

## **Personal Initiatives and Social Entrepreneurial Wealth Creation in South-South Region of Nigeria**

**Mary Shadrach Omofowa<sup>1</sup> & Shadrach Omofowa<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Human Resources, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration, Global Polytechnic, Benin City

Corresponding Email: shadrachomofowa@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

*This study examined the relationship between personal initiatives and social entrepreneurial wealth creation piloted by female entrepreneurs, in south-south region of Nigeria (Edo, Delta, Rivers and Cross-rivers). Specifically, the study aimed at ascertaining the extent to which entrepreneurship pro-activeness, opportunity recognition, self-fulfilment and behavioural mechanisms enhance social wealth creations in total communities. The study adopted a survey research design, our objectives and hypotheses were empirically formulated for the study. Primary source of data were used to elicit information both from the female entrepreneurs and members of the local communities. The population consists of 1550 domestic organizations certified by corporate affairs commission and a sample size of 317 was drawn using Taro Yamane formula (1964). The Cronbach alpha reliability was used in assessing the reliability of the instrument adapted in the study for the purpose of data presentation and analysis, analysis of variance, correlations analysis were used. Also the statistical software used for the analysis is STATA 13.0. The study findings revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between pro-activeness, self-fulfilment, opportunity recognition and behavioural mechanism on social wealth creation. Based on the findings and conclusion, the study recommends that entrepreneurial process should be an avenue for mentorship; serve as an avenue for engaging the youth, in addition, entrepreneurs be proactive in solving social ills.*

**Keywords: Personal Initiatives, Social Entrepreneurial Wealth Creation, Entrepreneurship Pro-activeness, Self-Fulfilment**

**JEL Classification Codes: D03, D80, I31, J24, L26**

---

### **1. Introduction**

The downturned economy and corresponding increased job search affect the mentality and aspirations of citizens. Government alone cannot

create jobs for its citizens. This indicates a need for job creation mentality based on personal attributes. Entrepreneurial development entails skills, competence, capabilities and intentions translated into actions based on certain personal convictions of the individual (Weiss, Anisimova & Shirokova, 2019). This changing mentality will significantly influence the rate of poverty alleviation which is the basic problem that confronts social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship has been described by several related terms in solving challenges in Nigeria. These challenges are gradually moving nations into social entrepreneurial wealth creation. It has become evident that personal initiative, opportunity recognition, self-determination, behavioral mechanisms, and entrepreneurial alertness have significantly impacted social entrepreneurs' wealth creation.

Presently, in Nigeria, there are numerous challenges of technological facilities, trust issues, visibility of social entrepreneurs that have affected entrepreneurship as noted by Olaleye *et al.*, (2021), and personal initiatives are key indicators that sensitises private and public entrepreneurs in engaging key sectors of the Nigerian economy. In this study, personal initiatives is consistently linked to higher value creation and innovativeness of social entrepreneurs as it is the proactive behavioural mechanism that ignites the ability to overcome barriers and recognise opportunities to achieve determined value creation in social economic disposition (Frese & Fay, 2001).

Personal initiatives play a crucial role in social entrepreneurial wealth creation; it involves pre-launch, launch, and execution or overcoming barriers from the syndrome of proactive behavioural mechanism. Its' impact on the effectiveness of social entrepreneur is due to its suitability to character, creative thinking, resource, and situational management (Hisrich, 1990). The International Monetary Fund [IMF], (2020) noted that the recent Ebola and Covid-19 pandemic has crippled entrepreneurial activities and resulted in youth restlessness (Ressa, 2021). The recent Ebola, Covid-19 pandemic and the 2023 general election is also a trigger to violent crimes. Interestingly, we proposed that social wealth creations are activities to enhance the living standard of the citizens. However, this can be achieved in a prudent way.

Extant literature affirms that the initiative of the entrepreneur is positively linked to social wealth creation (Olaleye *et al.*, 2021; Johnmark, Munene & Balunywa, 2016). Prior studies suggest entrepreneurial orientation of disabilities persons (Johnmark, *et al.*, 2016). Other authors observed that social wealth creation is influenced by variables such as job creation, non-monetary focus, and institutional needs (Germak, 2013). Despite studies on personal initiative, there is a gap in how it affects social

entrepreneurial wealth creation. Studies relating personal initiative to social wealth creation in a not-for-profit organization in Nigeria are scanty. Further, examining how personal initiatives influences social wealth creation in Local Communities is important. More so, many past studies assessed personal initiative on social entrepreneurial wealth creation in developed economic contexts (Nascimento & Salazar, 2020; Anggraeni, 2019; Morais-da-Silva, Segatto & Bezerra-de-Sousa, 2020). We align with the argument of Zahra (2007) that context matters in entrepreneurship development. Nonetheless, there is a gap in the developing nation context. Besides, we have responded to the call by other researchers to assess personal initiative on social entrepreneurial wealth creation in varying contexts (Nsereko *et al.*, 2018) especially in developing or emerging market organizations managed and formed by women (Zafar *et al.*, 2022; Rosca *et al.*, 2020).

Following the recent literature, this study seeks to further investigate what drives individuals (pro-activeness, innovativeness, behavioural mechanism) to engage in social entrepreneurial wealth creation which is essentially social in nature, (Barki *et al.*, 2015), duties to develop innovation of social problem solution (Morais-da-silva *et al.*, 2019). Here this study sought to define social entrepreneurship as a result of non-consensual definitions (Collavo, 2018). Developing a clearer understanding of social entrepreneurship, wealth creation, and personal initiatives has received little empirical attention. Drawing on the theory of personal initiative view which emphasizes on behavioral approach, in setbacks, and environmental change for the better. This is in contrast to a passive approach which is characterized by doing what one is told to do, lacking the ability to adjust to misfortune, resilience, and environmental sustainability (Frese & Fay, 2001). The authors affirmed that personal initiatives significantly impact social entrepreneurial wealth creation in a community-based not-for-profit organization. This lends credence to personal initiatives skill, knowledge, institution, and insight that enhance social entrepreneurial wealth creation. The study intends to empirically investigate personal initiative on social wealth creation in Not-for-profit organizations in community-based organizations in south-south, Nigeria.

The paper is structured as follows: the next section gives an overview and reviews the literature on personal initiatives, its measures (pro-activeness, self-fulfilment, opportunity recognition, and behavioural mechanism) and social entrepreneurial wealth creation in south-south Nigeria and ends with a discussion of the theoretical framework. Next, the methodology, data collection, analysis, conclusion, and implications for

academicians, policy makers and practitioners are presented in the final sections of the paper.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Social Entrepreneurship**

Social entrepreneurship in Sub Sahara is still in its infant stage in a developing economy. In Nigeria's context, social entrepreneurship does not have any legal definition; hence a unified definition remains a paradox (Lasprogala & Cotton, 2003). Nigeria's entrepreneurship dates back to the late 50s. According to Kerlin (2001), communities in the northern part of Nigeria were the first to embrace the cooperative law of social entrepreneurial wealth creation, these wealth creation ventures made some impact until corruption and politics crept into the management of these co-operatives leading to the demise of these co-operatives. Just recently, the concept of social entrepreneurship wealth creation began to gain momentum and came to the limelight as a means of addressing social needs in Nigeria (Olokundun, *et al.*, 2018). The emergence of social entrepreneurship in Nigeria was propelled by social needs, poverty eradication, environmental challenges, and injustices of wealth creation amongst the six geo-political regions in Nigeria.

Furthermore, support from International NGOs created a platform for social entrepreneurship advancement (Babalola, 2012). These are numerous NGOs in Nigeria that focus on addressing social issues like oil spillage in Niger/Delta, Boko Haram Insurgence, Kidnapping, Banditry, Cow rustling, Advance fee fraud, and herds, farmers clashes. These NGOs are local and internationally based. A key concern of social entrepreneurship is socio-economic vices, sustainability of the environment, infrastructural development, policy formulation, and implementation; these are factored into social entrepreneurial wealth creation.

However, community-based organizations, social activists, human right activist, and environmentalists, must ensure mass campaigns for masses sensitization and benefit of these NGOs. With these campaigns, a number of the populace would avail themselves of the opportunity of coming out of their travails. The government of Nigeria's role as an agent of social entrepreneurship manifested in 1979, the Obasanjo regime introduced Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) as a pivotal of assisting farmers in growing agricultural products, and livestock to cater to the growing Nigeria population, 1980 president Alhaji Shehu Shagari introduced Green Revolution, President Ibrahim Babangida introduces numerous agencies to eradicate poverty, infrastructural development, etc. such programmes, Family Support Programme (FSP), a better life for rural women, Directorate

of Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) too numerous to mention. Other programs established by different administrations include, the National Poverty Eradication Program, (NAPEP), the National Resource Development and Conservation Scheme, (NRDCs), the Family Economic and Advancement Programme (FEAP) and the present Administration of President Muhammadu Buhari established N-power program. These various programmes stood as a formidable front for social entrepreneurship in Nigeria assisted by the Federal Government, Although social entrepreneurship is a growing phenomenon in Nigeria, awareness seems to be rising and more social entrepreneurs are inspiring change across Africa including Nigeria.

However, there is minimal scholarly research in the area of personal initiatives on social entrepreneurial wealth creation in Nigeria. In recent years, a few scholarly investigations have looked into areas such as social enterprises and social entrepreneurship (Nascimento & Salaza, 2020; Iyortsun, 2015). Development of infrastructure by multinationals in Nigeria and other social amenities (Oghojafor *et al.*, 2011), despite all these; the study on the impact of personal initiatives on social entrepreneurial wealth creation in Nigeria remains vague and un-investigated, policies and structure governing social entrepreneurship in Nigeria remains a challenge to existing studies on the subject, this prevailing gap in the study of social entrepreneurship wealth creation in Nigeria inspired this research. Additionally, it becomes important to validate the previous studies done by Hanley, Wachner and Weiss (2016) and Nsereko *et al.*, (2018) on how the personal initiative theory enhances personal initiative in social entrepreneurship and can give credence to wealth creation and solve socioeconomic issues. They conducted their research using not-for-profit organizations and other Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO).

Additionally, studies over the last two decades are highlighting the need for an impact assessment of social entrepreneurship. Globally, the impact assessment of personal initiatives by social entrepreneurship in relation to socio-economic benefit, social problems solutions to wealth creation, and opportunities for job creation is attracting academic discussion and hence encouraging insight on the subject, especially in an emerging market in developing countries such as Nigeria, Uganda, Ghana, Kenya (Foryt, 2002; Hanley *et al.*, 2015). According to Nsereko *et al.* (2018), personal initiative is when social entrepreneurs apply new ideas or approaches in not-for-profit organizations, they solve social problems, therefore personal initiative is critical in managing social entrepreneurs and giving credence to wealth creation by social entrepreneurs.

In the view of Dakung *et al.*, (2016) to maintain the relevance and

sustainability of social entrepreneurs in an emerging market in Nigeria, impact analysis is inevitable, thus, addressing the concept of personal initiative is inevitable, though the emergence of social entrepreneurs in Nigeria is geared toward socio-economic transformation, the impact assessment on accurate data based potentials is not clear, thereby creating a further gap, this study seeks to investigate further, assessment of personal initiatives, social entrepreneurship wealth creation in solving socio-economic issues in Nigeria, if this exist and how much such effort needed in solving these issues.

### **2.1.1 Conceptualizing Social Entrepreneurship**

Social entrepreneurship addresses grand societal problems that relate it to opportunity recognition and opportunity exploitation that target social value creation or social change (Hietschold; *et al.* 2019). This focus on social wealth creation differentiates it from others entrepreneurs. Consequently, they are set primarily to meet social objectives, not for financial profit (Renko, 2013).

Social entrepreneurs are of different categories—community social entrepreneurs; this entrepreneur addresses community needs within a geographical region, and their personal initiatives are job creation and opportunities for marginalized change agents in a community. Non-profit social entrepreneurs are endowed for social good, the path taken by savvy entrepreneurs who use skills for creating change, however, the result often takes time to manifest, transformational social entrepreneurs, these entrepreneurs stand as mentors, and recruit and foster talent in-house. The global social entrepreneur is focused on the realization of social responsibility, and positive change as opposed to just profit e.g. education, infrastructure development, and provision of social amenities in the locality.

Scholars have studied differences in their personalities, for example optimistic (Gabarret, Vedel & Decaillon, 2017), committed (Miller *et al.*, 2012), emotional (Miller *et al.*, 2012) and altruistic (Ruskin *et al.*, 2016). However, their trait approach is still debated (Keh, Der Foo & Lim, 2002). They face challenges of resource constraints (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006), and stakeholders legitimately (Renko, 2013). Specifically, Dess (2001) briefly linked social entrepreneurship to; rethinking social values. Wealth creation for the benefit of all. Dedication to the continuous learning process, Operating resources capability, Social responsibility for the public.

### **2.1.2 Conceptualizing Personal Initiatives**

Opportunity identification and the promotion of an inquiry toward

social issues is a global concern, towards individual ability on personal initiative and its dimensions. Social entrepreneurs often think above the box, on socioeconomic issues to arrive at a solution for the community. This study dwells on pro-activeness, self-fulfilment, opportunity recognition, and behavioural mechanism on wealth creation. Presently scholars argued entrepreneurial behavioural mechanisms with personal initiatives (Dakung *et al.*, 2016; Frese, 2015), in managing social issues and adding to the literature which supports personal initiative theory (Frese *et al.*, 1996). Social entrepreneurs and personal initiatives result in better-performing tasks, self-fulfilling, recognizing opportunities, being more proactive, and displaying high behavioural mechanisms (Krauss, *et al.*, 2003).

### **2.1.3 Pro-activeness and Social Entrepreneurship Wealth Creations**

Proactive entrepreneurs are action oriented entrepreneurs who have the propensity, of human capabilities to take decisive actions in the face of external constraints, thereby altering the environment in which they operate. A proactive social entrepreneur's foresight can change the world (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000), such as shaping the environment; community friendly, ideas, and businesses, that can have a social impact. Social entrepreneurs' pro-activeness also means, the ability of networking competence which emphasizes social ills, however, this depends on the entrepreneurs' personalities initiative, behavioural disposition, and level of interactions. This study considers vividly the social entrepreneurs' disposition as a precursor to pro-activeness. A case study can be viewed in Nigeria from angela mind the gap; which is currently providing free training for youths in digital skills. This has enabled young Nigerian to create content, and understand web design, for digital advertising. The core mission is to create wealth for privately unemployed individuals and also to digitize every sector of the Nigerian economy.

The organization as a social entrepreneur has been able to solve technical talent shortage on the African continent. Proactive people will always have a tendency to social change occurrence, (Kraus, *et al.*, 2012). Grant (2000) wanted to find out if a proactive disposition towards behaviours intuitively appeared to be related to entrepreneurship. The results confirmed that proactive initiative is positively associated with social entrepreneurial behaviours, hence proposing the following hypothesis.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no relationship between pro-activeness and social entrepreneurial wealth creation.

### **2.1.4 Personal Fulfilment Motivation and Social Wealth Creations**

Personal fulfilment refers to creativity, dignity, risk and ability to operate independently in satisfying a lifestyle or a social need. Personal fulfilment motivation has received little attention in social entrepreneurs' wealth creation. Hechavarria, Renko and Matthews (2012) suggest social responsibility and sustainability (Nicolopoulou, 2014), Charity, and Philanthropy (Acs, Boardman & McNeely 2013). While social networks, financing, and geographic attributes influence to process, personal fulfilment leads to the pursuit of theories of needs, Maslow (1943) which culminates in self-actualization and personal fulfilment on several grounds. For example, provision for oneself, and one family, explain why social entrepreneurs engage in wealth creation, even if such is to generate employment and pay salaries without financial payoff or economic gains (Zanakis, Renko & Bullough, 2012).

However, this need level is most likely not associated with social entrepreneurs, but just a motivational factor. Self-actualization relates to personal fulfilment which differentiates it from the commercial entrepreneur (Miller *et al.*, 2012). In terms of personal fulfilment motivation in Nigeria, the context can be viewed from leading philanthropy empowering young Nigerian and African youth, the Tony Elumelu Foundation (TEF), championing social entrepreneurship, and empowering women and men across Africa. The foundation believed the social entrepreneurship role is critical in creating social and economic wealth. The foundation is active in 54 African countries. Germak (2013) wanted to find out if personal fulfilment motivation disposition toward behavioural intuitively appeared to be related to social entrepreneurial wealth creations. The result confirmed a significant association between social entrepreneurs and being motivated to start wealth creation due to a motivation to fulfil a personal vision. It is consistent with the social entrepreneurship theoretical domain hence proposing the following hypothesis;

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no relationship between personal fulfilment motivation and social this wealth creation.

### **2.1.5 Opportunity Recognition and Social Entrepreneurial Wealth Creations**

Opportunity recognition is the detection of meaningful pattern in comparison with novice; it involves alertness, unique preparation, and new solution to the range of services. Nigeria living below the poverty line is growing compared to most other developing countries that have managed to reduce their number. 25% of women and 33% of the elderly people are faced with war and conflict, 25% are domestic violence, 28% of young people



facing difficulties, 67% are drug addicts, 14% are migrants, IDP, trafficking victims, refugees, and asylum seekers, 6% in trouble with the law, 10% homeless, 30% poor people and 63% individual with a physical or mental disability (National Bureau of Statistics Nigeria, 2022).

Social entrepreneurs are intended to drive societal transformation and address social issues and empower transformation within the system. Opportunity recognition demonstrates the capability of social entrepreneurs to identify a good idea and transform it into a business impression that improves value and create wealth to solve social ills in society (Lumpkin & Lichtenstein, 2005). Opportunity recognition in social entrepreneurship focuses on helping in problem-solving to ensure good living. It addresses factors like oil theft, Boko haram insurgency, drug abuse, etc. (Donbesuur, Boso & Hultman 2020). However, no accepted definition in relationship with social entrepreneurship wealth creation (Hulbert, Gilmore & Carson, 2015). For instance, Bull & Willard (1993) demonstrated that entrepreneur in social outlook appears under conditions of personal vision and social values, knowledge and current social condition and supportive environment. Opportunity recognition is also associated with resource arrangement, with a contributory effort to social values motivated by a social change to meet social needs. Opportunity recognition is characterized by the distinctive behaviour of the social entrepreneurs, the ability to comprehend their vision leading to wealth creation.

There are great chances of societal decay if social entrepreneurs cannot search for or identify ways of helping to curb this menace in society. Areas of opportunity recognition in Nigeria can be seen in the changing mind-set, especially amongst the younger generation which is essential for development on all levels. Recycling business Eco Future has been a huge shift in youth view on recycling, as more and more youth realize trash can have a monetary value. An increasing number of young people are focusing on careers rather than starting a family at an early age. And the pride in Nigerian-made is growing, especially in areas such as culture and fashion with Nollywood-produced films hitting cinemas, and Lagos fashion week being a hit with world-famous Nigerian fashion designers showcasing locally produced pieces. Pro-activeness enables social entrepreneurs in seeking new horizon for wealth creation, Nambisan & Zahra (2016).

Campos (2017) explore if opportunity recognition disposition toward behavioural intuitively appears to be related to social entrepreneur wealth creation. The finding shows that entrepreneurial activities identify new opportunities superior to wealth creation. Looking at the personal initiative theoretical lens, it is consistent with the social entrepreneurship, theoretical domain hence proposing the following hypothesis;

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no relationship between opportunity recognition and social entrepreneurial wealth creation.

### **2.1.6 Behavioural Mechanism and Social Entrepreneurial Wealth Creations**

Behavioural mechanism is unlocking traits of an entrepreneur to exploit potential opportunity that bring a significant sustainable social change in the environment. Personality traits, distinctive thinking beliefs, and attitudes are the behavioural outcomes of social entrepreneurs (Arora, Haynie & Laurence, 2013). Social entrepreneurial behaviour is a decision on opportunity and funds. Social entrepreneurial behaviour emphasizes the importance of refocusing research attention toward concrete and observable human action in wealth creation (Bird, Schjoedt & Baur, 2012). The central behavioural mechanism of social entrepreneurs is passion regarding care, improvement of human and environmental well-being, forecasting, progress, and expanding wealth creation. It also includes identifying social problems and finding innovative solutions to these problems.

Previous researchers illustrated optimistic (Gabarret *et al.*, 2017) commitment (Miller *et al.*, 2012) emotional (Miller *et al.*, 2012), and Altruistic (Ruskin *et al.*, 2016). In this regard, social entrepreneurial behavioural is the traits the entrepreneur shows in their services to the needing, taking responsibility for social problems which private and public sectors do not address as a yardstick for success. Social entrepreneurs, however, measure success on a system of value on social investment despite uncertainties and failures, the social entrepreneurs are encouraged to take action before uncertainties are resolved on social ills (Hayward, Shepherd & Griffins, 2006). Hietschold and Voegtlin (2021) examined if entrepreneur cognition (Behaviour) disposition toward behavioural intuitively appears to be related to social entrepreneur wealth creation. The findings indicate that entrepreneur cognition (behavioural mechanism) is an important puzzle piece in understanding social entrepreneurs. Looking at the personal initiative theoretical lens, it is consistent with this social entrepreneurship theoretical domain hence proposing the following hypothesis;

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no relationship between behavioural mechanism and social entrepreneurship wealth creations.

## **2.2 Theoretical Foundation**

This study adapted the theory of personal initiatives by (Frese *et al.*, 1996). This theory assumes that individuals with certain personal traits are influenced by their environment, and behavioural syndrome. Based on the model of commercial activities that differentiate the business from hybrid,

philanthropist, or profit-generated organizations, social entrepreneurial wealth creation is different due to its communally wealth creation owing to the institutional gap. The theoretical framework (Frese & Fay, 2001) is based on fundamental ideas that personal traits are relatively influenced by their environment and behavioural syndrome within the environment (Frese *et al.*, 2014).

Frese *et al.*, (1996) relate business initiatives to personal development, fundamental ideas, and behavioural syndromes in taking an active approach to tasks in overcoming setbacks, and the consequences of such an active approach in an environment are dynamic. Institutional entrepreneurship highlights non-financial support from the government and decreases in private participation affect the sustainability of Not-for-profit organizations, hence personal initiative is needed for adjustment in changes that may appear (Glaub, Frese, Fischer & Happe, 2015).

Therefore personal initiative involves acting on ideas neglected within the community, the motives is to fight abject poverty (Sutter, Bruton & Chen, 2019), the transformation of social settings (Alvord *et al.*, 2004), institutional change (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014), and promoting socio-economic development and growth of existing markets (Azmat *et al.*, 2015), through these proxy individuals, use their proactive, self-fulfilment, opportunity recognition and behavioural mechanism (Frese *et al.*, 1996, Germak & Robinson, 2012) for wealth creation. This implies that taking initiative involves acting on new ideas that potential competitors may not have noticed (Deshon & Gillespie, 2005). This shows that personal initiatives sharpen social needs in society, and harness resources (Frese, 2015). Parker, Bindl and Strauss (2010) documented that personal initiatives drive enhancing the behaviour of social entrepreneurs of community-based organizations in solving social problems in a developing nation like Nigeria. This theory neglects action regulatory mechanisms like intention in goal attainment (Gollwitzer & Brandstatter, 1997). However, this study provides insight on personal initiatives and social wealth creation in the subtropical region like Nigeria.

### **3. Methodology**

The state of knowledge and theory of development in a field and the researcher's view of the world are guided by the post-positivistic view, which advocates objective testing of empirical hypothesis, Brymand and Bell (2003) and Reichardt and Rallis (1994). This study employs a survey research design, this enables the researcher to collect data at a given point in time, and test the hypothesis quantitatively.

### 3.1 Model Specification

This study adapted and modified the model specification of Amughoro (2018), they examined entrepreneurship as an antidote for alleviating poverty and unemployment in Nigeria, secondary data from National Bureau of Statistics and Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin was used for the study. Entrepreneurship was taken as the independent variable, poverty and unemployment rate as dependent variable. This study modified their model to ensure that pro-activeness, self-fulfilment, opportunity recognition and behavioural mechanism are capture as the independent variables. The model is specified in econometric form in equation (1).

$$SEWC = f(PRTY, + SEFT, + OPPR, + BEHM + ut) \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

$$SEWC = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 PRTY + \beta_2 SEFT + \beta_3 OPPR + + \beta_4 BEHM + ut \dots \dots (2)$$

Where;

*PRTV = Proactiveness*

*SEFT = Self – fulfilment*

*OPPR = Opportunity, recognition*

*BEHM = Behavioral mechanism*

*SEWC = Social entrepreneurship wealth creation*

*u = Error term*

*α0 = constant*

*β1 – β4 = Regression coefficient*

The total population of study comprises 1550 community based organizations certified by corporate affairs commissions between the year 2018 and 2021 as non-governmental organizations that are based in various rural communities across the states in south-south region of the federation. These non-governmental organizations based in the local community were chosen because they are non-profit organizations, moreover, by 2050, Nigeria will be the third largest country in the world, but the fast population growth is currently creating more social ills than opportunities, especially for the youths. The needs for creative social entrepreneurs that can address growing social difficulties are imperative.

The sample size was determined by Yamane (1964) formula for a finite population and it is written as;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Where;

n = s, size

N = pp, size

e = err mg. 5%

$$n = \frac{1550}{1 + 1550 (0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{1550}{1 + 1550 (0.0025)} = \frac{1550}{1 + 3.875}$$

$$n = \frac{1550}{4.875}$$

n = 317

**Table1: Variables and Theoretical Underpinning**

Variables	Dependent/Independent	References
Personal Initiative	Independent	Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng & Tag (1997); Nsereko <i>et al.</i> , (2018), Grant, (2000).
Pro-activeness	Independent	Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng & Tag (1997)
Self-Fulfilment Motivation	Independent	Maslow (1943); Hechavarria, Renko & Matthews (2012).
Opportunity Recognition	Independent	Harms, Schulz, Kraus & Fiuk (2009).
Behavioural Mechanism	Independent	Carter, Gartner, & Reynolds, (1996); Kessler & Frank; (2009).
Social Entrepreneurial	Dependent	Acs, <i>et al.</i> , (2013); Philips, <i>et al.</i> (2015).

Source: Authors' Compilation (2023)

Community based organization that are humanitarian was used for the study. These organizations are philanthropies, charity organizations, self-help community organizations, and institutions that are in charge of preventing and rehabilitating drug addicts, and preventing human traffickers, providing job opportunity to reduce the rate of poverty, improve the health care system, and solve the problems of unemployment. 317 questionnaires were distributed, 243 were returned, 21 were invalid, and 222 were used for analysis purposes, a response rate of 70% was achieved. The participants were randomly selected through a personal approach. The descriptive statistics reveal that male was about (142), and females were about (80) between the 35-45 age bracket, (45.6%) of the respondent had 5 years' experience, about 35.4% for 10 years, and about 19% for about 10 years above. Finally, (82.6%) were married.

**4. Results and Discussion**

**Table 2: Cronbach Alpha Table Reliability Assessment**

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test cor.	Item-test cor.	Average interitem covariance	Alpha
Prtv	22	+	0.7363	0.5731	.4352078	0.8760
Seft	22	+	0.7557	0.6148	.4339237	0.8635
Oppr	22	+	0.8467	0.7560	.4000075	0.8305
Behm	22	+	0.8622	0.7770	.3892048	0.8248
Sewc	22	+	0.8721	0.7849	.373259	0.8214
Test Scale					.4063206	0.8711

Bartlett’s test for equal variances:  $\chi^2(3) = 25.0919$  Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.003$ . oneway sew behm  
 Source: Authors’ Computation (2023)

**Table 3: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)**

Variable	KMO
Prtv	0.8758
Seft	0.9074
Oppr	0.8233
Behm	0.8065
Sewc	0.8411
Overall	0.8430

Source: Author Desk Table (2023)

Table 3 explains why we conducted both reliability and validity test on the measurement scale used. The Cronbach alpha test was conducted for all the variables, the result suggests that the measurement instrument effectively captures the variable (Zikmund, Babin, Carr, & Griffin, 2013). Table 1.1 the KMO and Bartlett test for sampling adequacy was significant (KMO; 0.8430,  $P = 0.000 < 0.05$ ) suggesting that the variable is reliable and internally consistent. STATA 13.0 was the statistical package used for data analysis.

**Table 4: Correlation Matrix**

	prtv	Seft	Oppr	Behm	sewc
Prtv	1.0000				
Seft	0.3772	1.0000			
Oppr	0.4964	0.5468	1.0000		
Behm	0.4907	0.5730	0.7705	1.0000	
Sewc	0.5911	0.5886	0.6629	0.7004	1.0000

Source: Author Desk Table (2023)

**Table 5: Multiple Regression Result**

Source	SS	Df	Ms	No. of obs = 222		
Model	101.545388	4	25.3863469	F (4,217) = 88.07		
Residual	62.5492071	217	.288245194	Prob> F = 0.0000		
TOTAL	164.094595	221	.742509478	R-squared = 0.6188		
				Adj R-squared = 0.6118		
				Root MSE = .53688		
Sewc	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>/t	[95% conf. Interval]	Decision H1
Prtv	.2614329	.0474237	5.51	0.000	.1679628 .354903	Accepted
Seft	.2196912	.0539742	4.07	0.000	.1133104 .3260719	Accepted
Oppr	.1833871	.0743729	2.47	0.014	.0368013 .3299729	Accepted
Behm	.3346705	.0739987	4.52	0.000	.1888222 .4805188	Accepted
_cons	.205855	.214297	0.96	0.338	.216515 .628225	Accepted

Source: Authors Desk Table

**Table 6: Bartlett's Test ANOVA**

Source	Ss	DF	Ms	F	Prob> F
Btw grp	60.5386249	4	15.1346562	31.71	0.0000
Within grp	103.55597	217	.47721645		
Total	164.094595	221	.742509478		

Bartlett's test for equal variances: chi2(4) = 17.4072 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. oneway sewc seft

Source: Authors Desk Table

**Table 7: ANOVA**

Source	Ss	DF	Ms	F	Prob> F
Btw grp	57.4517375	4	14.3629344	29.23	0.0000
Within grp	106.642857	217	.491441738		
Total	164.094595	221	.742509478		

Bartlett's test for equal variances: chi2(4) = 46.1367 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. oneway sewc oppr

Source: Authors Desk Table

**Table 8: ANOVA**

Source	Ss	DF	Ms	F	Prob> F
Btw grp	86.95969	3	28.9865633	81.92	0.0000
Within grp	77.1349046	218	.353829838		
Total	164.094595	221	.742509478		

Bartlett's test for equal variances:  $\chi^2(3) = 13.8863$  Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.003$

. oneway sewc behm

Source: Authors Desk Table

**Table 9: ANOVA**

Source	Ss	F	Ms	F	Prob> F
Between groups	91.5999258	3	30.5333086	91.82	0.0000
Within groups	72.4946688	218	.332544352		
Total	164.094595	221	.742509478		

Source: Researcher calculation using stata ver 13.0

Out of 317 questionnaires, 240 was returned, 21 questionnaire were excluded due to the misleading and missing value 222 questionnaire was suitable and used for analysis purposes this represent 70% which is adequate for data analysis (Bryman & Bell, 2015). In table 1.1 terms of the numbers of social entrepreneurs, 100 (45.1%) of social entrepreneurs are mentoring between 1-10 entrepreneurs, 66 (29.7%) have between 11-20 social entrepreneur mentoring, 41 (18.5%) are mentoring between 21-30 social entrepreneurs, and (6.7%) and mentoring between 31-40 social entrepreneurs. With respect to this year of experience, 120 (54.1%) social entrepreneurs have been in community service between 0 and 5 years, 69 (31.1%) between 6-10 years, and 33 (14.9%) between 11 years and above.

#### 4.1 Discussion of Findings

This study explores personal initiative, self-fulfilment, opportunity recognition pro-activeness, and behavioral mechanism on social entrepreneurial wealth creations. The result affirmed the significant contribution of personal initiative with all variables. Prior studies established that personal initiative has a significant impact on social wealth creation (Nsereko *et al.*, 2018), as well as the identification of opportunities (Campos, 2017), and pro-activeness (Frese, 2015, Glaub, *et al.* 2014). Furthermore, self-fulfilment is key to reality (Westphal & Bonanno, 2007). Lastly, the previous investigation affirmed behavioural mechanisms strengthen social wealth creation, emphasizing social issues (Bird, Schjoedt & Baum, 2012). Furthermore pro-activeness influences social entrepreneurs' wealth creation, which was supported. The result showed a positive relationship between pro-activeness and social entrepreneurial wealth



creation. This suggests that pro-activeness energizes the entrepreneur, to solve social ills. This result is consistent with prior studies (Frese *et al.*, 1996, Grant, 2000, Kraus, Rigtering, Hughes & Hasman, 2012). This finding also validates the personal initiative theory.

There is no relationship between personal fulfilment motivation and social entrepreneur wealth creation, which was not accepted, the finding discovered a positive and significant relationship, finding validates (Germak, 2013) which suggests that personal initiative of self-fulfilment motivation alerts individual passion and self-efficacy to the identification of opportunities that encourages and motivate individual to create a social project for the community. The finding validates personal initiative theory which specifies that there must be a drive within the individual to undertake a social entrepreneur's task.

There is no relationship between opportunity recognition and social entrepreneurial wealth creation, however, this was not supported. The finding of the study revealed a positive and significant relationship between opportunity recognition and social entrepreneur wealth creation. This suggests that opportunity recognition influences social entrepreneur wealth creation. This is in consonance with previous research studies (Nambisan & Zahra, 2016, Anwar *et al.* 2021). A social entrepreneur must be proactive and have self-confidence abilities to discover opportunities, making them respond to social pressure within the communities.

It was stated that there is no relationship between behavioural mechanisms and social wealth creation, this was not supported, rather the finding shows a positive relationship between behavioural mechanisms and social wealth creation, and this was supported, This suggests that entrepreneurs' behavioural mechanism is associated with intention translated into actions in reality. It also includes evaluation and judgment to be able to identify social needs and be more persuaded to establish social projects for community needs, this study is in consonance with prior studies (Hayward *et al.*, 2021). These findings also validate personal initiative theory which assumes that entrepreneurs with mental sharpness and self-confidence have a higher propensity to become entrepreneurs.

## **5. Conclusion and Recommendations**

Achieving and understanding social entrepreneurial success lies within the personal initiative. This study enhances our understanding of personal initiative and social entrepreneurial wealth creation. We reasoned that personal initiatives are fundamental abilities that the social entrepreneur should have the other to address social problems in Nigeria. Importantly, personal initiatives explain pro-activeness, opportunity recognition, self-

fulfilment motivation, and behavioral mechanism in community-based organizations in the emerging country context.

This study, therefore, recommends the assistance of the entrepreneur financially and non-financially by the government and well established organization to be proactive in discovery and solving social ills. The entrepreneur should be motivated in discovery opportunities for social project that would serve as an avenue for youth employment. Entrepreneurship process should be an avenue for mentorship.

## References

- Acs, Z., Boardman, M. & McNeely, C. (2013). The social value of productive entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 40, 785-796.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D. & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 40, 260-282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886304266847>.
- Amughero, O. A. (2018). Entrepreneurship: An antidote for alleviating poverty and unemployment in Nigeria. In Town and Gown, the reciprocal linkage for Nigeria Development, *book of readings with international Conference held 21-24 September, 2015 at Delta State University Abraka, Nigeria*.
- Anggraehi, A. I. (2019). Understanding entrepreneurs' personal initiatives. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen Dan Ekonomi*, 21(3), 81-86. <https://jos.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/jame>. ISSN 1410-9336/E-ISSN:2620-8482.
- Anwar, M. M., Clauss, T. & Issah, W. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation and new venture performance in emerging markets: The mediating role of opportunity recognition. *Review of Management Sciences*, 16, 769-796.
- Arora, P. J., Haynie, M. & Laurence, G. A. (2013). Counterfactual thinking and entrepreneurial self-efficacy: The moderating role of self-esteem and dispositional affect. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(2), 359-385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00472.x>.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship, same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x.
- Azmat, F., Ferdous, A. S. & Couchman, P. (2015). Understanding the dynamics between social entrepreneurship and inclusive growth in subsistence marketplaces. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 34, 252-271. doi:10.1509/jppm.14.150.

- Babalola, Y. (2012). The impact of corporate social responsibility on firms profitability in Nigeria. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 45, 41-50.
- Barki, E., Comini, G., Cuuliffe, A., Hart, S. & Rai, S. (2015). Social entrepreneurship and social business retrospective and prospective research. *RAE-Revista de Administracdo de Empresas*, 55(4), 380-384. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020150402>.
- Bird, B., Schjoedt, L. & Baur, J. R. (2012). Editor's introduction. Entrepreneur behavior elucidation and measurement. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(5), 889-919. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.2012.36>.
- Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2010). Business research methods. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bull, I. & Willard, G. E. (1993). Towards a theory of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(3), 183-195.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2014). Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 82, 42-57. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.008.
- Campo, H. M. (2017). Impact of entrepreneurial passion on entrepreneurial orientation with the mediating role of entrepreneurial alertness for technology-based firms in Mexico. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 24, 353-374. doi:10.1108/JSBED-10-2016-0166.
- Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B. & Reynolds, P. D. (1996). Exploring start-up event sequences. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11, 151-166. doi:10.1016/0883-9026(95)00129-8.
- Collarvo, T. (2018). Unpacking social entrepreneurship, exploring the definition chaos and its consequences in England. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 14(2), 49-82. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20181423>.
- Dakung, R. J., Munene, J. C. & Balunywa, M. (2016). Robustness of personal initiative in moderating entrepreneurial intentions and action of disabled students. *Cogent Business & Management*, 3(1), 1169575.
- Deshon, R. P. & Gillespie, J. Z. (2005). A motivated action theory account of goal orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1096-1127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1096>.
- Dess, J. G. (2001). The meaning of social entrepreneurship (Working Paper). Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Donbesuur, F., Boso, N. & Hultman, M. (2020). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation on new venture performance: Contingency

- role of entrepreneurial actions. *Journal of Business Research*, 118, 150-161.
- Foryt, S. (2002). Social entrepreneurship development in developing nations (Independent Report). INSEAD. Fontainebleau. Retrieved from [www.griequity.com/resources/integraitech/GRPmarket/socialenterprises.pdf](http://www.griequity.com/resources/integraitech/GRPmarket/socialenterprises.pdf)
- Frese, M. (2015). Psychological intervention for effective entrepreneurial mind-set. Singapore: NUS Business School, Department of Management and Organization.
- Frese, M. & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 113-187.
- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K. & Tag, A. (1996). The concept of personal initiative: Evaluation study in a developed country. NUS Business School and Lueneburg submitted for Publication.
- Frese, M., Hass, L. & Friedrich, C. (2014). Training business owners in personal initiatives: Evaluation study in a developed country. NUS Business School and Lueneburg submitted for Publication.
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 37-63. doi:10.2307/256630
- Gabarett, I., Vedel, B. & Decaillon, J. (2017). A social affair: Identifying motivation of social entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(3), 399-415. doi:10.1504/IJESB.2017.084845
- Germak, A. J. (2013). Social entrepreneurial motivation: A quantitative analysis of nascent social entrepreneurs. EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers No. LG, 13-69 *4th EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise - LIEGE*, 2013.
- Germak, A. J. & Robinson, J. A. (2012). Exploring motivation of nascent social entrepreneurs to engage in social innovation. Paper presented at the International Social Innovation Research Conference (ISIRC), Birmingham, England. Paper available from authors.
- Gielnik, M. M., Frese, M., Kaharo-Kawuku, A., Katono, I. W., Kyejjusa, S., Ngoma, M. & Dlugosch, T. J. (2015). Action and action regulation in entrepreneurship: Evaluating a student training for promoting entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 14, 69-94. doi:10.5465/amie.2012.0107
- Glaub, M. E., Frese, M., Fischer, S. & Hoppe, M. (2014). Increasing personal initiative in small business managers or owners leads to entrepreneurial success: A theory-based controlled randomized field

- intervention for evidence-based management. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(3), 354-379.
- Golwitzer, P. M. & Brandstätter, V. (1997). Implementation intention and effective goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 186-199. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.186>
- Grant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435-462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600304>
- Guo, H., Su, Z. & Ahlstrom, D. (2016). Business model innovation: The effects of explanatory orientation, opportunity recognition and entrepreneurial bricolage in an emerging economy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 33(2), 533-549.
- Hanley, L. M. Wachner, A. M. L. & Weiss, T. (2016). The role of social investors in developing and emerging economies. In *Routledge Handbook of Social and Sustainable Finance* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781315772578/chapters/10.4324%2F9781315772578-3>
- Harms, R., Schulz, A., Kraus, S. & Fink, M. (2009). The conceptualization of opportunity in strategic management research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 1(1), 57-71.
- Hayward, M. L. A., Shepherd, D. A. & Griffin, D. (2006). A hubris theory of entrepreneurship. *Management Science*, 52(2), 160-172.
- Hechavarria, D., Renko, M. & Matthews, C. (2012). The nascent entrepreneurial hub, goals entrepreneurial self-efficacy and start-up outcomes. *Small Business Economics*, 39(3), 685-701.
- Hietschold, N. & Voegtlin, C. (2022). Blinded by a social cause? Differences in cognitive biases between social and commercial entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 13(3), 431-452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2021.1880466>
- Hietschold, N., Voegtlin, C., Scherer, A. G. & Gehman, J. (2019). What we know and don't know about social innovation: A multi-level review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2019(1), 13781. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.13781abstract>
- Hisrich, R. D. (1990). Entrepreneurship/intrapreneurship. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 209.
- Hulbert, B., Gilmore, A. & Carson, D. (2015). Opportunity recognition by growing SMEs: A managerial or entrepreneurial function? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 23(7), 616-642.
- International Monetary Fund (2020) Annual Report: Crisis upon crisis.

- Iyortsun, A. (2015). A conceptual overview of social entrepreneurship and its relevance to the Nigeria third sector. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, 3(4), 32-51.
- Reuel Johnmark, D., Munene, J. C. & Balunywa, W. (2016). Robustness of personal initiative in moderating entrepreneurial intentions and actions of disabled students. *Cogent Business & Management*, 3(1), 1169575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2016.1169575>.
- Keh, H. T., Der Foo, M. & Lim, B. C. (2002). Opportunity evaluation under risky condition: The cognitive processes of entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 125-148, doi:10.1111/1540-8520.00003.
- Kerlin, J. A. (2001). *Social enterprises: A global comparison*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.
- Kessler, A. & Frank, H. (2009). Nascent entrepreneurship in a longitudinal perspective: The impact of person, environment resource and the founding process on the decision to start business activities. *International Small Business Journal*, 27, 720-742.
- Kraus, S., Rigtering, J. C., Hughes, M. & Hasman, Y. (2012). Entrepreneurial intention and the business performance of SMEs: A quantitative study from the Netherlands. *Review of Managerial Science*, 6(2), 161-182.
- Krauss, I., Frese, M., Friedrich, C. & Unger, J. M. (2003). A psychological model of success among Southern African small business owners. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14(3), 315-344.
- Lasprogata, G. A. & Cotton, M. N. (2003). Contemplating enterprise: The business and legal challenges of social entrepreneurship. *American Business Law Journal*, 41(1), 67-113.
- Lumpkin, G. T. & Lichtenstein, B. B. (2005). The role of organizational learning in the opportunity recognition process. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 451-472.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S. & Vogus, T. J. (2012). Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 616-640. doi:10.5465/amr.2010.0456.
- Morais-da-Silva, R. L., Segatto, A. P. & Bezerra-de-Sousa, I. G. (2020). Connecting two sides: A qualitative study on social innovation ventures and poor communities in an emerging

- economy. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 31(5), 966-980.
- Nambisan, S. & Zahra, S. A. (2016). The role of demand-side narrative in opportunity formation and enactment. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 5, 70-75.
- Nascimento, L. D. S. & Salazar, V. S. (2020). On social enterprises and social entrepreneurship an extension. *BAR-Brazillian Administration Review*, 17(2), e190014.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1807.7692/bar2020190014>
- National Bureau of Statistics Nigeria (2022). Extensive National Measures of Multidimensional Poverty: Nigeria Gross Domestic Product, Report quarter 4 bulletin, 2022, linked to Federal Ministry of Budget and Planning.
- Nicolopoulou, K. (2014). Social entrepreneurial between cross-currents; Towards a framework for theoretical restructuring of the field. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(4), 678-702.
- Nsereko, I., Balunywa, W., Munene, J., Orobia, L. & Mohammed, N. (2018). Personal initiative: Its power, in social entrepreneurial venture creation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1443686.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1443686>.
- Oghojafor, B. E. A., Aduloju, S. A. & Olowokudejo, F. F. (2011). Social entrepreneurship as an instrument for curbing youth gangsterism: A study of the Nigeria urban communities. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, 3(2), 616-623.
- Olaleye, S. A., Sanusi, I. T. & Dada, O. A. (2021). Nigeria Social Enterprise Perception on Social Issues Profit Maximization, Innovation and Knowledge Sharing for Poverty Eradication. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 7(2), 107-116.  
<https://dx.doi.org/10.20469/ijbus.7.10005-2>.
- Olokundun, M., Falola, H., Saku, O. & Oluremi, O. (2018). The role of social entrepreneurship and state in propelling national development in Nigeria. A conceptual approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 22(1), 1-10.
- Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K. & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 827-856.
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N. & James, P. (2015). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428-461.
- Renko, M. (2013). Early challenges of nascent social entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(5), 1045-1069.

- Ressa, T. W. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic, its consequences, and the recovery: Implementation of disaster education and management is key to the schooling of children with disabilities. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 5(1), 22-48.
- Rosca, E., Agarwal, N. & Brem, M. (2020). Women Entrepreneurs as Agent of Change: A Comparative of Social Entrepreneurship Processes in Emerging Markets. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 157, 120057. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120057.
- Ruskin, J., Seymour, R. G. & Webster, C. M. (2016). Why Create Value for Others? An Exploration of Social Entrepreneurs' Motives. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(4), 1015-1037. doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12229.
- Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Sloan, P., Legrand, W. & Simons-Kaufmann, C. (2014). A Survey of Social Entrepreneurial Community-Based Hospitality and Tourism Initiative in Developing Economies: A New Business Approach for Industry. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 6(1), 51-61.
- Sutter, C., Bruton, G. D. & Chen, J. (2019). Entrepreneurship as a Solution to Extreme Poverty: A Review and Future Research Direction. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34, 197-214. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.06.003.
- Vargas-Hernandez, J. G. & Gonzalez, O. E. V. (2020). Innovation in utility craftsmanship; Analysis based on human capital. *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs*, 5(1), 42-50. doi: 10.24088/ijbea-2020-51005.
- Weiss, J., Anisimova, T. & Shirokova, G. (2019). The translation of entrepreneurial intention into start-up behaviour: The moderating role of regional social capital. *International Small Business Journal*, 37(5), 473-501.
- Westphal, M. & Bonanno, G. A. (2002). Post Traumatic Growth and Resilience to Trauma: Different Sides of the Same Coin or Different Coins? *Applied Psychology*, 56, 417-427. <https://doi.org/10.1111/opps.2007.56issue-3>.
- Yamane, T. (1964). *Statistics: An Introduction Analysis*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, New York Harper and Row Publishers.
- Zafar, Z., Wenjuan, L., Sulaiman, M. A. B. A., Siddiqui, K. A. & Qaiati, S. A. (2021). Social entrepreneurship orientation and enterprise fortune: An intermediary role of social performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 714-725.



- Zahra, S. A. (2007). Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(3), 443-452.
- Zanakis, S. H., Renko, M. & Bullough, A. (2012). Nascent entrepreneurs and the transition to entrepreneurship: Why do people start new businesses? *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Zikmund, W. G., Babin, B. J., Carr, J. C. & Griffin, M. (2013). *Business research methods* (9th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.