perceived social support operate as mediators in the relationship between prior experience and SEI. Hockerts' theory has been tested in developed and developing countries, with varying degrees of success. Hockerts (2017) tested the model using three samples and discovered that: moral obligation has a negative relationship with SEI that is either negligible or significant; the relationship between prior experience and SEI is mediated by empathy, social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and perceived social support; and SEI is positively correlated with social entrepreneurial self-efficacy and perceived social support in all samples.

Ip et al. (2017b) conduct a partial investigation of the model in the developed nation of Hong Kong. They discovered that while moral duty has a negative link with SEI, empathy, perceived social support, and prior experience had positive relationships. These findings are congruent with those of Hockerts (2017). Contrary to Hockerts' findings, they discovered that social entrepreneurial self-efficacy had no appreciable positive

association with SEI (2017). Additionally, de Sousa-Filho et al. (2020) examined the model in Brazil, a developing nation, and discovered that some of Hockerts's (2017) samples agreed with their findings. As previous research yields inconsistent results, additional study is required. Furthermore, launching a business mostly depends on the context of its intended use, as entrepreneurship is a social activity (Ukil, 2022a). Therefore, we look into how Hockerts' SEI model functions in Bangladesh, a different sociocultural environment.

### **2.2.2 social entrepreneurship self-efficacy**

Self-efficacy is a crucial motivator that influences one's goals, sentiments, effort, coping strategies, and persistence (Bandura, 1997, 2001). Research indicates an entrepreneur with high self-efficacy is more likely to "exert more effort for a greater length of time, persist through setbacks, and develop better (Urban,2020).The notion that one can successfully perform the many roles and tasks of an entrepreneur has been measured using the Entrepreneurial Self-Esteem (ESE) construct . Another important concept in entrepreneurial study is self-efficacy.Self-efficacy is a person's belief in their own ability to do a desired behavior. It has previously been demonstrated that self-efficacy is a crucial prerequisite for pro-social behavior like blood donation as well as entrepreneurial behavior.A self-efficacy measure tailored to the S-ENT context is proposed by this study. Self-efficacy metrics ought to be in close proximity to the relevant domain. It is not surprising that social entrepreneurial intents have been found to be positively connected

with a healthy dose of self-confidence, given the complexity of many social challenges. This study defines social entrepreneurial self-efficacy as the belief that every individual can contribute to the resolution of society problems( Hockerts, 2015).

### **2.2.3 social entrepreneurship outcome expectation**

## **2.3 Theoretical Review**

### **2.3.1 Agency Theory**

Agency theory is developed by Jensen and Meckling (1976) and is defined as the relationship between the principals, such as shareholders and agents (social entrepreneurial company executives and managers). In this theory, shareholders who are the owners or principals of the companies hire the agents to perform work. Principals delegate the running of business to the directors or managers, who are the shareholder 's agents. In the agency theory shareholders expect the agents to act and make decisions in the principal 's interest. On the contrary, the agent may not necessarily make decisions in the best interests of the principals. In some instances, the agents (managers) act opportunistically and pursue their own interests at the expense of principals (shareholders). Thus shareholders must accept the effects associated with individual factors, organizational factors, organizational resources and environmental factors in order to maintain SE performance and bonding managers in order to preserve their rights. Calvo (2006) elaborates that the agency theory is concerned with resolving two SE problems that can occur in agency relationships. The first problem is the agency problem

that arises when (a) the desires or goals of the principal and agent conflict and (b) it is difficult or expensive for the principal to verify what the agent is actually doing. The problem arises when the principal cannot verify that the agent has acted appropriately. The second is the problem of risk sharing that arises when the principal and agent have different attitudes towards risk. In this case the principal and the agent may prefer different actions because of different risk preferences.

### **2.3.2 Stakeholder Theory**

Stakeholders have been broadly defined as —any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organisation ‘s objectives (Freeman, 1984). The theory argues that SE organizations should serve all groups or individuals who have a stake in the organisation, typically including employees, customers, suppliers, and local communities. his study makes no exception to this paradigm shift and attempted to approach social entrepreneurship from this theoretical perspective. While the shareholder theory espouses the —free market doctrine, stakeholder theory argues that the problems of free rider, moral hazards and monopoly power inherent to the free market justify government intervention and corporate social responsibility. In the stakeholder view, organizations cannot maximize the shareholder interests at the expense of other stakeholders because doing so is neither moral nor economically efficient (Barua, 2016). The —stakeholder model proposes extending the focus of managers beyond the traditional individual and organizational factors in order to understand the needs,

expectations, and values of groups previously perceived to be external to the company. In this sense, stakeholders of a firm can be defined as —individuals and constituencies that contribute, either voluntarily or involuntarily, to its wealth-creating capacity and activities, and who are therefore its potential beneficiaries and/or risk bearers (Townsend & Hart, 2008). In this evolving literature, stakeholder theory has been presented in three broad ways namely descriptive, instrumental, and normative. Stakeholder theory has both normative (moral/ethical), descriptive and instrumental (profit/wealth-enhancing) implications, as dealing with stakeholders can be regarded as a responsibility to meet the legitimate claims of all stakeholders and/or as a means to maximize firm wealth. Understanding the constructs in stakeholder ‘s theory is critical to understanding the activities of social entrepreneurs as agents of change in enterprise based parastatals as addressed in this study.

### **2.3.3 Resource Dependency Theory**

The resource dependency theory concentrates on the role of board of directors in providing access to resources needed by the firm. Resource dependency theory focuses on the role that directors play in providing or securing essential resources to an SE organization through their linkages to the external environment. Indeed, resource dependency theorists provide focus on the appointment of representatives of independent organizations as a means for gaining access in resources critical to firm performance. For example, outside directors who are partners to a law firm provide legal advice, either in

board meetings or in private communication with the firm executives that may otherwise be costlier for the firm to secure. The provision of resources enhances SE firm functioning, firm 's performance and its survival. Directors bring resources to the firm, such as information, skills, access to key constituents such as suppliers, buyers, public policy makers, social groups as well as legitimacy. Directors can be classified into four categories namely insiders, business experts, support specialists and community influential. First, the insiders are current and former executives of the firm and they provide expertise in specific areas such as finance and law to the firm itself as well as general strategy and direction. Second, the business experts are current, former senior executives and directors of other large for-profit firms and they provide expertise on business strategy, decision making and problem solving. Third, the support specialists are the lawyers, bankers, insurance company representatives and public relations experts who provide support in their individual specialized field. Finally, the communities influential are the political leaders, universities, members of clergy, and leaders of social or community organisation.

## **2.4 Empirical Review**

Ukilet al.(2023) examine advancing the model of social entrepreneurial intention: the role of perceived financial security. Perceived financial security is a new antecedent for SEI that this study presented. It verified the model in a developing country using two distinct measuring scales and samples (n and 241). The authors also employed a partial least

squares-based structural equation model to test their theories. The results demonstrate that social entrepreneurial self-efficacy, perceived financial security, and social support all directly predict SEI and further mediate the relationship between SEI and previous experience. The Hockerts model is therefore extended.

Vidovic (2023) examine social entrepreneur in the society of multiple transitions. The study uses an exploratory and qualitative approach. Empirical data are gathered during 14 semi-structured interviews with Croatian social entrepreneurs. Thematic analysis was used as an analytical framework. The findings suggest complexity of social entrepreneurs' rationale and identities as they face challenges in balancing different goals. Democratic and participative governance appear to be the weakest link of social enterprises. Identity of social entrepreneurs in the society of multiple transitions is fluid and changes through the continuum from pure social to pure commercial, from more related to civil society to more related to the market, from mostly individual to mostly collective.

Gieureet al.(2019) examine entrepreneurial intentions in an international university environment. A proposal was made to expand the TPB by incorporating two new constructs: university education and entrepreneurship abilities. The study's target audience consisted of both domestic and foreign students enrolled in various universities. The information was gathered via a verified survey (n = 276). The links between the variables and the hypotheses were tested using structural equation modeling. If

students receive quality instruction and training, they are more likely to develop entrepreneurial abilities. Since it is believed that information and training make people highly talented, entrepreneurial skills are important in explaining entrepreneurial ambitions. This increases people's inclination to launch a business.

Sari et al. (2021) examine social entrepreneurship, transformational leadership and organizational performance: the mediating role of organizational learning. Data are collected using questionnaires distributed to directors of 122 village-owned enterprises in Siak Regency, Indonesia. A total of 85 completed responses were received and analysed by using WarpPLS 5.0. Empirical findings confirm that social entrepreneurship and transformational leadership influence organizational learning and organizational performance. Further analysis shows that social entrepreneurship and transformational leadership affect organizational performance through organizational learning, and therefore the latter acts as a mediating variable. This study reveals that social entrepreneurship and transformational leadership enhance organizational learning to improve organisational performance. This study contributes to the field of management accounting for village owned enterprises

Barua (2016) examine e the effect of social entrepreneurship factors on the performance of commercially oriented parastatals in Kenya. The study adopts a survey design with mixed approaches: a systematic integration of quantitative and qualitative methods. The population of the study was 55 enterprise based parastatals with a population of 495 top

managers. Using stratified and simple random methods, 270 respondents were randomly selected from amongst the 30 commercially oriented parastatals in Kenya. The respondents comprised of top managers from the 30 parastatals. The questionnaire was used to collect data. Secondary data is collected from financial and audited statements. Binary logistic regression analysis was conducted and the results are used to make interpretations and conclusions. The results of findings show that the correlation results indicate that there is: a positive and significant relationship between individual factors, organizational resources, and organizational factors, environmental factors on the performance of enterprise based parastatals.

Nambri(2019) examine social entrepreneurship in Papua New Guinea. Using Kendall's tau (non-parametric) and Mann-Whitney U statistical analysis, this research analyzed the investors/developers and beneficiaries of the project; their observations on the PPP programs and CBD and their effect of social entrepreneurship as a business concept and its contribution toward creating social value in communities. The EMPNG and OSL as investors/developers of the project, through their PPP programs, are building and developing capacities amongst the communities along the PNG LNG pipeline. The application of social entrepreneurship has a business concept minimal but is eagerly pursued by EMPNG and OSL for Lancos to adopt the concept to create social value in communities to improve socio-economic outcome and livelihoods. The study answers the questions regarding the correlation on PPP influences on CBD and social entrepreneurship and CBD influence on social entrepreneurship. Further studies are

needed to establish causal relationships and to develop a framework to upscale the social entrepreneurship concept among Lancos of the PNG LNG project.

Khatiwada (2014) examine social entrepreneurship as an approach to community development. The study data are collected through data triangulation process of expert interviews and descriptive case study of a school for community (ASC). The collected data are analysed with an approach of thematic analysis. The findings of this study indicate that the social entrepreneurship is not a new phenomenon in Nepal, but the framework and terminologies are becoming popular in the recent years. It is evident that social entrepreneurship has remarkable contribution in triple-bottom-line components of community development.

Rahim (2016) examine Respondents are chosen by systematic random sampling and 401 respondents participated in this study. This study uses structural equation modelling for analysis and the findings show that entrepreneurial leadership mediates the relationship between social entrepreneurial behaviour and organizational performance. Based on the result, the best path to achieve organizational performance is by following the mediating path. Both entrepreneurial leadership and social entrepreneurial behaviour are considered new and in their infancy stage. As a result, this study fills the literature gap in the particular fields. In addition, this study provides empirical evidence on the relationship between the constructs, it is able to contribute practically towards the leaders of the

organizations as they will understand better the role of social entrepreneurial behaviour and entrepreneurial leadership towards its organizational performance.

Hattab (2023) examine The research has been conducted based on secondary and primary data collection. The secondary data collection supplements the study with data that have experimented by other researchers in the entrepreneurship literature. results show that Egyptian social entrepreneurs are moderately applying effectuation principles as they perform their regular activities.

Aloulou and Algarni (2022) examine the determinants of social entrepreneurial intention (SEI) in the context of Saudi Arabia. The study's findings come from a survey that 278 Saudis answered. An exploratory and a confirmatory factor analysis are carried out in order to evaluate the constructs' factorial structure, validity, and reliability in order to analyze data and validate the suggested hypotheses. The next step involved using goodness-of-fit statistics to demonstrate how well a number of different models fit the model. Hierarchical regression modeling is used to assess the direct and indirect effects of important factors on SEI. The results demonstrate that earlier social problem experience and both SEI and its predecessors, as well as social problem experience and SEI itself, have favorable correlations. Interestingly, neither social support nor moral obligation appear to be connected with SEI.

Cardella et al.(2023) examine Findings from a sample of 962 college students show that social entrepreneurial intention (SEI) is significantly and favorably impacted by prior

experience with social issues (PESP) and empathy (EMP). Moreover, in addition to directly affecting SEI, moral obligation (MO), perceived social support (PSS), and social self-efficacy (SES-E) mediated the relationships between PESP and SEI as well as EMP and SEI. More intriguingly, the association between EMP-SEI was influenced to the advantage of women by gender (male vs. female), but not by the type of study (social sciences vs. economics and business sciences).

ClarkMuntean and Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016) examineFeminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship. The analyses, which employ three distinct feminist lenses, indicate that gender is not acknowledged by the field of social entrepreneurship as an organizing principle in society, and that emphasizing women in it perpetuates the problematic gendered assumptions that underpin the field of women's entrepreneurship research. The writers analyze gender issues in the field of social entrepreneurship critically by utilizing liberal feminist, socialist feminist, and transnational/post-colonial feminist viewpoints.

Odor (2019) examine what influences social entrepreneurs to adopt particular social enterprise structures and why.In order to resolve the tensions, they encounter, social entrepreneurs frequently "decouple" their governance and/or organizing practices from those prescribed in external standards or start to create new structures and ways of organizing. The qualitative data set for this thesis consists of fifteen in-depth interviews with social entrepreneurs and their advisors regarding structure choice. The analysis presented offers new insights into the dynamics of structure choice by social

entrepreneurs, including the potential nodes of conflict between exogenous prescriptions and social entrepreneurs' own orientation to certain aspects of organization and what social entrepreneurs actually do in the face of such conflict. I find that conflict is particularly prevalent in respect to ownership and decision-m

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research Design

The research design is the framework and procedures that an investigator plans to use to provide data or solutions to the study problem. The study utilized a cross-sectional one-time engagement approach to gather data from the participants. The choice of this study design was influenced by the nature of the research and the requirement to relate the influence of leadership style throughout the company.

#### 3.2 Population of the Study

The term "population" describes the group of individuals that a researcher wishes to study. In this case, the population consists of 300 SMES in Egor Local Government Area in Benin City, Edo State.

#### 3.3 Sampling and Sample Size

Yamane (1967) is stated as follows:

$$n = \frac{1}{1+N(e)^2}$$

where

n = sample size,

N = population

e = latitude of error

population = 250

$$e = 0.05$$

$$n = \frac{250}{1 + 1250(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{250}{1 + 250(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{250}{1 + 0.625}$$

$$n = \frac{250}{1.625}$$

$$n = 154$$

154 respondents are selected by means of a random sample procedure. It is not possible to collect questionnaire responses from every member of the study population; thus this is done to ensure that every member of the research population has an equal chance of being selected.

### **3.4 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument**

The basic measure of a notion, measurement, or conclusion's validity is how well-founded and plausible it is to match the real world. Strong in Latin, validus is where the word "valid" from. The extent to which a measurement tool measures what it purports to measure is its validity. A measure's degree of consistency is known as its reliability. When a test yields the same result every time under the same circumstances, it is considered dependable.

### **3.5 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument**

The research supervisor validates the research equipment. Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the instrument's reliability. If an instrument's Cronbach alpha coefficient is higher than 0.70, it is considered reliable (Cronbach, 1951).

### **3.6 Research Instrument**

#### **3.6 Method of Data Collection**

The study was conducted using a semi-structured questionnaire that was adapted from the prior studies. It addressed the respondents' sociodemographic profiles in addition to the four study questions and objectives. Data from earlier research as well as the tools used to gather and examine data from related studies were used to construct the instrument. The sections include specifics about the leadership philosophies adopted by the executives of the respondents' firms, the outcomes of those philosophies, and the overall output of the workforce in each case.

### **3.7 Model Specification**

To examine the relationship between social entrepreneurship and community resilience,, the following regression model is developed.

$$CR = f(SEI, SESE, SEOE)$$

$$CR = b_0 + b_1SEI + b_2SESE + b_3SEOE + \epsilon$$

Where,

CR= Community Resilience

SEI= Social Entrepreneurship Intention

SESE=Social Entrepreneurship Self-Efficacy

SEOE=Social Entrepreneurship Outcome Expectation

$\epsilon$ =error term

### **3.8 Method of Data Analysis**

The instrument was coded into an appropriate format for analysis after being checked for completeness to make sure participants responded to all of the questions. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to analyze the study's data. Descriptive statistics, such percentages and frequencies, are used in the study to answer its research aims and clarify the demographic features of the respondents. Ordinary least square (OLS) regression will be used to analyse the data for the

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**Introduction**

This focuses on the data presentation, analysis, and interpretation. Questionnaire was used to collect the data for the study. 154 copies of questionnaire are distributed to respondents in Benin City, do State, Nigeria but 110 valid responses are received. This implies that 71% response rate was accomplished.

Table 4.1 Bio Data of the respondents

ITEMS	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
<b>Gender</b>			
<b>Male</b>	60	55%	60
<b>Female</b>	50	45%	110
<b>Total</b>	110		
<b>Age</b>			
<b>Below 25</b>	20	18%	20
<b>25-30Years</b>	20	18%	40
<b>31-35Years</b>	30	27%	70
<b>35Years and Above</b>	40	36%	110

<b>Total</b>	110		
<b>Qualification</b>			
<b>ND</b>	38	35%	38
<b>B.SC.</b>	50	45%	88
<b>Master</b>	20	18%	108
<b>Ph.D</b>	2	2%	110
<b>Total</b>	110	100%	
<b>Working</b>			
<b>Experience</b>			
<b>Below 2 years</b>	30	28%	30
<b>2-5 years</b>	40	36%	70
<b>5Years and Above</b>	40	36%	110
<b>Total</b>	110	100%	

---

Field Study (2024)

Table 4.1 shows that 60(55%) of the respondents are male while 50(45%) of the respondents are female. 20(18%) of the respondents are below 25 years, 20(18%) of the respondents are between 25-30 years, 30(27%) of the respondents are between 31-35 years, and 40(36%) of the respondents are 35 years and above. In terms of qualifications, 38(35%) of respondents have ND/NCE, 50(45%) of respondents have B.Sc. 20(18%) of respondents have masters' degrees, 2(2%) respondents have Ph.D. In terms of working experience, 30(28%) of the respondents have working experience of below

2years,40(36%) of the respondents have working experience of 2-5years, and 40(36%) of the respondents have working experience of above 5years.

**Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics ofCommunity Resilience**

S/N	ITEM	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	People in my community feel like they belong to the community	50(45%)	30(27%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)
2	My community has the resources it needs to take care of community problems.	48(44%)	32(29%)	5(5%)	20(18%)	5(5%)
3	People in my community communicate with leaders who can help improve the community.	46(42%)	34(30%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	20(18%)
4	My community actively prepares for future disasters.	56(51%)	24(22%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)
5	My community tries to prevent disasters.	52(47%)	28(25%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	20(18%)

Field Study (2024)

Table 4.2 shows that 50(45%)of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 30(27%) of the respondent agreed,20(18%)of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that people in my community feel like they belong to the community. 48(44%)of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 32(29%) of the respondent agreed,5(5%)of the respondents are undecided, 20(18%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that my community has the resources it needs to take care of community problems.

46(42%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 34(30%) of the respondent agreed, 5(5%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 20(18%) of the respondents strongly disagree that people in my community communicate with leaders who can help improve the community. 56(51%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 24(22%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that my community actively prepares for future disasters. 52(47%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 28(25%) of the respondent agreed, 5(5%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 20(18%) of the respondents strongly disagree that my community tries to prevent disasters.

**Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics of Social Entrepreneurship Intention**

S/N	ITEM	SA	A	U	D	SD
5	I expect that at some point in the future I will be involved in launching an organization that aims to solve social problems.	46(42%)	34(30%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	20(18%)
6	I have a preliminary idea for a social enterprise on which I plan to act in the future.	48(44%)	32(29%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)
7	I do not plan to start a social enterprise	46(42%)	34(30%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	20(18%)

Field Study (2024)

Table 4.3 shows that 46(42%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 34(30%) of the respondent agreed, 5(5%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents

disagree and 20(18%) of the respondents strongly disagree that I expect that at some point in the future I will be involved in launching an organisation that aims to solve social problems. 48(44%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 32(29%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that I expect that I have a preliminary idea for a social enterprise on which I plan to act in the future. 46(42%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 34(30%) of the respondent agreed, 5(5%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 20(18%) of the respondents strongly disagree that I do not plan to start a social enterprise.

**Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics of Social Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy**

S/N	ITEM	SA	A	U	D	SD
8	I am convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it	48(44%)	32(29%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)
9	I could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces.	56(51%)	24(22%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)
10	Solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to.	52(47%)	28(25%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	20(18%)

**Field Study (2024)**

Table 4.3 shows that 48(44%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 32(29%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents

disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that I am convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it. 56(51%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 24(22%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that I could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces. 52(47%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 28(25%) of the respondent agreed, 5(5%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 20(18%) of the respondents strongly disagree that Solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to.

**Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics of Social Entrepreneurship Outcome Expectation**

S/N	Item	VHE	HE	NE	LE	VLE
11	Financial rewards (personal wealth, increase personal income, etc.)	48(44%)	32(29%)	5(5%)	20(18%)	5(5%)
12	Independence/Autonomy (personal freedom, be your own boss, etc.)	56(51%)	24(22%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)
13	Personal rewards (public recognition, personal growth, to prove I can do it, etc.)	52(47%)	28(25%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	20(18%)
14	Family security (to secure future for family members, to build a business to pass on, etc.)	50(45%)	30(27%)	20(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)

Field Study (2024)

Table 4.4 shows that 48(44%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 32(29%) of the respondent agreed, 5(5%) of the respondents are undecided, 20(18%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that financial rewards (personal wealth, increase personal income, etc.). 56(51%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 24(22%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 5(5%) of the respondents strongly disagree that independence/autonomy (personal freedom, be your own boss, etc.). 52(47%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 28(25%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 20(18%) of the respondents strongly disagree that Personal rewards (public recognition, personal growth, to prove I can do it, etc.). 50(45%) of the respondents of the strongly agreed, 30(27%) of the respondent agreed, 20(18%) of the respondents are undecided, 5(5%) of the respondents disagree and 5(s%) of the respondents strongly disagree that Family security (to secure future for family members, to build a business to pass on, etc.).

**Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics for All the Variables**

	CR	SEI	SESE	SEOE
Mean	30.49412	31.59064	25.77824	32.39412
Median	40.00000	34.00000	26.50000	31.00000
Maximum	50.00000	40.00000	40.00000	40.00000
Minimum	10.00000	10.00000	8.000000	8.000000
Std. Dev.	6.225315	4.048431	5.717585	5.212975

Skewness	-0.607508	-0.986012	-0.195776	-0.691122
Kurtosis	4.688410	6.885541	3.195590	5.767307
Jarque-Bera Probability	30.64953 0.000000	135.2775 0.000000	1.356944 0.507392	67.77750 0.000000
Sum	6544.000	5744.000	4520.000	5337.000
Sum Sq. Dev.	6528.494	3673.345	5333.176	4592.594
Observation s	110	110	110	110

From table 4.5, we observe that CR has a mean value of 31.59 with maximum and minimum values of 50 and 10 respectively and a standard deviation of 6.23. SEI has a mean value of 33.55 with a maximum and minimum values of 40 and 10 respectively, and standard deviation of 4.0. SESE has a mean value of 25.78 with maximum and minimum values of 40 and 8 respectively, and standard deviation of 5.7. SEOE has a mean value of 32.239 with a maximum and minimum values of 40 and 8 respectively, with a standard deviation of 5.21.

#### **Table 4.6: Regression Results**

Dependent Variable: CR

Method: Least Squares

Date: 05/29/24 Time: 10:55

Sample (adjusted): 1 110

Included observations: 170 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
----------	-------------	------------	-------------	-------

C	16.63582	4.726810	3.519461	0.0006
SEI	0.060615	0.096061	0.630999	0.5289
SESE	0.311598	0.124343	2.505956	0.0132
SEOE	0.368488	0.102396	3.598647	0.0004
<hr/>				
R-squared	0.408243	Mean dependent var	38.49412	
Adjusted R-squared	0.355933	S.D. dependent var	6.215315	
S.E. of regression	5.397196	Akaike info criterion	6.244292	
Sum squared resid	4777.274	Schwarz criterion	6.354967	
Log likelihood	-524.7648	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.289203	
F-statistic	11.02360	Durbin-Watson stat	1.651673	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Table 4.8 shows that R<sup>2</sup> of 0.40 indicates 40% of the systematic variation of the dependent variable. The F-statistics value of 11 and the associated p-value of 0.00 indicate that the hypothesis of a joint significance of the model cannot be rejected at 5%. The result shows that SEI (0.061) has positive and insignificant (p-value of 0.52 < 0.05) relationship with CR. The result also shows that SESE (0.311) has a positive and significant (P-V=0.01 > 0.05) relationship with CR. Finally, SEOE (0.368) has a positive and significant (0.00 > 0.05) relationship with CR. The Durbin-Watson statistics of 1.65 shows absence of serial correlation.

#### 4.2 Discussion of Findings

The study examines social entrepreneurship and community resilience. The following findings emerge from the study. The result shows a positive and insignificant relationship between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience. The result is

consistent with Barua et al. (2016) that find a positive and insignificant relationship between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience. The result is inconsistent with Ukilet et al. (2023) that find a negative relationship between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience. The result also shows a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience. The result is consistent with Vidovic et al. (2023) that find shows a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience. The result is inconsistent with Ukilet et al. (2023) that find a negative relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience. Finally, the results show a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience. The result is consistent with Sari et al. (2020) that find a show a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience. The result is inconsistent with Nambri (2019) that find a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The following findings emerges from the study.

- 1.The result shows a positive and insignificant between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience.
- 2.The result is consistent with. The result also shows a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and community resilience.
3. Finally, the results show a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience.

#### **5.2 CONCLUSION**

The study examines social entrepreneurship and community resilience. Questionnaire was used to collect the data for the study. 154 copies of questionnaire are distributed to respondents in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria but 110 valid responses are received. Simple percentage, descriptive statistics and ordinary least square regression(OLS) regression are used to analyse the data. The following findings emerges from the study.The result shows a positive and insignificant between social entrepreneurship intention and community resilience. The result is consistent with. The result also shows a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship self-efficacy and

community resilience. Finally, the results show a positive and significant relationship between social entrepreneurship outcome expectation and community resilience.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

The following recommendations emerges from the study

- 1.The study recommends government should provide adequate facilities to accommodate people because of natural disaster.
- 2.The government should organise workshop for community in order to cope with community resilience.
3. The entrepreneurs should provide facilities will protect their workers in the community.

### **5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies**

Future studies can increase the sample size in order compare their studies with this study. Furthermore, future studies can replicate these studies in another environment to test the validity of the study. Also, variables such as entrepreneurial orientation, entrepreneurial support can be added to their model by future researchers.

## References

- Aldrich, D.P., & Meyer, M.A. (2014). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1–16.
- Aloulou, W.J., & Algarni, E.A. (2022). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intention: empirical evidence from the Saudi context. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 18(4), 605-625.
- Amanchukwu, R. N., Amadi-Ali, T. G., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). Climate change education in Nigeria: The role of curriculum review. *Education*, 5(3), 71-79.
- Amobi, D., & Onyishi, T. (2015). Governance and climate change in Nigeria: A public policy perspective. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies*, 9(2), 199-210.
- Andikko, S. (2017). Social entrepreneurship: challenges in the implementation of educational technology innovation to address literacy : Comparative study among social entrepreneurs in prize-based competitions ( An unpublished M.Sc thesis) . Erasmus University of Rotterdam.
- Apata, T. G. (2011). Effects of global climate change on Nigerian agriculture: An empirical analysis. *CBN Journal of Applied Statistics*, 2(1), 31-50.
- Barua, E.N. (2016). Effect of social entrepreneurship factors on firm performance of enterprise based parastatals in Kenya (An unpublished Ph.D thesis). Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Bushell, S., Buisson, G. S., Workman, M., & Colley, T. (2017). Strategic narratives in climate change: towards a unifying narrative to address the action gap on climate change. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 28, 39-49.
- Canestrino, R., Ćwiklicki, M., Magliocca, P., & Pawełek, B. (2020). Understanding social entrepreneurship: A cultural perspective in business research. *Journal of Business Research*, 110, 132–143.
- Cardella, G.M., Sánchez, B.R.H., Justo, J.M.R.D.J., & García, J.C.S. (2023). Understanding social entrepreneurial intention in higher education: does gender and type of study matter. *Studies in Higher Education Latest Articles*.

- Choko, O. P., Olabisi, L.S., Onyeneke, R. U., Chiemela, S. N., Liverpool-Tasie, L. S. O., & Rivers, L. (2019) 'A resilience approach to community-scale climate adaptation. *Sustainability*, 11, 1-16.
- Clark Muntean, S., & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016). Feminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship: critique and new directions. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3), 221-241.
- Ebele, N. E., & Emodi, N. V. (2016). Climate change and its impacts in Nigeria economy. *Journal of Scientific Research and Report*, 10(6), 1-13.
- Gieure, C., Benavides-Espinosa, M. del M., & Roig-Dobón, S. (2019). Entrepreneurial intentions in an international university environment. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(8), 1605–1620.
- Hattab, H. (2023). Effectuation and the social entrepreneurship: an empirical study of the relationship between adopting the principles of effectual logic and social enterprise's performance in Egypt. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Innovation*, 6(1), 1-20.
- Hockerts, K. (2015). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 105–130.
- IPCC (2007) 'Adaptation and mitigation options', In (book section): Summary for Policymakers. In: Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Core Writing Team, Pachauri, R.K and Reisinger, A. (eds.)). IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland. This version: IPCC.
- IPCC. (2014) 'Climate change 2014: Synthesis report. Contribution of working groups I, II and III to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', [Core Writing Team, Pachauri, R. K and Meyer, L. A (Eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland: pp. 93-112.
- Khatiwada, P. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an approach to community development: A case study of social entrepreneurship in Kathmandu, Nepal (An unpublished B.Sc. project) . Diaconia University of Applied Sciences.
- Lindeley, S., O'Neil, J., Kandeh, J., Lawson, N., Christian, R., & O'Neil, M. (2011) 'Climate change justice and vulnerability. York, Joseph Rowntree.
- Martin, R.L., & Osberg, S. R. (2015). *Getting beyond better: How social entrepreneurship works*. Harvard Business Review Press.

- Nambri D. (2019). A study of social entrepreneurship in Papua New Guinea stakeholder relationship along liquefied natural gas pipeline (An unpublished MBA project). Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University.
- Nkoana, E. M., Verbruggen, A., & Huge, J. (2018) 'Climate change adaptation tools at the community level: An integrated literature review. *Sustainability*, 10, 1-21.
- Odor, J.C. (2019). What influences social entrepreneurs to adopt particular social enterprise structures and why? (An unpublished DBA thesis). Sheffield Hallam University.
- Ogbuabor, J. E., & Egwuchukwu, E.I. (2017). The impact of climate change on the Nigerian economy. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 7(2), 217-223.
- Onwutuebe, C. J. (2019). Patriarchy and women vulnerability to adverse Climate Change in Nigeria. *Climate Change Original Research*, 9(1), 1-7.
- Preston, I., Banks, N., Hargreaves, K., Kamierczak, A., Lucas, K., Mayne, R., Downing, C., & Street, R. (2014) 'Climate change and social justice: an evidence review. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Rahim, M.H.L.B. (2016). The relationship of social entrepreneurial behaviour, entrepreneurial leadership and organizational performance of small and medium enterprises in Malaysia (An unpublished DBA thesis). University Utara Malaysia.
- Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.
- Sari R. N., Junita D., Anugerah R., & Nanda S. T. (2021). Social entrepreneurship, transformational leadership and organizational performance: the mediating role of organizational learning. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 23(2), 464-480.
- Sauermann, M.P. (2023). Social Entrepreneurship as a Tool to promoting Sustainable Development in low-Income Communities: An Empirical analysis. Munich Personal RePEc Archiv.
- Tran, A.D.P., & Korfflesch, H.V. (2016). A conceptual model of social entrepreneurial intention based on the social cognitive career theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 17-38.
- Trung, N.H. (2016). Community resilience, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation: learning with coastal communities in Central Vietnam (An unpublished Ph.D thesis). Carleton University.

- Ukil,M.I., Ullah,M.S., &Hsu,D.K.(2023). Advancing the model of social entrepreneurial intention: the role of perceived financial security. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*,26(1),40-55.
- Urban, B. (2020). Entrepreneurial alertness, self-efficacy and social entrepreneurship intentions. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(3), 489–507.
- Vidovic, D. (2023).The meaning of being a social entrepreneur in the society of multiple transitions. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 19(3), 237-255.
- World Bank. (2019). Building climate resilience: Experience from Nigeria’, pp. 1-7.

**Appendix**

Department of Entrepreneurship  
Faculty of Management Sciences  
University of Benin,  
Benin City.

Date.....

Dear Respondent,

**Request Your Cooperation in completing this questionnaire**

I am an under graduate student undergoing a full-time B. SC. program at the Institution mentioned above; I am conducting a research study on Social Entrepreneurship and Community Resilience in Edo State as part of the requirements for awarding the earlier stated degree. In this regard, you were selected as a sample member.

I kindly request that you spare a few moments to assist with this Study by completing this questionnaire. I assure you that your response will be treated with strict confidentiality, as you are required to disclose your identity. Similarly, your answer would be strictly for stated academic purpose!

Thanks for your anticipatory co-operation.

.....

Researcher

**Section A: Background Characteristics of Respondents**

- Q1. Gender  Female  Male
- Q2. Age  Below 25  25-30  31-35  above 35
- Q3. Level of Academic Pursuit  ND  B.S.C  Masters  Ph.D

Q4. Working Experience.

( ) Below 2 years ( ) 2-5 years ( ) above 5 years.

Please Indicate the extent you agree with the following statement

Strongly Agree =SA, agree =A, Neutral =Disagree =D, Strongly Disagree =SD

Very High Extent = VHE

High Extent = HE

Low Extent = LE

Very Low Extent=VLE

S/N	Community resilience	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	People in my community feel like they belong to the community					
2	My community has the resources it needs to take care of community problems.					
3	People in my community communicate with leaders whocan help improve the community.					
4	My community actively prepares for future disasters.					
5	My community tries to prevent disasters.					
	<b>social entrepreneurship intention</b>					
5	I expect that at some point in the future I will be involved in launching an organization that aims to solve social problems.					
6	I have a preliminary idea for a social enterprise on which I plan to act in the future.					
7	I do not plan to start a social enterprise					
	<b>Social Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy</b>					
8	I am convinced that I personally can make a contribution to address societal challenges if I put my mind to it					

9	I could figure out a way to help solve the problems that society faces.					
10	Solving societal problems is something each of us can contribute to.					
	<b>social entrepreneurship outcome expectation</b>	VHE	HE	NE	LE	VLE
11	Financial rewards (personal wealth, increase personal income, etc.)					
12	Independence/Autonomy (personal freedom, be your own boss, etc.)					
13	Personal rewards (public recognition, personal growth, to prove I can do it, etc.)					
14	Family security (to secure future for family members, to build a business to pass on, etc.)					