

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313887337>

Influence of Gender and Age on Social Entrepreneurship Intentions among University Students in Gauteng Province, South Africa

Article · June 2016

CITATIONS

12

READS

904

1 author:



Habofanwe Koloba

University of the Free State

14 PUBLICATIONS 68 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



There is no current project that I am involved in. [View project](#)

Influence of Gender and Age on Social Entrepreneurship Intentions among University Students in Gauteng Province, South Africa

Chipeta E. M.

North-West University, P O Box 1174,
Vanderbijlparrk 1900, South Africa. Email:
medachipeta@hotmail.com
Tel: 073 8247261

Koloba H. A.

University of the Free State, P O Box 339,
Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa. Email:
kolobaha@ufs.ac.za
Tel: 051 401 7081

Surujlal J.

North-West University, P.O Box 1174, Vanderbijlpark 1900, South Africa. Email:
Babs.Surujlal@nwu.ac.za
Tel: 016 910 3489

Abstract

Research on social entrepreneurship has sparked a responsive chord among researchers worldwide. Despite having a global presence, empirical research investigating the prevalence of social entrepreneurship in South Africa is still rare. The purpose of this paper was to investigate whether there are significant differences regarding the influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurship intentions among university students. A questionnaire was administered among 294 students from selected universities in the Gauteng province, South Africa. Using factor analysis procedure, six factors that influence social entrepreneurship intentions among university students were extracted. ANOVA was then applied to examine the differences regarding the influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurship intentions. Significant differences were found in terms of the influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurial intentions and attitude towards entrepreneurship among students. Therefore, it is recommended that universities should create a favourable environment that positively nurtures student's intentions towards social entrepreneurship.

Keywords: *Social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship intentions, gender, age.*

Introduction

The phenomenon of entrepreneurship has a long history. Originally, the 17th century French economist Richard Cantillon described an entrepreneur as someone who takes the risk of engaging in exchanges for a profit (Hébert & Link, 2009). Since inception, the term entrepreneur gained popularity to the point that other writers, such as Jean Baptist Say reformulated the concept's meaning and described an entrepreneur as a leader of production and distribution processes, who aims at minimising resource allocation while maximising overall efficiency within a production process (Peneder, 2009). Entrepreneurship continued to gain popularity through to the 20th century where classical economist Joseph Schumpeter introduced the

concept of innovation (Hébert & Link, 2009). As an innovator, Schumpeter described an entrepreneur as someone who makes a profit through successful innovation of the entire production and distribution process.

To date, entrepreneurship has remained an important field of study. This importance is correspondingly reflected in the level of entrepreneurial activity around the globe (Bosma, Acs, Autio Codurs & Levie, 2009). Many countries have promoted entrepreneurship for reasons such as economic growth, wealth creation, and employment creation. Research shows that, due to the effect of scarce employment opportunities (Nabi, 2003; Moreau & Leathwood, 2006), university

students and academics worldwide are increasingly choosing entrepreneurship as an alternative career option. Bramwell and Wolfe (2008) remarked that university students' increasing interest in entrepreneurship is a good platform for creating sustainable economic development.

Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010) identified four related domains in the study of entrepreneurship namely, conventional, institutional, cultural and social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship has increasingly become an important topic for discussion among researchers (Tracey & Phillips, 2007; Nga & Shamuganathan, 2010). Social entrepreneurship provides researchers with a platform to challenge, question and rethink concepts and assumptions that exist in other fields of management and business research (Mair & Marti, 2006). Therefore, encouraging the study of social entrepreneurship among South African university students could serve as a catalyst for the many social ills plaguing the country, such as youth unemployment and poverty (Viviers, Venter, & Solomon, 2012).

Social entrepreneurship

The concept of social entrepreneurship lacks a unified definition (Brock, 2008). Like entrepreneurship, researchers have interpreted the concept differently (Dees, 1998). While some researchers have described social entrepreneurship as a not-for-profit business initiative (Austin, Stevenson, Wei-Skileern, 2006; Mair & Marti, 2006), others have described it as commercial business with a social mission (Sagawa & Segal, 2000:105; Cornelius, Todress, Janjuha-Jivraj Woods & Wallace, 2008). Other researchers understand social entrepreneurship as a way of addressing the society's social needs (Sullivan, 2007; Tracey & Phillips, 2007).

Social entrepreneurship initiatives began in the 1980's when Bill Drayton established the Ashoka foundation (Hsu, 2005). The mission of the establishment was to identify and

support world leaders who are change-driven and equip them with venture capital for the purpose of improving peoples' lives (Sen, 2007). As such, social entrepreneurship developed through the working together of voluntary and public organisations, communities and private organisations to achieve a common goal of social-upliftment instead of merely focusing on making profits (Shaw & Carter, 2007). The concept of social entrepreneurship has captured the imagination of many thoughtful observers worldwide (Dees, 2007). For example, the establishment of Grammen Bank, the Skoll Foundation and numerous social entrepreneurship initiatives were launched by most of the renowned universities in the world.

To date, research on social entrepreneurship has gained a global presence, particularly in the western economies (Aygören, 2014). Most surveyed work on social entrepreneurship has been conducted in the United States (US) and the United Kingdom (UK) (Mair & Nabo, 2003; Short, Moss & Lumpkin, 2009; Cukier, Trenholm, Carl, & Gekas, 2011). The concept has also received attention in developing countries such as South Africa (Mair & Marti, 2006; Viviers, *et al.*, 2012; Urban, 2013). However, Visser (2011) argues that empirical research investigating the prevalence of social entrepreneurship in South Africa is still scarce as most of social entrepreneurship articles' emphasis is on case studies or anecdotal evidence. This lack of empirical evidence on social entrepreneurship is an obstacle to the advancement of this emerging field (Cukier *et al.*, 2011).

From the onset, social entrepreneurship has consistently been commended as one effective process of providing the much needed social goods and services to the society at large and as a result, a social entrepreneur is known to be the agent of change behind these developments (Harding, 2006). Most importantly, social entrepreneurship flourishes

in situations where government facilities have failed or are unable to deliver the much needed resources and services such as employment, health care and education (Peredo & McLean, 2006). The 2006 UK Social Entrepreneurship Monitor report revealed that 3.2 percent of the work population consisted of social entrepreneurs, which represented over half the percentage number of commercial entrepreneurs of 6.2 percent (Harding, 2006).

Social entrepreneurship activities are also becoming prevalent among university students worldwide. Recently, Alsaaty Abrahams and Carter (2014) noted that entrepreneurial career choices are becoming more popular among university students due to high unemployment levels plaguing many economies worldwide. This was also evident in an earlier survey conducted by the 2006 UK Social Entrepreneurship Monitor (Harding, 2006). The survey revealed that, the younger age group (18 to 24years) in the UK were more likely to engage in social entrepreneurship compared to the older age group (35 to 44years). Furthermore, the survey also revealed that students with Masters and Doctoral Degree qualifications were more likely to engage in social entrepreneurship.

Other than age, several other demographic variables such as gender, income, level of education and marital status also have been identified as factors that may influence entrepreneurship intentions. In particular, a study by Carter and Brush (2004) found that gender has an influence on entrepreneurial intentions. The authors further note that while men desire to be their own boss, women have the intentions to engage in entrepreneurship in order to be personally challenged. Women also want to create employment in situations where they are able to balance career and family roles. Reflecting on the afore-mentioned findings it is evident that research on the influence of demographic variables on social entrepreneurship intentions is significant.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there are significant differences regarding the influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurship intentions among university students in the Gauteng province.

Methodology

A quantitative research approach was used to collect data from the participants. Quantitative research approach seeks to quantify data from larger sample groups, and usually applies some form of statistical analysis to interpret data (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). A comprehensive literature review on social entrepreneurship was conducted.

Sampling and sampling techniques

A non-probability sampling technique was employed to reach the target population. Convenience sampling technique was then chosen for the survey. Convenience sampling has the advantage of being fast and inexpensive (Malhotra & Peterson, 2006). Therefore, the universities were selected based on accessibility and cost-effectiveness. Consistent with previous similar studies (Nga & Shamuganathan, 2010; Urban, 2013), the sample size was set at 350 university students in the Gauteng province. Of the 350 questionnaires that were distributed, 300 were returned, giving a response rate of 86 percent. Upon screening the returned questionnaires, 6 questionnaires were rejected because of being partially completed and therefore were not included in the analysis. Therefore, 294 questionnaires were used in the final analysis.

Measuring instrument and data collection

A questionnaire was developed to investigate social entrepreneurship intentions among university students in Gauteng province. Section A comprised demographic information of students. Section B comprised statements regarding social entrepreneurship intentions. Items in Section B were scored on a 6-point

Likert type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). A pilot study was conducted among 55 students from selected universities in Gauteng province to identify errors and ensure the questionnaire was reliable and valid. The questionnaires for the main survey were administered by the primary author. Arrangements were made to visit the students at their respective universities. In many instances the questionnaires were administered face to face, thus ensuring a high response rate.

Scale reliability and Validity

The internal consistency of the scale was ascertained by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Coefficient Cronbach alpha values were computed for each factor and the overall reliability of the scale that was used in measuring social entrepreneurship intentions of university students. Values below 0.6 indicate unsatisfactory internal consistency and values above 0.6 indicate satisfactory internal consistency (Malhotra, 2010). Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.938, which indicates good internal consistency of social entrepreneurship intentions scale used in the survey. Three experienced researchers were requested to establish the face and content validity of the questionnaire. This was done in order to ascertain whether the questions were properly constructed and that the instrument did not comprise errors. The study also checked for convergent validity. Items loaded well on all constructs and there were no cross loadings. Table 2 provides item loadings and Cronbach's alpha values for each factor.

Data analysis

The data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (IBM SPSS version 22). Descriptive statistics were used to establish the demographic profile of the participants. The data were subjected to exploratory factor analysis to identify factors that influence social entrepreneurship intentions among university students. Analysis

of variance (ANOVA) was then applied to investigate whether there were any significant differences in terms of age and gender on social entrepreneurship intentions among university students. The reason for this is that if ANOVA and t-test are applied to data from two independent groups, the tests will give the same results (Kinner & Gray, 2000). Furthermore, as ANOVA was used to test for differences in terms of age, it was deemed appropriate for the sake of consistency to apply it to gender as well.

Ethical considerations

A number of ethical considerations were adhered to. Permission was obtained from two institutions and the necessary arrangements were made to administer the questionnaire. The questionnaire was accompanied by a letter explaining the purpose of the study. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary and they could withdraw at any time without repercussions. They were assured that they will remain anonymous at all times and therefore they did not have to provide their names and all information would be treated with the strictest confidence.

Results

Demographic profile of the sample

Majority of student were female constituting 58 percent. In terms of age majority of participants were in the age group 18 to 22 years constituting 78 percent. Furthermore, first year and second year students collectively make up 53 percent of participants. Table 1 presents the demographic statistics of participants.

Table 1: Demographic statistics of participants

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	121	41%
Female	170	58%
Missing	3	1%
Age category		
18-22years	228	78%
23-26years	49	17%
27-30 and above	14	4%
Missing	3	1%
Year of study		
1 st and 2 nd years	157	55%
3 rd years	112	38%
Post graduates	16	9%

Exploratory factor analysis

To ascertain the suitability of the data for analysis, the KMO measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity were applied. The KMO value of 0.936 indicated that the data were appropriate for analysis and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant at 0.000 supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix (Malhotra, 2010). Principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was conducted on the data. Six factors that collectively describe social entrepreneurship intentions of university students were extracted. The cumulative variance explained was 63.571 percent. Table 2 presents the rotated factor loading matrix.

Table 2: Rotated factor loading matrix

FACTOR DESCRIPTION	FACTORS					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Social entrepreneurial intentions						
B6.6 I will make every effort to start and run my own business to address the basic needs of the society.	.843	.247	.128	.162	.003	.076
B6.8 I have very seriously thought in starting a business that will focus on the needs of the society.	.820	.212	.237	.102	.001	.031
B6.9 I have the business intention to start a business that will address the needs of the society someday.	.820	.267	.154	.132	.016	.053
B6.7 I am determined to create a business in the future that will focus on the needs of the society.	.800	.317	.184	.109	-.095	.075
B6.5 My professional goal is to become a business person who addresses the needs of the society.	.791	.223	.070	.120	-.045	.122
B6.2 I intend to start my own business in the next five years to address the needs of the society.	.752	.212	.149	.071	.166	.128
B6.4 I am ready to start a business that will address the needs of the society.	.699	.135	.193	.134	.201	.154
B6.1 I plan to be self-employed in the foreseeable future after I graduate from my university.	.680	.219	.185	.015	.246	.058
B3.5 I want to launch a new business of my own before graduating.	.586	.125	.160	-.132	.385	.048
B3.8 I am more interested in establishing my own business than getting a job.	.586	.425	.089	.038	.288	.011
B3.4 Even if I should launch a new business and fail many times, I will keep on trying until I succeed.	.559	.344	.156	.032	.038	.302
B3.6 I am confident that I can successfully launch a new business on my own.	.536	.245	.298	-.217	.314	.161
Attitude towards entrepreneurship						
B1.3 I would rather start a new business than be the manager of an existing one.	.229	.777	.059	-.062	.081	.146
B1.6 Overall, I consider a career as an entrepreneur to be good	.267	.722	.199	-.003	.085	.065
B1.1 I would prefer to be an entrepreneur, rather than an employee of a large business.	.323	.721	.088	-.078	.012	.087
B1.4 Starting my own business sounds attractive to me.	.391	.699	.306	.002	.034	.075
B1.5 I personally consider entrepreneurship to be a highly desirable career for people with my education background.	.318	.614	.163	.032	.117	-.030
Proactive personality						
B2.3 I excel at identifying opportunities.	.134	.147	.807	.055	.152	.097
B2.5 I can spot a good opportunity long before others can.	.323	.035	.708	.051	.243	-.020
B2.4 I love to challenge the status quo.	.146	.123	.706	.054	-.012	.201

FACTOR DESCRIPTION	FACTORS					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
B2.1 I enjoy facing and overcoming obstacles to my ideas	.168	.274	.658	.021	-.198	.136
B3.1 I can take risks with my money, such as investing in risk businesses.	.298	.238	.403	.062	.285	.095
Attitude towards entrepreneurship education/ university environment						
B4.2 At my university, people are actively encouraged to pursue their own ideas.	.075	-.007	-.009	.807	-.045	.097
B4.3 At my university, you get to meet lots of people with good ideas for new businesses.	.078	-.038	.086	.798	-.081	.132
B4.4 At my university there is a well-functioning structures to support the start-up of new businesses.	.029	-.066	.094	.757	.169	.007
B4.1 I know many people at my university who have successfully started their own business	.240	.066	-.022	.542	.338	-.050
Perceived behavioural control						
B4.5 Entrepreneurship cannot be taught people are born to be entrepreneurs.	-.064	-.009	-.037	.090	.672	.123
B5.2 It would be easy for me to start my own business	.326	.205	.206	.136	.556	.069
B5.4 I have the skills and capabilities required to succeed as an entrepreneur.	.381	.176	.391	.000	.492	-.029
Risk taking propensity						
B3.3 I like to try new foods, new places, and totally new experiences.	.167	.082	.137	.096	.043	.818
B3.2 When I travel I tend to take new routes.	.193	.140	.214	.118	.176	.677
Eigenvalue	11.54	2.49	1.90	1.46	1.25	1.06
% of Variance	37.23	8.03	6.14	4.72	4.05	3.40
Cumulative %	37.23	45.26	51.40	56.12	60.18	63.57
Reliability (Cronbach's alpha)	0.94	0.85	0.78	0.73	0.51	0.57
Means	49.13	22.57	22.16	14.56	10.78	8.77
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.						

ANOVA – Six factors of social entrepreneurship intentions and gender

Analysis of variance was conducted to explore whether there were any significant differences

regarding the influence of gender on social entrepreneurship intentions. Table 3 presents the results of ANOVA on gender.

Table 3: ANOVA – six factors and gender

Factors	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social entrepreneurial intention	Between Groups	1339.010	1	1339.010	6.554	.011*
	Within Groups	57616.550	282	204.314		
	Total	58955.560	283			
Attitude towards entrepreneurship	Between Groups	169.082	1	169.082	5.372	.021*
	Within Groups	9033.050	287	31.474		
	Total	9202.131	288			
Proactive personality	Between Groups	14.557	1	14.557	.820	.366
	Within Groups	5111.843	288	17.749		
	Total	5126.400	289			
Attitude towards entrepreneurship education/university environment	Between Groups	21.917	1	21.917	1.110	.293
	Within Groups	5707.897	289	19.751		
	Total	5729.814	290			
Perceived behavioural control	Between Groups	29.649	1	29.649	3.222	.074
	Within Groups	2659.141	289	9.201		
	Total	2688.790	290			
Risk taking propensity	Between Groups	2.600	1	2.600	.464	.496
	Within Groups	1618.431	289	5.600		
	Total	1621.031	290			

*. Significant at 0.05 level

As illustrated in Table 3, there were statistically significant differences regarding the influence of gender on 'social entrepreneurial intention' and 'attitude towards entrepreneurship'; and there were no significant differences regarding the influence of gender on the rest of the factors. These results imply that men and women have

different views regarding their actions towards social entrepreneurial intentions. The results also imply that men and women have different perceptions with regard to how attractive entrepreneurship is, as an alternative career choice. Consistent with these findings Carter and Brush (2004) found that men desired entrepreneurial roles in order to become their

own boss, while women intentions to engage in entrepreneurship is to be personally challenged. Women also want to create self-employment in order to be able to balance career and family roles. The reflected significant differences require a post-hoc test to be conducted in order to identify the specific differences regarding the influence of gender on social entrepreneurial intentions and attitude towards entrepreneurship. However, post-hoc analysis test could not be conducted on gender because post-hoc tests apply in situations where a factor has more than three or more groups of means (Stevens, 1999).

ANOVA – Six factors of social entrepreneurship intentions and age

Analysis of variance was conducted to explore the influence of age on social entrepreneurship intentions. Significant differences were found regarding the influence of age on '*social entrepreneurial intentions*' and no significant differences on the rest of the factors. Table 4 provides the ANOVA results on age groups.

Table 4: ANOVA – six factors and age group

Dimension	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social entrepreneurial intention	Between Groups	1225.898	2	612.949	3.000	.051*
	Within Groups	57216.752	280	204.346		
	Total	58442.650	282			
Attitude towards entrepreneurship	Between Groups	111.746	2	55.873	1.761	.174
	Within Groups	9073.888	286	31.727		
	Total	9185.633	288			
Proactive personality	Between Groups	17.056	2	8.528	.479	.620
	Within Groups	5090.854	286	17.800		
	Total	5107.910	288			
Attitude towards entrepreneurship education/university environment	Between Groups	28.828	2	14.414	.730	.483
	Within Groups	5687.096	288	19.747		
	Total	5715.924	290			
Perceived behavioural control	Between Groups	23.554	2	11.777	1.271	.282
	Within Groups	2667.670	288	9.263		
	Total	2691.223	290			
Risk taking propensity	Between Groups	.202	2	.101	.018	.982
	Within Groups	1610.901	287	5.613		
	Total	1611.103	289			

*.Significant at 0.05 level

Upon finding significant differences *post-hoc* multiple comparison test was conducted to establish which age groups had the significant differences on social entrepreneurial intentions. Table 5 presents the results of *post-hoc* analysis tests on social entrepreneurial intentions and age.

Table 5: Post-hoc analysis – social entrepreneurial intentions and age

Dependent variable	(I) A2	(J) A2	Mean difference (J-I)	Std. Error	Sig.
Social entrepreneurial intentions	1(18-24 years) $\bar{x} = 4.04$	3 (27 to >30 years) $\bar{x} = 4.83$.	-0.78934	0.34027	.021

Table 5 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between group 1(18-24 years) and group 3(27 to >30 years) at the $p < 0.05$. Post-hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores for group 1(18-24 years; $\bar{x} = 4.04$) was significantly different from the mean scores for group 3(27 to >30 years; $\bar{x} = 4.83$). This result indicate that students in the age group 27 to >30 years are most likely to be engaged in social entrepreneurship compared to those in the age group 18 to 24 years. One plausible explanation could be that, considering their level of education, the older age group could have been more matured in their understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship compared to the younger age group. On the contrary a study by Harding (2006) found that the younger age group 18-24 years are most likely to engage in social entrepreneurial activity.

Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurship intentions among university students. First, it was evident that university students intend to engage in social entrepreneurship activities. In the context of South Africa this is significant because social entrepreneurship's aim is to pursue sustainable solutions to problems that government could not solve or are inadequately addressed (Santos, 2012). Among others, these could include access to water, the promotion of small businesses, and the integration of individuals into workforce or waste

management. Second, the study identified factors that are likely to collectively influence social entrepreneurship intentions among university students, namely social entrepreneurial intentions, attitude towards social entrepreneurship, proactive personality, attitude towards entrepreneurship education, perceived behavioural control and risk-taking propensity. The understanding of these factors is significant because intentions are “the single best predictor of any behaviour” (Urban & Barreira, 2007). However, it is worth noting that the intention to engage in entrepreneurial activity should not be confused with the mere desire or personal disposition since it is a conscious and planned resolve that drives the required actions to operate a business (Thompson, 2009). This line of contention is based on the fact that some people may in theory show the intention to own a business and indeed possess the personality to be self-employed, yet ended up not putting their ideas into practice.

In accordance with the objective of the study, it was found that there are significant differences in terms of age on social entrepreneurial intentions (*social entrepreneurship intention factor*) among university students. It is evident that younger students are less likely to engage in social entrepreneurship activities compared to their older counterparts. Consistent with the finding of Kim (2007:398) as age increases, the probability of self-employment also increases. Therefore, this calls for more interventions to encourage young people at an early stage of their life to consider entrepreneurship as a career

option in its various forms, including social entrepreneurship. This line of contention is based on the fact that social entrepreneurship plays an important role in the economic system by creating new industries, validating new business models and redirecting resources to societal problems that are inadequately addressed (Santos, 2012).

Similarly, gender differences were observed regarding social entrepreneurial intentions and attitude towards entrepreneurship (*social entrepreneurship factors*) among university students in Gauteng province. From this, it is interesting to note that attitude towards entrepreneurship plays a significant role in determining social entrepreneurship intentions. This finding is consistent with Robinson *et al.*'s (1991) finding in which they found that attitudes are a better predictor of entrepreneurial behaviour. One could argue that when students perceive the environment as supportive, they are likely to choose entrepreneurship as opposed to when they perceive it as hostile (Schwarz, Wdowiak, Almer-jarz & Breiteneker, 2009). Therefore, university students with a positive attitude towards entrepreneurship are likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Universities can create an environment that nurtures student's behaviour towards social entrepreneurship.

Limitations and implications for future research

The findings of this study should be viewed in light of limitations. The study was limited to a sample frame that only consisted of students from universities in Gauteng province. Although the sample size was consistent with previous studies, generalisation of the findings to the entire student population in the country should be approached with caution. Given the need to develop social entrepreneurship research in

South Africa, it is recommended that future research further explore and identify social entrepreneurship intentions factors using a larger sample size by including all provinces of South Africa. Future research could also focus on exploring the relationship between social entrepreneurship intentions and other variables such as personality traits and culture. Further research could also focus on exploring factors that influence the success of existing social entrepreneurship businesses. In this case, future research could provide findings on social entrepreneurship intentions that take into account responses from participants with an industry experience.

Conclusion

Social entrepreneurship research is still in its embryonic stage of development. However, despite the relatively infant research output, social entrepreneurship is an important area of study that is increasingly attracting attention among scholars worldwide. The purpose of this study was to contribute to the existing body of literature by investigating whether there were significant differences regarding the influence of gender and age on social entrepreneurship intentions among university students. Based on the findings emanating from this study, it is recommended that universities should create a favourable environment that positively nurtures student's intentions towards social entrepreneurship. In the past, women have consistently being found to be less likely to engage in entrepreneurship activities. Social entrepreneurship is one area which women can explore since its aim is to resolve societal problems. Therefore, there is a need to empower women in this field. South Africa is faced with a number of social ills, including unemployment, poverty and inequality.

References

- Alsaaty, F. M., Abrahams, D. & Carter, E. (2014). Business Students' Interests in Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship at a Historically Black Institution. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Development*, 2(1), 1-30.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Aygören, H. (2014). *Research in social entrepreneurship: from historical roots to future routes*. (In Phan, P.H, Bacq, S. Nordqvist, M., Eds. *Theory and Empirical Research in Social Entrepreneurship*, pp.11-70). Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bosma, N., Acs, Z.J., Autio, E., Coduras, A. & Levie, J. (2009). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Executive report. http://www.gemconsortium.org/download/1287850267108/GEM_Global_08. Date of access: 23 April 2014.
- Bramwell, A. & Wolfe, D. A. (2008). Universities and regional economic development: The entrepreneurial University of Waterloo. *Research Policy*, 37(8), 1175-1187.
- Brock, D. D. (2008). Social entrepreneurship teaching resources handbook. Available at SSRN 1344412. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1344412. Date of Access: 26 April 2015.
- Carter, N. M. & Brush C. G. (2004). *Gender*. In Gartner, et al. ed. *Handbook of Entrepreneurial Dynamics*, pp.12-25. California: SAGE Publications.
- Cornelius, N., Todres, M., Janjuha-Jivraj, S., Woods, A. & Wallace, J. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and the social enterprise. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(2), 355-96.370.
- Cukier, W., Trenholm, S., Carl, D. & Gekas, G. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Content Analysis. *Journal of Strategic Innovation & Sustainability*, 7(1), 99-119.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T. & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37-57.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Comments and suggestions contributed from the Social Entrepreneurship Funders Working Group. <http://www.redalmarza.cl/ing/pdf.ThemainingofSocialentrepreneurship.pdf>. Date of access: 06 May 2014.
- Dees, J. G. (2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society*, 44(3), 24-31.
- Harding, R. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship Monitor*. London: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor.
- Hébert, R. F. & Link, A. N. (2009). *A History of Entrepreneurship*. New York: Routledge.
- Hsu, C. (2005). Entrepreneur for social change. *US News & World Report*, 139(16), 63-66.
- Kim, G. (2007). The analysis of self-employment level over the life-cycle. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 47(6), 904-918.

- Kinner, P. R. & Gray, C. D. (2000). *SPSS for Windows Made Simple*. Release 10. UK. Psychology Press.
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Mair, J. & Noboa, E. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: how intentions to create a social enterprise get formed. Barcelona: IESE Business School Working Paper: No 521.
- Malhotra, N. (2010). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation: 6th ed.* London: Pearson Education.
- Malhotra, N. & Birks, D. (2007). *Marketing Research: An Applied Approach: 3rd ed.* London: Pearson Education.
- Malhotra, N. & Peterson, M. (2006). *Basic Marketing Research; a Decision-Making Approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Moreau, M. P. & Leathwood, C. (2006). Graduates' employment and the discourse of employability: a critical analysis. *Journal of Education and Work*, 19(4), 305-324.
- Nabi, G. R. (2003). Graduate employment and underemployment: opportunity for skill use and career experiences amongst recent business graduates. *Education & Training*, 45(7), 371-382.
- Nga, J. K. H. & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 259-282.
- Peredo, A. M. & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Peneder, M. 2009. The meaning of entrepreneurship: A modular concept. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade*, 9(2), 77-99.
- Robinson, P. B., Stimpson, D.V., Huefner, J. C. & Hunt, H.K. (1991). An attitude approach to the prediction of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(4), 13-31.
- Sagawa, S. & Segal, E. (2000). Common interest, common good: Creating value through business and social sector partnership. *California Management Review*, 42(2), 105-122.
- Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
- Schwarz, E. J., Wdowiak, M. A., Almer-jarz, D. A. & Breitenecker, R. J. (2009). The effects of attitudes and perceived environment conditions on students' entrepreneurial intent. *Education and Training*, 51(4), 272-291.
- Sen, P. (2007). Ashoka's big idea: Transforming the world through social entrepreneurship. *Futures*, 39(5), 534-553.
- Shaw, E. & Carter, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and Empirical Analysis of the Entrepreneurial Processes and Outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Economic Development*, 14(13), 418-434.
- Short, J. C., Moss, T. W. & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 161-194.
- Stevens, J. (1999). Post hoc Test in ANOVA. <http://pages.uoregon.edu/stevensj/posthoc.c.pdf>. Date of access: 19th March 2015.

- Sullivan, D. M. (2007). Stimulating social entrepreneurship: can support from cities make a difference? *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 77-78.
- Thompson, E. R. (2009). Individual entrepreneurship intent: construct clarification and development of an internationally reliable metric, *entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 669-694.
- Tracey, P. & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2), 264-271.
- Urban, B. (2013). Social Entrepreneurship in an Emerging Economy: A Focus on the Institutional Environment and Social Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy. *Managing Global Transitions*, 11(4), 3-25.
- Urban, B. & Barreira, J. (2007). Insight into technopreneurship: self-employment perceptions among engineering students. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 21(1), 40-58
- Visser, K. (2011). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: context, relevance and extent. *Industry and Higher Education*, 25(4), 233-247.
- Viviers, S., Venter, C. & Solomon, G. (2012). South African students' intentions to establish social enterprises. *The Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 5(1), 70-88.