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ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was two-fold: 1) to determine if a relationship exists between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic undergraduate students; and 2) to determine if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.

The findings demonstrated that there was indeed a positive relationship between having a proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions among students; these findings supported the conclusions made by Crant (1996) which demonstrated that proactive students tend to have intentions to become entrepreneurs. Also, the findings demonstrated that hope did not moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. This was surprising, however, it may be that African American and Hispanic undergraduate students need more than hope to increase their desire to become social entrepreneurs.

The researcher concluded that it is likely that the moderated relationship was not supported because some students may not yet possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to create social enterprises. Future research should consider other possible moderating mechanisms involved in the proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions relationship. It is possible that entrepreneurial parents, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, socio-economic status, and other variables may moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. Researchers and practitioners may have to conceptualize frameworks that can aid in training and developing social entrepreneurs. Critical pedagogy and the Center of Creative Leadership’s Assessment, Challenge, and Support (ACS) model can be utilized.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In this present study, the researcher will determine if a positive relationship exists between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic undergraduates, and to determine if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic undergraduate students. Research has begun to move from merely examining personality as a main effect (Barrick, Parks & Mount, 2005), to focus on the moderating or mediating effects that explain how personality influences a dependent variable. This approach can also be taken to examine the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions and to investigate whether hope moderates this relationship.

There is a great need for universities and institutions to adequately prepare marginalized groups to transform their communities by helping to eliminate the oppressive elements of poverty, crime, unemployment and other social ills that have devastated African American and Hispanic countries and communities, and the first step is to identify those individuals who have the drive and the desire to do so. Education’s role is to challenge inequality and dominant myths rather than socialize students into the status quo (Dehler, 2009). Learning is directed toward social change and transforming the world and ‘true’ learning empowers students to challenge oppression in their lives (Stage, Muller, Kinzie, & Simmons, 1998, p. 57). For profit organizations may also want to determine which students have social entrepreneurial intentions because it may demonstrate that those students may be aligned with organizations recent push to become more socially responsible. A primary indicator of business effectiveness is the degree to which businesses recognize and effectively manage their impact on society at large. Commonly referred to as corporate social responsibility (CSR), businesses vary widely in the degree to which they are sensitive to the adverse
impacts that their operations have on stakeholders (Kolodinsky, Madden, Zisk, & Henkel, 2010). Students who possess social entrepreneurial intentions may be suitable candidates for firms interested in becoming more socially responsible and interested in engaging in social ventures that impact communities because in the business world, nearly “90% of Fortune 500 firms embraced corporate social responsibility as an essential element in their organizational goal, and actively promoted their CSR activities in annual reports” (Boli & Hartsuiker, 2001). Among the 250 largest multinational firms in 2005, 64% published formal CSR reports (Porter and Kramer, 2006). Corporate social entrepreneurship is a process that may contribute to the collective quest for superior organizational performance and societal betterment (Austin & Reficco, 2009), and this may be the direction organizations may take in the future. The identification of high potential employees is a crucial step for building and developing a large talent pool that enables organizations to effectively adapt and respond to changes in the environment (Conger & Fulmer, 2003; Karaevli & Hall, 2003). African Americans and Hispanic undergraduate students who possess social entrepreneurial intentions may be the right candidates for organizations who wish to maximize their profits and effect social and environmental change through their business.

**Rationale**

There is a need to identify and develop social entrepreneurs in order to solve some of the complex problems facing the United States and the rest of the world such as poverty, unemployment, crime and other serious issues. Nearly half of the 6 billion people in the world are poor (Sachs, 2005). There are three degrees of poverty: extreme (or absolute) poverty, moderate poverty and relative poverty (Sachs, 2005). Extreme poverty, defined by the World Bank as getting by on an income of less than $1 a day, means that households cannot meet basic needs for survival. The total number of people living in extreme poverty, the World Bank estimates, is 1.1 billion,
down from 1.5 billion in 1981 (Sachs, 2005). While that is progress, much of the one-sixth of humanity in extreme poverty suffers the ravages of AIDS, drought, isolation and civil wars, and is thereby trapped in a vicious cycle of deprivation and death (Sachs, 2005).

Education in Africa has been dramatically affected by the HIV/AIDS crisis (Gundersen & Kelly, 2008). This is especially true for the millions of children who have lost one or both parents to HIV/AIDS. In 2003, over 12 million children in sub-Saharan Africa under the age of 18 – approximately 3.5% of this cohort – were orphaned due to AIDS (UNAIDS, 2004). The situation is not expected to improve anytime soon - by 2010 the number of HIV/AIDS orphans is expected to exceed 35 million (Gundersen & Kelly, 2008). These orphans face numerous challenges, including interruption or termination of their educations (Gundersen & Kelly, 2008). In addition to the challenges facing orphans, there are millions of other vulnerable children: these are children who are at-risk of becoming orphans, or who live in households facing financial difficulties in caring for sick adults, orphans, or both (Gundersen & Kelly, 2008). One possible consequence of the HIV/AIDS crisis in Zimbabwe and elsewhere is a deterioration in the educational opportunities for orphans and other vulnerable children. Given that high returns are associated with education (Glick & Sahn, 2000; Psacharopoulos, 1994), the loss of education for a large segment of the population would likely worsen the already dire economic consequences of the HIV/AIDS crisis (Gundersen & Kelly, 2008).

The situation in some Caribbean and Latin American nations is also dire. With an average gross domestic product of less than $450 per head in 2002, which has not changed in real terms since the 1970s, Haiti remains the poorest country in the western hemisphere (United Nations, 2003). Over 60 per cent of the population lives in extreme poverty and the majority is completely out of reach of any governmental amenities and services (United Nations Development Programme
[UNDP], 1999; United Nations, 2000; World Bank, 2001). Over two-thirds of the population lack access to safe drinking water and health and sanitation facilities (Gage & Calixte, 2006). Unemployment is around 70 per cent and half the adults cannot read or write (World Bank, 2001). The declining economy and continued political instability have had huge repercussions on Haiti’s health system. With the exception of Port-au-Prince, the capital city, and a few urban areas, there is a marked shortage of equipment and qualified personnel (Gage & Calixte, 2006). Despite rapid urbanization and the convergence in poverty rates between rural and urban areas, rural poverty remains an important welfare problem in most Latin American countries, a huge wastage of human resources, a frequent source of political destabilization and a cause of environmental pressures (De Janvrey & Sandoulet, 2000). The policy record in dealing with rural poverty has been highly uneven and generally disappointing, with the sources of gains in reducing the relative number of rural to urban poor mainly caused by population shifts as opposed to successful rural poverty reduction (De Janvrey & Sandoulet, 2000). In general, poverty remains an enormous challenge for Latin American countries and it is still one of the greatest challenges facing Latin American policy-makers today (Sarocostti, 2007). The United Nations Development Programme (2005) measures the effects of deprivation on the quality of life using the human poverty index (HPI). At the top of the HPI ranking were Uruguay, Chile and Costa Rica, due to the fact that they had reduced human poverty to the point at which it affected less than 10 percent of their populations. Guatemala, Honduras, Bolivia, Nicaragua and Haiti received the lowest HPI scores in Latin America (Sarocostti, 2007).

In the United States African American and Hispanic communities are disproportionately more prone to poverty, violent crime and other social ills. Homicide is one of the leading causes of death among young African American and Hispanic men (Jones-Webb & Wall, 2008). Among men 15 to 34 years of age in the U.S. in 2004, African American men were 12 times more likely than
Caucasian men to be victims of homicide (45.5 per 100,000 vs. 3.8 per 100,000) and Hispanic men were four times more likely than Caucasian men to be homicide victims (14.9 per 100,000 vs. 3.8 per 100,000) (WISQARS, 2004).

Data from the U.S. Census indicates that poverty affects Hispanics disproportionately (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997). The findings from the U.S. Census revealed that about one-third of the more than 29 million Hispanics living in the United States in 1996 were living in poverty compared to 11.2% of white non-Hispanic persons (De La Rosa, 2000). The poverty rates for Hispanic families were much higher than the poverty rates for African American and white non-Hispanic families (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997). In particular, the poverty rates of Hispanic families headed by single females were astoundingly high (De La Rosa, 2000). Sixty-one percent of such families were described as impoverished in contrast to 52.8% percent of African American families, and 38.9% of white non-Hispanic families (De La Rosa, 2000). Among single female heads-of-household age 18 and younger, the rates were even higher for Hispanic than African American, or white non-Hispanic families (De La Rosa, 2000).

In African American communities, African Americans often endure a harsh and extremely disadvantaged environment where poverty, crime, welfare dependency and educational failure are not only common but all too frequently the norm (Massey, 1994). The African American unemployment rate in the United States has been more than twice that of whites over the past three decades. From 1972 to 2002, the average African American unemployment rate was 12.4%, while the average unemployment rate for whites was 5.5% (Robinson, 2009).

HIV is also a very serious problem facing African American and Hispanic communities. Approximately 9 million adolescents and young adults in the United States acquire a sexually
transmitted infection (STI) every year (Bauermeister, Zimmerman, Gee, Caldwell, & Xue, 2009). Youth aged between 15 and 24 account for one half of all new STIs each year (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 2005) and over one half of the 30,000 newly diagnosed HIV cases reported yearly in the United States (Hariri & McKenna, 2007). Among those affected by HIV, there continues to be unequal prevalence across the United States, with African Americans ages 13 to 24 accounting for 55% of all HIV infections in this age stratum (Centers for Disease Control [CDC], 2006). As of 2002, there were an estimated 77,000 Hispanics living with AIDS, and an additional 13,000 Hispanics living with HIV (Centers for Disease Control, 2002).

The number of Hispanics living with HIV/AIDS increased by an estimated 31% between 2000 and 2004 (Centers for Disease Control, 2006b). As with other female populations, the proportion of Latinas with AIDS (compared to Hispanics) has been rising steadily. The latest data suggest that Latinas make up approximately 25% of the total number of Hispanics with AIDS (Centers for Disease Control, 2003), and as many as 20% of all women ever diagnosed with the disease (Zambrana, Cornelius, Boykin, & Lopez, 2004). Latinas 55 and over comprised 6% of all Latinas infected with the virus by 2002 (Centers for Disease Control, 2002), and there are estimates that this figure has risen to 7–8%.

Identifying and solving large scale social problems requires social entrepreneurs because only entrepreneurs have the committed vision and inexhaustible determination to persist until they have transformed an entire system (Drayton, 2005). Poor nations and communities need social entrepreneurs to generate innovative solutions to complex problems to transform their societies. Fortunately some young people are working to bring about transformational change. For example, a group of young Americans started a non-profit group called Invisible Children to help tackle the issue of child abduction, torture and in many cases murder in Uganda (Invisible Children, 2009).
There is a need to figure out which individuals are most likely to have social entrepreneurial intentions in order to train and equip them with the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities that will allow them to be effective social entrepreneurs that are equipped to handle some of the world’s complex problems such as poverty, crime, HIV, etc.

Gartner (1988) wrote that entrepreneurship is the creation of organizations. What differentiates entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs is that entrepreneurs create organizations, while non-entrepreneurs do not (Gartner, 1988). This same logic can be applied in social entrepreneurship. In this dissertation the researcher’s aim is to determine if having a proactive personality and hope plays a role in African American and Hispanic undergraduates having the intentions to become social entrepreneurs.

As social entrepreneurs and the enterprises they create gain economic strength, research to understand the phenomenon has burgeoned (Drayton, 2002). Whether because the notion of someone starting a business for reasons other than profit maximization might seem oxymoronic to some or because there is something fundamentally different about individuals who choose to do this, much research on social entrepreneurism has focused on identifying characteristics that make such individuals stand out (Dees, 2001).

Social entrepreneurship is a construct that bridges an important gap between business and benevolence; it is the application of entrepreneurship in the social sphere (Roberts & Woods, 2005). The encouragement of social enterprises is viewed as a central tenet of regional development strategies in areas of deprivation (Parkinson & Howorth, 2008). People running social enterprises are held up as vital to the economy and a commitment to the development and growth of the social enterprise sector is being emphasized by policy-makers at all levels (Parkison & Howorth, 2008). There has been a mushrooming of events, papers, books, journals, websites and specialist
associations which reflect a growing interest in the social enterprise sector (Parkison & Howorth, 2008).

As a field, social entrepreneurship is at an exciting stage of infancy, short on theory and definition but high on motivation and passion (Mair & Marti, 2006). The concept of social entrepreneurship is still poorly defined and its boundaries to other fields of study remain fuzzy (Mair & Marti, 2006). While to some this may appear to be a problem, other researchers see it as a unique opportunity for researchers from different fields and disciplines, such as entrepreneurship, sociology and organizational theory, to challenge and rethink central concepts and assumptions (Mair & Marti, 2006). The challenge for academia is to turn an inherently practitioner-led pursuit into a more rigorous and objective discipline (Sharir & Lerner, 2006). Because entrepreneurship is a dominant factor in the economy, researchers have examined a number of factors that may explain entrepreneurial activity (Sharir & Lerner, 2006). Essential to the founding and establishing of any social venture are the individuals and groups with the vision, drive and perseverance to provide answers to social problems and needs, whether educational, welfare, environmental or health related (Sharir & Lerner, 2006). They may feel the need to fill a gap in services left open by the public or private sectors (Anheier & Ben-ner, 1997), to address the needs of special populations (Tropman, 1989), to contribute their time, skills, energy and assets to society (Edward, 1995), or have a commitment to the realization of ideological goals without forcing those goals onto the general public (Rose-Ackerman, 1997). In some instances, social entrepreneurs develop more than just one particular program or service, and their attempts to respond to basic problems and dilemmas in the community and society may inspire the synergetic union of many different entities (Sharir & Lerner, 2006).
There is a need to know how social entrepreneurs’ personalities are different from non-social entrepreneurs and this will lead to questions such as whether or not personality traits are related to social entrepreneurial success. Personality variables have an important role to play in developing theories of the entrepreneurial process, including entrepreneurial intentions e.g., (Crant 1996) and (Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005). Individuals with certain personality traits may be more attracted to the entrepreneurial form of employment than others may be (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). Overwhelming evidence exists within the vocational psychology literature that mean personality scores differ across jobs, occupations, and work environments (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2003). For example, Holland’s (1985) typology of vocational choice is built on substantial empirical evidence that people make occupational choices on the basis of different interest patterns, which produces different personality profiles across occupations and work environments.

The literature on person–environment fit (Kristof-Brown, 1996) similarly supports the proposition that individuals gravitate toward jobs and work environments that match their personalities. For example, Schneider, Smith, Taylor, and Fleenor (1998) found significant mean personality differences among managers across organizations. Schneider’s (1987) attraction–selection–attrition (ASA) model explains how individual and organizational processes produce mean differences in personality across organizational work environments. Ones and Viswesvaran (2003) adapted the ASA logic to explain the homogeneity of personality scores within jobs. Individuals with certain personality traits may be more attracted to the entrepreneurial form of employment than others may be (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). Second, selection by outside agents critical to founding a new venture—investment bankers, venture capitalists, potential partners, suppliers, and key employees—may favor individuals possessing certain personality traits over others (Zhao
& Seibert, 2006). Such favorable selection will facilitate the actual founding of an entrepreneurial venture.

Finally, individuals with certain personality traits may find entrepreneurial activities more satisfying and fulfilling than do others without those traits, and thus these individuals may persist long enough to actually establish the new venture and become an entrepreneur (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). The results of a multiple regression analysis based on meta-analytic estimates showed a relationship between personality and entrepreneurship (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). When all five personality dimensions were included as a set, the multiple correlation was .37, a moderate effect size by conventional standards (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). The authors advised that the results should not be regarded as exact because they are based on estimated intercorrelations, but they were suggestive (Zhao & Seibert, 2006).

Personality variables appear to have a role in future theories of entrepreneurship. According to a study the personality construct with the strongest relationship to entrepreneurship was Conscientiousness (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). Subsequent analyses examined achievement and dependability as separate constructs (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). Achievement motivation has been implicated as an important individual difference variable predicting entrepreneurship since the work of McClelland (1961). Zhao and Seibert (2006) results supported McClelland’s (1961) original proposition and are consistent with meta-analytical results presented by Collins, Hanges, and Locke (2004). Collins et al. showed further that achievement motivation is positively related to entrepreneurial performance. These studies provided growing evidence regarding the importance of achievement motivation in entrepreneurship. The effect size for dependability, the second facet of Conscientiousness, was not significantly different from zero (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). Thus there is some evidence that facets within a single primary personality dimension can have differential
relationships with entrepreneurship status. Exploring the role of narrow traits in the attainment of entrepreneurship status may therefore be a productive avenue for future research (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). But to add theoretical value, the burden of proof is to demonstrate that the narrow traits explain variance beyond that associated with the primary dimensions of the parsimonious five factor models (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996).

Proactive personality may be more suitable to examine entrepreneurial intentions than the Big Five personality factors. Despite the widespread acceptance of the five factor model, theorists have argued that when attempting to link personality to a specific criterion of interest, the criterion-related validity of basic personality traits is likely to be exceeded by compound or emergent personality variables that are more specifically tailored to the outcome (Hough & Schneider, 1996). According to Hough and Schneider (1996), compound personality traits are comprised of basic personality traits that do not all covary.

Proactive personality is thought to be one example of such a compound variable (Hough, 2003), and it has proven to be predictive of a number of career development outcomes. Bateman and Crant (1993) developed the proactive personality concept, defining it as a relatively stable tendency to effect environmental change that differentiates people based on the extent to which they take action to influence their environments. Individuals with a prototypical proactive personality identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative, take action, and persevere until meaningful change occurs (Crant, 2000). This has tremendous implications as it relates to social entrepreneurship and it is very possible that proactive African American and Hispanic students may want to identify opportunities in which they can make a positive difference in their communities and persevere until they challenge the status quo and create meaningful change in their communities.
Proactive personality is viewed as a propensity to engage in action toward influencing one's environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). This is triggered by their job crafting motivation to exert control over their work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) leading to the activation of performance-protection strategy (Hockey, 1993). Proactive personality is an important determinant of individual, organizational, and team outcomes, and plays an important role when the environment is challenging or unfavorable, such as the one that most entrepreneurs face (Gupta & Bhawe, 2007). Furthermore, there is a need to probe whether proactive personality has a relatively similar effect on social entrepreneurial intentions.

It is the researcher’s view that an understanding of social entrepreneurial intentions holds promise for better understanding the role of key elements of the social entrepreneurial process, such as proactive personality and hope. An understanding of what drives social entrepreneurs to create social ventures that can transform communities and society in general may inform universities and other institutions on how to develop these individuals. African American and Hispanic college students that are identified as having social entrepreneurial intentions can go back to their communities and make a positive impact by challenging the status quo. However, Paulo Freire (1992, p.8) wrote that “the idea that hope alone will transform the world, action undertaken in that kind of naivete, is an excellent route to hopelessness, pessimism, and fatalism. But the attempt to do without hope, in the struggle to improve the world, as if that struggle could be reduced to calculated acts alone, or a purely scientific approach is a frivolous illusion.” Proactive individuals who possess hope may have intentions to become social entrepreneurs with the ambition of challenging the status quo; however it takes more than proactivity and hope to change the world, and universities and other institutions have to aid in the preparation of social entrepreneurs.
This study aims to highlight the ambitions of African American and Hispanic students, and universities and other institutions may see the need to give those students the tools necessary for them to make a positive difference in their communities. Freire’s (1993) work portrayed a practical and theoretical approach to emancipation through education. He wanted people to develop an ontological vocation, a theory of existence that views people as subjects, not objects, who are constantly reflecting and acting on the transformation of their world so it can become a more equitable place for all to live. Freire (1993) was concerned about a social transformation, a demythologizing of reality and an awakening of critical consciousness whereby people perceive the social, political, and economic contradictions of their time and take action against the oppressive elements. There is a need for universities and institutions to adequately prepare marginalized groups to transform their communities by helping to eliminate the oppressive elements of poverty, crime, unemployment and other social ills that have devastated African American and Hispanic communities, and the first step is to identify those individuals who have the drive and the desire to do so.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was two-fold: 1) to determine if a relationship exists between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic undergraduate students; and 2) to determine if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.

**Objectives of Study**

Specific objectives formulated to guide the research include:

- To describe the research participants on selected personal characteristics: Age, Gender, School Classification and Ethnicity.
• To measure African American and Hispanic undergraduate students’ proactive personality score, hope score and social entrepreneurial intentions score.
• To determine if a positive relationship exists between African American and Hispanic undergraduate students’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.
• To determine to what extent hope will moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions such that the higher the hope score, the more individuals will have social entrepreneurial intentions.

**Definition of Terms**

• **Proactive Personality**: Bateman and Crant (1993) defined the prototypic "proactive personality" as one who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces and who effects environmental change. Proactive personalities identify opportunities and act on them; they show initiative, take action, and persevere until they bring about meaningful change. In contrast, people who are not proactive exhibit the opposite patterns: they fail to identify, let alone seize, opportunities to change things.

• **Hope**: This construct is defined as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (1) agency (goal-directed energy) and (2) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (Snyder, Harris, Anderson, Holleran, Irving, Sigmon, Yoshinobu, Gibb, Langelle, & Harney, 1991). Based on this definition, hope’s agency or “willpower” component provides the determination to achieve goals, whereas its pathways or “waypower” component promotes the creation of alternative paths to replace those that may have been blocked in the process of pursuing those goals (Youssef & Luthans, 2007).
• **Social entrepreneurial intentions**: This construct can be described as a person’s intention to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance social change through innovative solutions.

• **Social entrepreneurship**: Thompson, Alvy, and Lees (2000) described social entrepreneurship as the process of applying entrepreneurial principles to creative vision, leadership, and the will to succeed in inducing social change.

**Significance of Study**

Relationships between personality traits and entrepreneurial behavior are frequently addressed in entrepreneurship theorizing and research (Rauch & Frese, 2007), and may have an important role in social entrepreneurial research. Social entrepreneurship leads to the establishment of new social organizations or not for profits and the continued innovation in existing ones (Mort, Weerawardena, & Carnegie, 2003). Social entrepreneurs identify under-utilized resources and find ways of putting them to use to satisfy unmet social needs (Leadbeater, 1997). In the broader realm of entrepreneurial research personality variables have an important role to play in developing theories of the entrepreneurial process, including such areas as entrepreneurial career intentions (e.g., Crant, 1996; Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005). This may hold true for social entrepreneurial intentions and it is important for universities and other institutions to identify and develop individuals who have a desire to positively transform society.

This study will attempt to add to the body of knowledge describing the impact of proactive personality, and hope on social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic undergraduate students.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter begins with a review of literature on critical social theory, entrepreneurship, minorities and social change, social entrepreneurship, the theory of planned behavior, entrepreneurial intentions, social entrepreneurial intentions and then continues with a review of literature on proactive personality and hope.

Critical Social Theory

African American and Hispanic students who possess hope may have strong intentions to become social entrepreneurs that will challenge the status quo and make a positive difference in this world. The purpose of this study is to determine whether having a proactive personality and hope may impact African American and Hispanic undergraduate students. However, it is important to state early on the importance of critical social theory as a tool in developing minority students to become social entrepreneurs. It is not enough to simply identify these students; there is a need for universities and other institutions to play a major role in developing individuals that will challenge the oppressive status quo. Leonardo (2004, p. 11) stated that “critical social theory is a multidisciplinary knowledge base with the implicit goal of advancing the emancipatory function of knowledge. It approaches this goal by promoting the role of criticism in the search for quality education. Through critical social theory in education, quality is proportional to the depth of analysis that students have at their disposal. As a critical form of classroom discourse, critical social theory cultivates students’ ability to critique institutional as well as conceptual dilemmas, particularly those that lead to domination or oppression. It also promotes a language of transcendence that complements a language of critique in order to forge alternative and less oppressive social arrangements. A critical social theory-based movement in education highlights the relationship between social systems and people, how they produce each other, and ultimately how
critical social theory can contribute to the emancipation of both.” Presently universities are not doing enough to prepare marginalized groups to challenge the status quo in the United States. Greenleaf (2002) pointed out that one of the flaws in the education system is that the current system does not prepare individuals for leadership and does not encourage the poor to improve the communities in which they were raised; rather they are given goals to move into the areas of the upper class. Critical social theory can play a large part in the education of African American and Hispanic undergraduate students because it calls educators to activism. Activists stand between the constituent base and the power-holders (Brown, 2004). Their role is to organize constituents, articulate their concerns, and negotiate/advocate on their behalf with power-holders and to develop a repertoire of action strategies with the long-term aim of shifting power (Tilley, 1993). Educational activists recognize the ethical dimensions of teaching other people’s children, they work to provide them with the highest quality of education they would desire for their own children, and they learn to work as an ally with the community (Brown, 2004). Educational activists share power with marginalized groups, they seek out networks, and they teach others to act politically and to advocate individually and collectively for themselves and other marginalized groups (Brown, 2004). Activism requires a “critical consciousness” and an ability to organize “reflectively for action rather than for passivity” (Freire, 1985, p. 82). Banks (1981) concurred, “they must also develop a sense of political efficacy, and be given practice in social action strategies which teaches them how to get power without violence and further exclusion. Opportunities for social action, in which students have experience in obtaining and exercising power, should be emphasized within a curriculum that is designed to help liberate excluded ethnic groups” (p. 149). Critical social theory can be utilized to prepare African American and Hispanic undergraduate students to tap into their potential and to challenge the status quo and help reduce some of the social ills facing the United States and the
world as we know it. Consistent with a Freirian vision of education, universities need to embrace forms of teaching and learning that promote increased awareness and understanding of the ways in which social forces act on people’s lives to produce and reproduce inequalities (Rhoads, 2009).

University education needs to move beyond normalized conceptions of knowledge and truth and include counter and oppositional narratives in order that students might develop the kinds of critical questions necessary for confronting complex social and global realities (Rhoads, 2009). Universities and other institutions are needed to prepare disenfranchised groups to become social entrepreneurs and this study aims to determine if there is a positive relationship between proactive personality, hope and social entrepreneurial intentions. If universities can identify which students have the desire to engage in social change they can better prepare them to challenge the status quo. In the next section a review of college students and social change, entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship describes the state of entrepreneurial research.

**College Students and Social Change**

The role of college students as agents of change has been identified through various movements and occurrences of activism that involved student-initiated collective action against authoritative social and political structures (Mars, 2009). Lipset and Schaflander (1971) identified such movements and activism as far back as the student involvement in the nineteenth century revolutionary movements in France, Germany and Italy. More recently, student activism has been widely recognized through the demonstrations of the civil rights movement, protests against America’s involvement in the Vietnam conflict, and collective support for the divestment of South African Apartheid (Mars, 2009). Students have also been shown to engage in grassroots leadership that was intended on creating organizational change within colleges and universities (Mars, 2009). For example, over the past two decades a new form of student activism has emerged on campuses
around the country (Rhoads, Buenavista, & Maldonado, 2004). Campus organizations representing students of color increasingly have united for the purpose of enhancing academic support for students from underrepresented or marginalized ethnic or racial backgrounds (Rhoads, Buenavista, & Maldonado, 2004). Student organizations representing African American, Asian American, Latino, and Native American students have pooled their resources and political clout in order to enhance retention efforts (Rhoads, Buenavista, & Maldonado, 2004). The programs and activities developed by such efforts are largely student initiated. For example, at one campus, student organizations representing African American, Philippine, Chicano, Native American, and Vietnamese students have formed an umbrella organization that coordinates an extensive array of recruitment and retention activities (Rhoads, Buenavista, & Maldonado, 2004).

The study of social entrepreneurship has been mostly limited to the large scale efforts of elite and influential actors to create social transformation (O’Connor, 2006); there is definitely a need to examine marginalized groups’ social entrepreneurial intentions. The exploration of socially-oriented student entrepreneurs who act as grassroots agents of change offers a less-elite perspective on social entrepreneurship (Mars, 2009).

**Minorities and Social Change**

In the 20th century social and political activism was an important aspect of student life and culture in the United States (Franklin, 2003). As historians and other social scientists begin to assess the dominant patterns and trends in movements for social change over the past century, they are beginning to conclude that student activism was an important element in itself and as part of larger social reform movements (Franklin, 2003). African American and Hispanic college students show the potential for social entrepreneurship and this was evident in the student activism and civic engagement which was displayed during efforts to fight for racial justice and immigration reform.
In this section the researcher will highlight African American and Hispanic students’ involvement in movements for social change.

**Hispanics and Social Change**

The civic potential of young Hispanics became very evident in early 2006. Rallies were held across the United States in support of immigration policy reform that was sympathetic to immigrants (Wilkin, Katz & Ball-Rokeach, 2009). From the end of March to the middle of April 2006, young people held rallies at their schools, or walked out of school, to express their support for immigrant workers and the need for immigration reform (Bada, Fox, & Selee, 2006). Surprising the American political elite and general populace, the pro-immigrant rights marches signified for many ‘the awakening of the sleeping giant’ – the stirring of Hispanic political activism which in due time has the potential to translate into sustained political mobilization and empowerment (Reyes, 2007). Although Hispanic activism is in itself not a new phenomenon, the marches were unprecedented in terms of size and scope (Reyes, 2007). Hispanic college students can play a vital role in the movement towards immigration reform and other issues relevant to their communities if they are trained to become social entrepreneurs that can advocate and organize for comprehensive immigration reform and work to counter anti-immigrant policies and groups, and help grassroots voices shape and influence the immigration debate at the national level. Unfortunately, most grant-making foundations ignore Hispanics (Cortes, 1999). Of all the funds granted each year by major U.S. foundations, the amount earmarked for Hispanics fluctuates between 2 percent and three-quarters of 1 percent (Cortés, 1991). The existence of Hispanic nonprofits is largely the result of incomplete integration and lack of opportunity for Hispanics in mainstream economic and legal institutions (Cortes, 1999). Hispanics formed many of their informal associations as a collective response to persecution by other U.S. residents and institutions. Informal associations of Hispanics
eventually led, in some cases, to establishment of formal, tax-exempt nonprofit corporations controlled by Hispanics for the benefit of their own communities (Cortes, 1999). It is very important for universities and other institutions to prepare proactive Hispanic students to become social entrepreneurs in order to make an impact in their communities which have been largely ignored.

**African Americans and Social Change**

The civic potential of young African Americans became very evident in September 2007. The September 20th 2007 mobilization that attracted 60,000 Black youth and their supporters to Jena, LA, to protest the injustice meted out to six Black high school students breathed new life into a fading protest tradition (Hotep, 2008). Civil rights activists such as Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson viewed the Jena mobilization as a "rekindling of the spirit of the civil rights movement" when widespread discontent with institutional racism stirred thousands of ordinary African American people to behave in extraordinary ways (Hotep, 2008). Hurricane Katrina also spurred young African American students to make a difference in their community. Students from Dillard University, a historically black university in New Orleans, were actively engaged with organizations, agencies, and businesses in the Gentilly neighborhood of New Orleans as they initiated community service and service learning activities with medical, mental health, and social welfare assistance agencies.

An example of an African American social entrepreneur making a positive difference is E. Aminata Brown. Brown was sickened by the plight of women in parts of Ghana. Accra and other big Ghanaian cities such as Kumasi and Takoradi are magnets for adolescent girls and young women from rural villages who flee their birthplaces because of dire economic conditions, which systemically deprive them of access to higher education, vocational training, and basic income opportunities (Lee, 2008). While living in Accra, Ghana from 1999-2003, Brown founded a creative African women’s collective, consisting of young women from rural villages (Lee, 2008). With this
collective, she led the innovation, design and development of artistic textile products called BaBa Blankets™, which are exported to Europe and the U.S. Brown's social enterprise provides under-educated women with a creative growth environment, as well as offering them sustainable income and other vital resources. Through the ongoing development of BaBa Blankets™, Brown intends exposing the world to the vibrant beauty of West African culture and the boundless potential of its people (Lee, 2008).

Proactive African American and Hispanic undergraduate students have the potential to create social enterprises that can impact their communities and the world. Social entrepreneurship is emerging as an innovative approach for dealing with complex social needs (Johnson, 2002). Social entrepreneurs utilize entrepreneurial principles to organize, create, and manage a venture to bring about social change. In the next section a brief overview of entrepreneurship is presented.

**Entrepreneurship**

Although the concept of entrepreneurship was first defined more than 250 years ago, many have held it as one of the mysterious forces of human nature (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Schumpeter (1934) defines it as the process that introduces new combinations in the market. The practice of entrepreneurship is, of course, as old as trading between tribes and villages. Many different and useful approaches have been used to describe and to analyze entrepreneurship (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Scholarly interest in entrepreneurship is burgeoning (Sorenson & Stuart, 2008). According to the ISI Web of Science, the number of articles published with the term “entrepreneur/ship” in the title, abstract, or keywords each year tripled from roughly 50 in 1990 to more than 150 in 2000 (Sorenson & Stuart, 2008). Since then, activity has only accelerated; the annual count of articles doubled again between 2000 and 2005, and authors published more than 370 academic papers on entrepreneurship in 2006 alone (Sorenson & Stuart, 2008). Since
entrepreneurial activity is increasingly relevant to economic output and labor employment in both developed and developing nations, new knowledge about entrepreneurship can speed the outcomes desired by enterprising individuals, firms, and societies (Busenitz, West, Shepard, Nelson, Chandler, & Zacharakis, 2003). Entrepreneurship has tended to fall within three main streams of research, which include a focus on the results of entrepreneurship, the causes of entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurial management (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). In the first stream of research, economists have explored the impacts and results of entrepreneurship (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). For example, Schumpeter (1934), in his seminal article, examined entrepreneurship as a key process through which the economy as a whole is advanced. The second stream of research has focused on the entrepreneurs themselves. Research in this stream examines entrepreneurship from a psychological and sociological perspective (Collins & Moore, 1964; McClelland, 1961). Finally, the third stream has focused on the entrepreneurial management process. This diverse literature includes research on how to foster innovation within established corporations (Burgelman, 1983), start-ups and venture capital (e.g., Timmons & Bygrave, 1986), organizational life cycles (Quinn & Cameron, 1983), and predictors of entrepreneurial success (Dollinger, 1984). From these three streams of research, earlier conceptualizations of entrepreneurship have often focused on either the economic function of entrepreneurship or on the nature of the individual who is “the entrepreneur,” whereas in recent years, significant research has focused on the search of the “how” of entrepreneurship (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Among the many engaged in this area, Stevenson (1985) defined entrepreneurship as “the pursuit of opportunity beyond the tangible resources that you currently control.” With this definition, emphasis is placed upon how opportunity can be recognized, the process of committing to an opportunity, gaining control over the resources, managing the network of resources that may or may not be within a single hierarchy, and the way in
which participants are rewarded (Stevenson, 1985; Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). The entrepreneurial organization focuses on opportunity, not resources. Entrepreneurs must commit quickly, but tentatively, to be able to readjust as new information arises (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). The process of commitment becomes multi-staged, limiting the commitment of resources at each stage to an amount sufficient to generate new information and success before more resources are sought. The entrepreneurial organization uses the resources that lie within the hierarchical control of others and, therefore, must manage the network as well as the hierarchy (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006).

An area of entrepreneurship that is becoming increasingly popular is social entrepreneurship. The term “social entrepreneurship” is used to refer to the rapidly growing number of organizations that have created models for efficiently catering to basic human needs that existing markets and institutions have failed to satisfy (Seelos & Mair, 2005). Social entrepreneurship combines the resourcefulness of traditional entrepreneurship with a mission to change society (Seelos & Mair, 2005). In the following section a literature review of the concept will be discussed further.

Social Entrepreneurship

The concept of social entrepreneurship has been rapidly emerging in the private, public and non-profit sectors over the last few years, and interest in social entrepreneurship continues to grow (Johnson, 2002). Currently, the non-profit sector is facing intensifying demands for improved effectiveness and sustainability in light of diminishing funding from traditional sources and increased competition for these scarce resources (Johnson, 2002). At the same time, the increasing concentration of wealth in the private sector is promoting calls for increased corporate social responsibility and more proactive responses to complex social problems, while governments at all
levels are grappling with multiple demands on public funds (Johnson, 2002). Social entrepreneurship is emerging as an innovative approach for dealing with complex social needs (Johnson, 2002). With its emphasis on problem-solving and social innovation, socially entrepreneurial activities blur the traditional boundaries between the public, private and non-profit sector, and emphasize hybrid models of for-profit and non-profit activities (Johnson, 2002). Promoting collaboration between sectors is implicit within social entrepreneurship, as is developing radical new approaches to solving old problems (Johnson, 2002).

In the literature overall, the main definitional debates are over the locus of social entrepreneurship (Johnson, 2002). Thompson (2002) argues that social entrepreneurship exists primarily in the non-profit sector. Many define social entrepreneurship as bringing business expertise and market-based skills to the non-profit sector in order to help this sector become more efficient in providing and delivering these services (e.g., Reis, 1999). This category includes non-profits running small, for-profit businesses and channeling their earnings back into social service problems as well as non-profits adopting private sector management techniques in order to get more mileage out of existing resources (McLeod, 1997). Boschee (1998) distinguishes between for-profit activities which serve to help offset an organization’s costs, and what he calls ‘social purpose ventures’ whose primary purpose is to make a profit which can then be used for non-profit ventures. Others define social entrepreneurship more broadly, and argue that social entrepreneurship can occur within the public, private or non-profit sectors, and is in essence a hybrid model involving both for-profit and non-profit activities as well as cross-sectoral collaboration (Johnson, 2002). These definitions tend to put more emphasis on the ‘entrepreneurial’ nature of these activities and the creativity and innovation that entrepreneurs bring to solving social problems in unique ways rather than focussing on the social benefits such services can provide (Johnson, 2002). This
conceptualization suggests social entrepreneurship can take a variety of forms, including innovative not-for-profit ventures, social purpose business ventures (e.g., for-profit community development banks, and hybrid organizations mixing for-profit and not-for-profit activities (e.g., homeless shelters that start small businesses to train and employ their residents) (Dees, 1998).

William Drayton is thought to have coined the term ‘social entrepreneur’ several decades ago (Davis, 2002). He is widely credited with creating the world’s first organization to promote the profession of social entrepreneurship, Ashoka: Innovators for the Public. Drayton recognized that social entrepreneurs have the same core temperament as their industry-creating, business entrepreneur peers but instead use their talents to solve social problems on a society-wide scale such as why children are not learning, why technology is not accessed equally, why pollution is increasing, etc. The essence, however, is the same. Both types of entrepreneur recognize “when a part of society is stuck and provide new ways to get it unstuck” (Drayton, 2002). Each type of entrepreneur envisages a systemic change that will allow him or her to tip the whole society onto this new path, and then persists and persists until the job is done (Drayton, 2002). Thompson, Alvy, and Lees (2000) described social entrepreneurship as the process of applying entrepreneurial principles to creative vision, leadership, and the will to succeed in inducing social change. Social entrepreneurs are different from business entrepreneurs in many ways. The key difference is that social entrepreneurs set out with an explicit social mission in mind. Their main objective is to make the world a better place. This vision affects how they measure their success and how they structure their enterprises (Dees, 2001). Broadly speaking, two overlapping conceptions of social entrepreneurship can be identified in the literature.

For some scholars, social entrepreneurship refers to the creation of positive social change, regardless of the structures or processes through which it is achieved (Tracey & Phillips, 2007).
Indeed, this underpins the influential work of Dees (1998), whose definition is perhaps the most commonly cited and used. From this perspective, social entrepreneurs are concerned with reconfiguring resources in order to achieve specific social objectives, and their success is measured by the extent to which they achieve “social transformation” (Pearce, 2003; Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). While they may develop business ventures in order to fund their activities, they are as likely to rely on philanthropy or government subsidy to achieve their social missions (Tracey & Phillips, 2007). A second strand in the literature focuses on generating “earned income” in the pursuit of social outcomes (Boschee, 2001). From this perspective, social entrepreneurship is concerned with enterprise for a social purpose and involves building organizations that have the capacity to be both commercially viable and socially constructive (Tracey & Phillips, 2007). It therefore requires social entrepreneurs to identify and exploit market opportunities in order to develop products and services that achieve social ends, or to generate surpluses that can be reinvested in a social project (Leadbeater, 1997). The job of the social entrepreneur is to recognize when a part of society is not working and to solve the problem by fixing the system, spreading solutions and persuading entire societies to take new leaps (Drayton, 2005). “Social entrepreneurs are not content just to give a fish or to teach how to fish. They will not rest until they have revolutionized the fishing industry” (Drayton, 2005). Identifying and solving large scale social problems requires social entrepreneurs because only entrepreneurs have the committed vision and inexhaustible determination to persist until they have transformed an entire system (Drayton, 2005). In spite of the varying definitions of social entrepreneurship, one commonality emerges in almost every description: the ‘problem-solving nature’ of social entrepreneurship is prominent, and the corresponding emphasis on developing and implementing initiatives that produce measurable results in the form of changed social outcomes and/or impacts (Johnson, 2002).
Social entrepreneurship leads to the establishment of new social organizations or not for profits and the continued innovation in existing ones (Mort, Weerawardena, & Carnegie, 2003). There is broad agreement that social entrepreneurs and their undertakings are driven by social goals; that is, the desire to benefit society in some way or ways. This is another way of saying that the social entrepreneur aims in some way to increase ‘‘social value,’’ i.e. to contribute to the welfare or well being in a given human community (Peredo & Mclean, 2006). Social entrepreneurship, or entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose, has been on the rise in recent decades. A partial indicator of this surge is revealed by the growth in the number of nonprofit organizations, which increased 31% between 1987 and 1997 to 1.2 million, exceeding the 26% rate of new business formation. However, the dynamic is even more robust, as other forms of social entrepreneurship, beyond that occurring within the nonprofit sector, have also flourished in recent years (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),
- Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,
- Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and
- Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created (Dees, 1998).

Although the concept of social entrepreneurship may be new, initiatives that employ entrepreneurial capacities to solve social problems are not (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). For years, agencies have launched programs and implemented interventions to help impoverished and marginalized groups (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). Government aid agencies and private
foundations have invested billions of dollars to support such initiatives, and some of them have been quite innovative (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). While entrepreneurial phenomena aimed at economic development have received a great amount of scholarly attention, entrepreneurship as a process to foster social progress has only recently attracted the interest of researchers (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004).

The theory of planned behavior is a good framework for explaining an individual’s intention to perform a given behavior (i.e., intentions to start a social venture that will positively transform society). Intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a behavior; they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). The next section will give a brief review of the theory of planned behavior.

**Theory of Planned Behavior**

The theory of planned behavior is an extension of the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) made necessary by the original model’s limitations in dealing with behaviors over which people have incomplete volitional control (Ajzen, 1991). As in the original theory of reasoned action, a central factor in the theory of planned behavior is the individual’s intention to perform a given behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a behavior; they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). As a general rule, the stronger the intention to engage in a behavior, the more likely should be its performance. The first determinant of intentions is the person’s attitude, conceptualized as the overall evaluation, either positive or negative, of performing the behavior of interest (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008). The second determinant of intentions is subjective
norm, which reflects perceived social pressure to perform or not perform the behavior (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008). The third determinant of intentions is perceived behavioral control, which reflects the extent to which the behavior is perceived to be under volitional control (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008). Perceived behavioral control has been argued to indirectly affect behavior via intentions and/or have a direct effect on behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Madden, 1986). Ajzen (1991) argued that considered actions are preceded by conscious decisions to act in a certain way. He further theorized that these intentions were the result of attitudes formulated through life experiences, personal characteristics and perceptions drawn from these prior experiences (Kuehn, 2008). He proposed that the three determinants of intention 1) **Attitude toward the behavior** as being “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question.” Attitude is a composite variable comprised of both cognitive and affective elements that support this mindset toward entrepreneurship as a lifestyle or career or activity, whether positive or negative (Ajzen, 1991). As an attitude is a conclusion or predisposition toward an action, it too is formed through experience and perceptions formed over the life of the person (Ajzen, 1991). 2) **Subjective norm** refers to “the perceived social pressure to perform or not perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991).” This variable would be influenced not only by broad cultural attitudes toward entrepreneurship, but also the attitudes of particular individuals, groups and networks the person is most influenced by, such as family, friends, peers and significant ‘others’(Ajzen, 1991). 3) **Perceived behavioral control** “refers to the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior and it is assumed to reflect past experience, as well as anticipated impediments and obstacles (Ajzen, 1991).” This variable is recognized as most impacted by and closely related to Bandura’s (1986) perceived self-efficacy, a person’s belief they can execute a particular action.
According to Ajzen (1991) the central factor in the theory of planned behavior is the individual’s intention to perform a given behavior (ie. intentions to start a social venture that will positively transform society). Intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a behavior; they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). As a general rule, the stronger the intention to engage in a behavior, the more likely should be its performance (Ajzen, 1991).

**Entrepreneurial Intentions**

Intentions to act are believed central to understanding the behaviors in which people engage. While actual behavior may differ from intended behavior, it has been established that one’s intention to act toward something in a certain manner is the most consistent predictor of actual behavior, particularly planned behavior (Krueger, Reilly and Carsrud, 2000). Intentions-based models then are particularly suited to entrepreneurship as the entrepreneurial process is a planned one (Kuehn, 2008). Individual entrepreneurial intent has proven to be an important and continuing construct in entrepreneurship theory and research (Carr & Sequeira, 2007; Hmieleski & Corbett, 2006). All new firms set up by individuals, or groups of individuals outside the formal context of existing firms, begin with some degree of planned behavior on the part of those individuals (Krueger & Reilly, 2000; Shook, Priem, & McGee, 2003). On occasion, new business opportunities may, of course, be stumbled upon inadvertently by those who might not previously have consciously planned to become entrepreneurs, but even then, as motivational theories of behavior suggest (Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein, 1967), the exploitation of such inadvertently discovered opportunities through starting a firm begins, nevertheless, with purposeful intention that precipitates action (Thompson, 2009). Not all new business opportunities that are stumbled upon result in new
firms because, as Krueger (2007, p. 124) emphasizes, “behind entrepreneurial action are entrepreneurial intentions,” and not all individuals will have such intentions, either before or after they find by serendipity a new business opportunity. The “intentionality” (Katz & Gartner, 1988, p. 431) of would-be entrepreneurs has therefore long been stressed as an important variable in understanding the formation of new business ventures (Bird, 1988). Existing research suggests that the setting up of new firms by intending individuals is moderated and mediated by personal circumstances, such as parental background and educational level (Carsrud, Olm, & Eddy, 1986), by individual cognitions of new business opportunities (Busenitz & Lau, 1996; Choi & Shepherd, 2004), and by broader environmental factors at both individual and national institutional levels (Korunka, Frank, Lueger, & Mugler, 2003; Westlund & Bolton, 2003). Scientifically discovering and examining the effect of such moderating and mediating factors on intending individuals’ decisions finally either to start or not to start new firms requires a prior assessment of those individuals’ intent to become entrepreneurs in the first place (Thompson, 2009). Individual entrepreneurial intent is perhaps most appropriately and practically defined as a self-acknowledged conviction by a person that they intend to set up a new business venture and consciously plan to do so at some point in the future (Thompson, 2009). That point in the future might be imminent or indeterminate, and may never be reached (Thompson, 2009). Those with entrepreneurial intent need not ever actually set up a new business because myriad personal circumstances and environmental factors may militate against this (Thompson, 2009). Some with entrepreneurial intent may advance to being nascent entrepreneurs, that is, those undertaking advanced actions formally to set up a new firm (Thompson, 2009). However, while having entrepreneurial intent is a necessary condition for a nascent entrepreneur, becoming a nascent entrepreneur is neither necessary for having entrepreneurial intent, nor is it entrepreneurial intent’s inevitable outcome (Thompson, 2009). The
degree and intensity of individuals’ entrepreneurial intent might reasonably be expected to vary from person to person possessing it, and to vary for the same person at different points in time depending on circumstances (Thompson, 2009).

**Social Entrepreneurial Intentions**

Social entrepreneurial intentions can be described as a person’s intention to launch a social enterprise or venture to advance social change through innovation. As previously stated, according to Ajzen (1991) the central factor in the theory of planned behavior is the individual’s intention to perform a given behavior (i.e. intentions to start a social venture that will positively transform society).

In recent years college students in the United States and all over the world are enthused about making a difference in the world and are very much engaged in seeking ways in which they can help transform society for the better. Due to students’ desire for opportunities to make a difference various universities throughout the United States are introducing social entrepreneurship fellowship programs and courses designed to support students who are launching social enterprises. For example New York University has a social entrepreneurship fellowship that attracts three types of change-makers; 1) those that have or are planning to develop an innovative idea to address a specific social problem in a pattern breaking, sustainable and scalable way, 2) those that will work in and/or build the infrastructure needed for social entrepreneurial work to take root, including individuals who will practice their profession in a social entrepreneurial organization (accountants, lawyers, etc.) and individuals who want to improve the operations and management systems of public, private and not for profit organizations, and 3) those who will bring action oriented awareness on a national and/or global scale to particular social problems through journalism, the
arts, photography, film making, television production and other media avenues (Social Entrepreneurship Graduate Fellowship, 2009).

**Proactive Personality**

Bateman and Crant (1993) developed the proactive personality concept, defining it as a relatively stable tendency to effect environmental change that differentiates people based on the extent to which they take action to influence their environments. Individuals with a prototypical proactive personality identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative, take action, and persevere until meaningful change occurs (Crant, 2000). In contrast, people who are not proactive exhibit the opposite patterns: they fail to identify, let alone seize, opportunities to change things. Less proactive individuals are passive and reactive, preferring to adapt to circumstances rather than change them (Crant, 2000). As work becomes more dynamic and decentralized, proactive behavior and initiative become even more critical determinants of organizational success. For example, as new forms of management are introduced that minimize the surveillance function, companies will increasingly rely on employees' personal initiative to identify and solve problems (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997). Crant (2000) defined proactive behavior as taking initiative in improving current circumstances or creating new ones; it involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present conditions. Employees can engage in proactive activities as part of their in-role behavior in which they fulfill basic job requirements (Crant, 2000). For example, sales agents might proactively seek feedback on their techniques for closing a sale with an ultimate goal of improving job performance (Crant, 2000). Extra-role behaviors can also be proactive, such as efforts to redefine one's role in the organization (Crant, 2000). For example, employees might engage in career management activities by identifying and acting on opportunities to change the scope of their jobs or move to more desirable divisions of the business (Crant, 2000). Crant (1995)
demonstrated that proactive personality accounted for incremental variance in the job performance of real estate agents after controlling for both extraversion and conscientiousness. Proactive personality refers to individuals’ disposition toward engaging in active role orientations, such as initiating change and influencing their environment (Bateman & Crant 1993). Proactive people are relatively unconstrained by situational forces, and they identify opportunities, act on them, show initiative, and persevere until meaningful change occurs (Crant, 2000). The key differentiating feature of proactive personality and behavior is an active rather than passive approach toward work (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Several researchers have examined an array of potential outcomes of proactive personality at work. For example, Crant (1995) examined the criterion validity of the proactive personality scale developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). Using a sample of 131 real estate agents, results indicated that the proactive personality scale explained an additional 8% of the variance in an objective measure of agents’ job performance beyond experience, social desirability, general mental ability, and two of the big five personality factors– conscientiousness and extraversion. Parker (1998) found that, using a sample from a glass manufacturing firm, proactive personality was positively and significantly associated with participation in organizational improvement initiatives. Becherer and Maurer (1999) examined the effects of a proactive disposition on entrepreneurial behaviors. Results from a sample of 215 small company presidents suggested that the presidents’ level of proactivity was significantly associated with three types of entrepreneurial behaviors: starting versus not starting the business, the number of startups, and the types of ownership.

The proactive personality scale, a recent addition to the literature on individual differences, appears to have the potential for providing further insight into the personality trait- entrepreneurship relationship (Crant, 1996). The proactive personality scale measures a personal disposition toward
proactive behavior, an idea that intuitively appears to be related to entrepreneurship (Crant, 1996). In a study conducted by Crant (1996) that examined the relationship between the proactive personality scale and entrepreneurial intentions, proactive personality was positively associated with entrepreneurial intentions. This may also be the case for social entrepreneurial intentions; people with a proactive personality may be more inclined to have social entrepreneurial intentions and may want to influence their environment. More proactive people may have a greater desire to become social entrepreneurs in order to help transform society for the better.

**Hypothesis 1: There will be a positive relationship between individuals’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.**

Kim, Hon and Crant (2009) examined the indirect effects of a proactive personality on career satisfaction and perceived insider status, determined the process by which newcomer creativity mediates these relationships. Their findings provided several important theoretical implications. They found that the extent to which new employees possess a proactive personality was associated with their creativity (Kim, Hon & Crant, 2009). Proactive personality has been linked to a number of desirable personal and organizational outcomes, and their findings provided evidence that employee creativity should be added to the positive correlates of a proactive disposition (Kim, Hon & Crant, 2009). Most fundamentally, their study’s results extend current proactive personality literature by addressing the underlying process by which proactive personality ultimately manifests itself in individual outcomes (Kim, Hon & Crant, 2009). Personality affects outcomes through moderating and mediating processes and mechanisms, and identifying these underlying structures has been posited as a desirable next step for moving the proactive personality literature forward (Seibert, Crant, & Krainer, 1999). For this reason the researcher decided to
examine hope as a potential moderator that may factor in the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intention.

**Hope**

Barack Obama delivered the keynote address at the 2004 Democratic Convention, entitled The Audacity of Hope, and in 2006 he released a book of the same title that expanded upon many of the same topics addressed in the speech. The speech and the book written by Obama stated that Americans have always been guided by a dogged optimism in the future, or what Obama called “the audacity of hope” (Obama, 2006). The researcher felt that it was necessary to examine hope because it made sense that this construct may provide the necessary fuel that will ignite undergraduate African Americans and Hispanics to become social entrepreneurs and agents of change in their communities.

Hope is conceptualized and operationalized in various ways by different people. The philosopher and theologian Thomas Aquinas (1927) conceptualized hope as a movement of the appetitive power ensuing from the apprehension of a future good, difficult but possible to obtain. Paulo Freire (1992) stated that hope helps us to "understand human existence, and the struggle needed to improve it." (p. 8). In a qualitative study that examined hope in the Dominican Republic it was found that the subjects viewed hope as an essential but dynamic life-force that grows out of faith in God, and is supported by relationships, resources and work, and results in the energy necessary to work for a desired future (Holt, 2000). Davis-Maye & Perry (2007) in a study that focused on the development of African American girls, conceptualized hope as a concept that continues to compel individuals when the odds seem insurmountable and it fuels resilience, and the ability to achieve and strive despite the existence of barriers.
Due to the hardships that African Americans faced in the United States one would expect that they would be lacking in hope, however, it appears to be the opposite (Adams, Rand, Kahle, Snyder, Berg, King, Rodrigues-Hanley, 2003). In a study of college students, for example, African Americans were higher in hope than their Caucasian counterparts (Munoz-Dunbar, 1993). According to Adams et al (2003), hope consistently has been found to play an important role in the subjective well-being reported by African Americans. Historically, scripture provided stories and text which African Americans identified with and found hope through God (Hoyt, 1991). Also, through oral tradition, custodians passed on the collective story, including the history, customs, and values of African Americans, thereby imparting insight into the lives of their fore-parents and ways in which they lived with hope (Wimberly, 1996). Adams et al (2003) stated that African Americans draw on hope as a way of remaining resilient in the face of adversity. Also through hopeful thinking, African Americans can gain new insights into their goal attainment activities (Adams et al, 2003). High-hope compared to low-hope African Americans appear to be better able to deal with the blockages to their goal attainments (Adams et al, 2003).

Hope is also a significant construct for Hispanics. In a recent study that examined Hispanic youth it was found that hope may be a particularly important strength or resource among young Hispanics, who often are confronted with the dual challenges of negotiating the transition to adulthood (Phinney, Kim Jo, Osorio, & Vilhjalmisdottir, 2005) and developing a positive bicultural identity within both Hispanic and European American cultures (Phinney & Devich Navarro, 1997; Romero & Roberts, 2003). As these youth identify and develop goals across various life arenas, they may need to marshal agency and pathways thoughts to navigate around obstacles such as poverty, discrimination, and other bicultural stressors (Edwards, Ong, Lopez, 2007).
The basic premise of hope theory (Snyder, Harris, Anderson, Holleran, Irving, Sigman, Yoshinobu, Gibb, Langelle, & Harney, 1991) is that hope is comprised of not only emotion, but thinking as well. Indeed, according to hope theory, thinking is at the core of hope (Snyder, 2002). While investigating the phenomenon of excuse making by individuals when they failed to perform well, Snyder discovered that even though these individuals had reasons for not doing well they also expressed the desire to establish positive goals (Helland & Winston, 2005). This research led Snyder to explore theories of motivation and he was further encouraged by the pervasive theme within the motivation literature of the “desire to seek goals,” (Helland & Winston, 2005). Subsequent investigation led Snyder to the conclusion that hopeful thinking couples goal setting with the self-assessment of one’s ability to attain a goal. In the lead article in an American Psychologist special issue, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) stated that the aim of the emerging positive psychology is to move away from the predominant pathological, reparative approach to a focus on ways to build positive qualities and virtues that enable individuals, organizations, and communities to flourish and prosper. As a major construct in positive psychology, however, hope has taken on a specific meaning and application, with the most widely recognized, theoretically derived, and research-tested definition coming from well-known clinical and positive psychologist C. Rick Snyder (1994). Based on Snyder’s (2000) theory building and research, hope is defined as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (1) agency (goal-directed energy) and (2) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (Snyder, Irving, & Anderson, 1991). Based on this definition, hope’s agency or “willpower” component provides the determination to achieve goals, whereas its pathways or “waypower” component promotes the creation of alternative paths to replace those that may have been blocked in the process of pursuing those goals (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Hope has been shown to be
applicable and to relate to performance in various domains, including the workplace (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997; Luthans & Jensen, 2002; Luthans, Van Wyk, & Walumbwa, 2004; Peterson & Luthans, 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2006). Importantly, both dispositional and state hope are recognized in the literature and have distinct measures (Snyder, 2000; Snyder et al., 1996). An influential perspective on the construct of hope is the theoretical framework of Dufault and Martocchio (1985), as developed by Herth (1991) in the field of nursing research. Within this theoretical model, hope is conceptualized as “a multidimensional dynamic life force characterized by a confident yet uncertain expectation of achieving a future good which is realistically possible and personally significant” (Dufault & Martocchio, 1985). Hope consists of two spheres—generalized hope, “an intangible umbrella that protects hoping persons by casting a positive glow on life” (Dufault & Martocchio, 1985, p. 380), and particularized hope, which concerns a specific outcome or hope object— which include affective, behavioral, cognitive, affiliative, temporal, and contextual components (Bryant & Cvengros, 2004).

The reality of hope as a phenomenon has been confirmed through research conducted over the past decade resulting in a cognitive based theory of hope (Helland & Winston, 2005). Hope Theory has been studied in relation to physical and psychological health (Snyder, 1996; Snyder, Irving & Anderson, 1991; Snyder, Feldman, Taylor, Schroeder & Adams, 2000), psychotherapy (Snyder, Michael & Cheavans, 1999) academic achievement and sports performance (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby & Rehm, 1997). Hope has much in common with other positive psychology concepts, yet the theory building and measures of hope have clearly demonstrated it to be an independent construct. For example, empirical analyses have shown that hope, optimism, and self-efficacy are related yet clearly distinct constructs (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999). Also, in a series of studies by Snyder, Cheavans, and Sympson (1997), hope measures have predicted coping, well-
being, and reported psychological health responses significantly beyond projections related to measures of anxiety, positive and negative affectivity, optimism, positive outcome expectancies, and locus of control (Luthans & Jensen, 2002). Scholarly reviews indicate that hope is conceptually independent and captures unique predictive powers in explaining how individuals cope and thrive (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999). Organizational research that is either underway or completed includes: hope as a factor in human and social capital management referred to as positive psychological capital (Luthans & Youssef, 2004); the role of hope in sustaining innovation during major changes such as mergers and acquisitions (Ludema, Wilmot, & Srivastva, 1997); the impact of high hope on profits, retention rates, follower satisfaction and commitment (Luthans & Jensen, 2002); the differences of hope levels among social workers and corresponding levels of stress, job satisfaction, commitment and performance (Kirk & Koeske, 1995); the development of positive organizational hope and its impact on organization citizenship behaviors (White-Zappa, 2001).

**Hypothesis 2:** Hope will moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions such that the higher the hope score, the more individuals will have social entrepreneurial intentions.

![Figure 1: Research Model](image-url)
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the sample, survey instruments, survey administration, data collection procedures, and data analyses will be described.

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study was: 1) to determine if a relationship exists between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions; and 2) to determine if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.

Objectives of Study

Specific objectives formulated to guide the research include:

- To describe the research participants on selected personal characteristics: Age, Gender, School Classification, and Ethnicity.
- To measure the research participants’ proactive personality score, hope score and social entrepreneurial intentions score.
- To determine if a positive relationship exists between individuals’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.
- To determine to what extent hope will moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions such that the higher the hope score, the more individuals will have social entrepreneurial intentions.

Pretesting

Different versions of entrepreneurial intentions measures have been developed over the years depending on the target of entrepreneurial intentions used in specific studies. The majority of entrepreneurship research, however, simply measures entrepreneurial intentions and there are no measures of social entrepreneurial intentions. None of the entrepreneurial intentions instruments is
adequate for capturing social entrepreneurial intentions; thus, it was necessary to modify and pretest an instrument that can assess social entrepreneurial intentions. The first step was to generate a social entrepreneurial item-pool and determine whether the items were understandable in terms of clarity and readability. Then, it was necessary to test the items for content validity. This involved using a panel of experts who have expertise on social entrepreneurship because members of the pilot may not have the expertise to critically examine the items. The surviving items were further tested in a pilot survey. The surviving items were used in the primary survey. Based on the feedback from participants in the pilot study, the format and instructions were also refined.

**Population and Sample**

The target population for this study was full time African American and Hispanic undergraduate students enrolled in research extensive universities in the southern portion of the United States. The accessible population for this study was African American and Hispanic full time undergraduate students who attended the institution where this study was conducted during the spring 2010 semester. Data collected for this study were analyzed to meet the objectives of this study using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software program. Throughout the process of data collection, no personal identification information (i.e. name, social security number) was collected from survey participants. Each subject was assigned an identification number for the purposes of data entry and follow-up with non-responders. The frame for this study included African American and Hispanic full time undergraduate students during the spring 2010 semester. The frame of the accessible population was identified through the registrar at the institution where this study was conducted. A simple random sample of n = 176 was drawn from the population of N = 2,545 African American and Hispanic undergraduate students at the institution where this study was conducted.
Cochran’s sample size determination Formula for $n$ With Continuous Data (Cochran, 1977) was used to determine the minimum sample size. Application of Cochran’s formula determined that a minimum sample size of 176 should be delivered. However in order to ensure that adequate data was collected, the researcher elected to increase the sample size to 1,280; this is necessary because response rates for Web surveys among college students are lower than those for paper-and-pencil surveys, though this may change as familiarity with technology continues to rise (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003). Studies of online surveys suggest that certain types of individuals are more likely to respond via the web vs. paper (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003). Minority college students typically have less experience with technology than do their White and Asian American peers, even after controlling for differences in technological preparedness that are due to parental education, parental income, and high school type (Sax, Ceja, and Teranishi, 2001). Lack of access to and familiarity with the Internet may undermine the participation of underrepresented minorities in online survey research (Underwood, Kim, & Matier, 2000).

A total of 214 students responded to the survey during the spring 2010 semester. For Proactive Personality 213 responded to the questions on the proactive personality scale; for state hope 194 responded to the state hope scale; for social entrepreneurial intentions, 213 responded to the social entrepreneurial intentions scale. All 214 students answered the demographic information questions addressing ethnicity, gender, school classification and age.

**Instrumentation**

Proactive personality will be measured using the 10-item version of Bateman and Crant’s (1993) measure refined by Seibert et al (1999). A sample item is “I am always looking for better ways to do things”. All items were rated on a seven point scale ranging from Strongly disagree (1)
to Strongly agree (7). The internal consistency of the abbreviated scale was good (alpha = .83). A higher score indicates a more highly proactive personality.

Hope was measured using Snyder, Sympson, Ybasco, Borders, Babyak and Higgins (1996) 6-item, 8-point Likert-type State Hope Scale (alpha = .90). Examples of scale items include “At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my goals” (agency) and “If I should find myself in a jam, I could think of many ways to get out of it” (pathways).

Social entrepreneurial intentions, the dependent variable, was measured using a five-point Likert scale, which was modified from an entrepreneurial decision scale (alpha = .92) in Chen, Greene, and Crick (1998). The social entrepreneurial intention instrument was validated by a panel of experts from various universities and institutions who specialize in the study and practice of social entrepreneurship. It was then field tested via email by 50 students. This researcher used Cronbach’s alpha to test for reliability. Cronbach’s alpha is the most widely used diagnostic measure of the reliability coefficient that assesses the consistency of an entire scale of related questions. The measures range from 0 to 1. The generally agreed upon lower limit accepted for Cronbach’s alpha is .70 (Hair et al., 1998). According to the pilot test social entrepreneurial intentions as measured by a modified version of Chen, Greene, and Crick (1998) the alpha was .86. Examples of scale items include “I am interested in launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change” and “I am prepared to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change”.

Data Collection

The students received an email from the researcher describing the research and inviting them to participate. The data collection procedure included a web-based survey. An internet link was sent to the students via email. Reminder notices were sent a week after the initial email was sent.
Data Analysis

The objectives of this study and how each was analyzed are as follows:

- To describe the research participants on selected personal characteristics: Age, Gender, School Classification, and Race.
- To measure the research participants’ proactive personality score, hope score and social entrepreneurial intentions score.

Frequencies, means and standard deviations in categories as applicable were calculated for each characteristic and each score.

- To determine if a positive relationship exists between individuals’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.
- To determine to what extent hope will moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions such that the higher the hope score, the more individuals will have social entrepreneurial intentions.

Pearson’s correlation coefficient was employed to determine if proactive personality was a significant predictor of social entrepreneurial intentions. Moderated multiple regression was utilized to determine whether the proposed moderating variable, hope, strengthened the relationship between the proposed predictor, proactive personality, and the criterion variable, social entrepreneurial intentions. Moderated multiple regression is widely used in management, psychology, and related disciplines. Accordingly, proactive personality, the predictor variable, and hope, the proposed moderator variable, were entered in Step 1 of the moderated multiple regression analysis. In Step 2, the interaction term reflecting the product of the predictor variable (proactive personality) and moderator variable (hope) was entered. A statistically significant increment in $R^2$ at Step 2, with an effect size of .02, supports a moderator effect.
Limitations of the Study

When considering the generalizability of the findings, potential limitations should be noted. African American and Hispanic sample precludes generalization to other races. Future researchers should examine social entrepreneurial intentions with a more racially diverse sample.

A second limitation is the inability to draw causal conclusions. However, research indicates that personality traits are fairly stable over time (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986), suggesting that the causal direction is from personality to social entrepreneurial intentions rather than the reverse. Future longitudinal research is needed both to provide further evidence for the stability of proactive personality over time and to establish the causal direction between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.

A third limitation is that data were collected using survey methodology which may be susceptible to problems such as common method variance and social desirability (Podsakoff &
Organ, 1986), and future researchers should attempt to develop and employ other methods for examining social entrepreneurial intentions than survey questionnaire.

A fourth limitation of this study was that the researcher combined African American and Hispanic undergraduate students. The differences of the two ethnic groups may become evident if the researcher had an adequate sample size for both groups.

A final limitation is that focusing on behavioral intentions weakens the explanatory power of the model. While the intention-behavior linkage is well established (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980), and entrepreneurial intentions have been studied previously (Crant, 1996), a longitudinal design following the students' career choices over time would be preferable. While this study provides compelling evidence for the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions, it would be inappropriate to generalize these results to actual social entrepreneurial behaviors like starting a new social enterprise or venture until such a relationship is confirmed by empirical research.

In this study, proactive personality was measured as a dispositional variable. Though this is in line with previous research (Crant, 1995; Seibert et al., 1999), it is possible that individual proactivity can be influenced by situational factors (Crant, 2000) as well as manipulated in an experimental setting. Future research could examine the possibility of how African American and Hispanic undergraduate students can be made more proactive through training initiatives.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was: 1) to determine if a relationship exists between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions; and 2) to determine if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. A total of 214 students responded to the survey during the Spring 2010 semester. Findings and analysis of the data are presented in this chapter. Results are arranged and presented by research objectives and hypotheses.

Objective One

Objective one of the study was to describe African American and Hispanic undergraduate students from a research extensive university in the southern United States on the following selected personal characteristics:

- Age
- Gender
- School Classification
- Ethnicity

Age

The first variable on which respondents were described was current age. Respondents were asked to choose the most appropriate range that included their current age. The category options were “18-25”, “26-35”, “36-45”, “46-55”, “56-65”, “66-75”, “76-85”, and “86 and older”. The largest number of respondents indicated their age as between 18 and 25 years (n = 210, 98.1%). The second largest group was the 26-35 age group, with 3 (1.4%). Only one respondent (n = 1, .5%) indicated their age as between 36 and 45 years. Table 1 gives the sample’s age distribution.
Gender

Regarding gender of the African American and Hispanic undergraduate study participants; the majority of the participants (n = 136, 63.6%) indicated their gender as female. Seventy eight subjects (36.4%) reported their gender as male.

Table 1

Age distribution of African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 and older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Classification

Respondents were also asked to report their year classification in school. The year classification for the largest group of respondents was senior (n = 66, 30.8%). The second largest group of respondents was sophomores (n = 59, 27.6%). The smallest group of respondents was freshman (n = 39, 18.2%). The information regarding year of classification of respondents is provided in Table 2.
Table 2

Year of Classification Distribution of African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Classification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

Regarding ethnicity of the study participants; the majority of the participants (n = 164, 76.6%) indicated their ethnicity as African American. Fifty subjects (23.4%) reported their ethnicity as Hispanic.

Objective Two

Objective two of the study was to measure the research participants’ proactive personality score, hope score and social entrepreneurial intentions score as measured by the proactive personality scale, the state hope scale and the social entrepreneurial intentions scale. Norms for the scales have not been established. The researcher contacted the scale developers and was advised to base norms on the study sample. Based on this information the scores were organized by the researcher by identifying the points on the scale which divided the scale into quartiles. Individuals in the highest quartile were designated as high (≥75th percentile). Individuals in the middle quartile were designated as moderate (26th-74th percentile). Individuals in the lowest quartile were designated as low (≤ 25 percentile).
Factor Analysis for Proactive Personality

The proactive personality scale used in this study consisted of ten items. The scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying factors could be identified. Results of the factor analysis procedure revealed one factor which explained 54.675% of the variance and an eigenvalue of 5.467. The items included in proactive personality, and their loadings (.803, .781, .780, .763, .757, .733, .723, .718, .685 and .636) are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Component Matrix for Proactive Personality Scores of African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive Personality</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see something I don’t like, I fix it</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others’ opposition</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I excel at identifying opportunities</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always looking for better ways to do things</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can spot a good opportunity long before others can</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Eigenvalue = 5.467, Percent of Variance = 54.675)
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Factor Analysis for State Hope

The state hope scale used in this study consisted of six items. The scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying factors could be identified. Results of the factor analysis procedure revealed one factor which explained 58.584% of the variance and an eigenvalue of 3.515. The items included in state hope, and their loadings (.827, .823, .814, .802, .718, and .577) are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Component Matrix for State Hope Scores of African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Hope</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I find myself in a jam I could think of many ways to get out of it</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my goals</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lots of ways around any problem that I am facing now.</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now I see myself as being pretty successful.</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can think of many ways to reach my current goals</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this time, I am meeting the goals that I have set for myself</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Eigenvalue = 3.515, Percent of Variance = 58.584)
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Factor Analysis for Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

The social entrepreneurial intentions scale used in this study consisted of five items. The scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying factors could be identified. Results of the factor analysis procedure revealed one factor which explained 66.206% of the variance and an
eigenvalue of 3.310. The items included in social entrepreneurial intentions, and their loadings (.872, .871, .844, .736, and .733) are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5**

**Component Matrix for Social Entrepreneurial Intentions Scores of African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Entrepreneurial Intentions</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considered launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am prepared to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am going to try hard to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How soon are you likely to launch your social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change?</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Eigenvalue = 3.310, Percent of Variance = 66.206)*

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

The mean proactive personality score for the respondents was 5.7 (SD = .88) and the scores ranged from a low of 1.50 to a high of 7.5. Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a high score (≥ 75 percentile) was 6.3 or higher. The percentage of students that had a high score was 25.4% (n = 54). Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a moderate score (26th-74th percentile) was 5.21 to 6.29. The percentage of students with a moderate score was
47.4% (n = 101). Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a low score (≤ 25 percentile) was 5.2 or lower. The percentage of students with a low score was 27.2% (n = 58).

The mean state hope score was 6.51 (SD = 1.01) and the scores ranged from a low of 2.50 to a high of 8. Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a high score (≥ 75 percentile) was 7.17 or higher. The percentage of students that had a high score was 26.3% (n = 51). Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a moderate score (26th-74th percentile) was 6.1 to 7.16. The percentage of students with a moderate score was 42.3% (n = 82). Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a low score (≤ 25 percentile) was 6 or lower. The percentage of students with a low score was 31.4% (n = 61).

The mean social entrepreneurial intentions score was 3.11 (SD = .87) and the scores ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a high score (≥ 75 percentile) was 3.75 or higher. The percentage of students that had a high score was 30% (n = 64). Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a moderate score (26th-74th percentile) was 3.1 to 3.74. The percentage of students with a moderate score was 20.7% (n = 44). Based on the quartiles established using the sample data a low score (≤ 25 percentile) was 3 or lower. The percentage of students with a low score was 49.3% (n = 105).

Table 6 illustrates the distribution of respondents’ scores.

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Percentile (≤ 25)</th>
<th>Percentile (26th-74th)</th>
<th>Percentile (≥75th)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2 (n = 58)</td>
<td>5.21-6.29 (n = 6.3)</td>
<td>6.3 (n = 66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective Three

Objective three (hypothesis one) of the study was that a positive relationship exists between individuals’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient was employed to determine if proactive personality was positively related to social entrepreneurial intentions. Results of the Pearson’s correlation coefficient indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions ($r = .397, p < .001$); therefore hypothesis one was supported.

Objective Four

Objective four (hypothesis two) of the study was to determine whether the proposed moderating variable, hope, strengthened the relationship between the proposed predictor, proactive personality, and the criterion variable, social entrepreneurial intentions. Accordingly, proactive personality, the predictor variable, and hope, the proposed moderator variable, were entered in Step
1 of the regression analysis. In Step 2, the interaction term reflecting the product of the predictor and moderator variables was entered. The addition of the product term resulted in an R squared change of .000. This result shows that hope does not moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions; therefore hypothesis two was not supported. Table 7 presents the results of the moderated multiple regression.

**Table 7**

The Moderating Role of Hope in the Relationship between Proactive Personality and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. $F$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>19.817</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose and Objectives

The primary purpose of this study was 1) to determine if a relationship exists between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions; and 2) to determine if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.

Specific objectives formulated to guide the research include:

1. To describe the research participants on selected personal characteristics: Age, Gender, School Classification, and Ethnicity.
2. To measure the research participants’ proactive personality score, state hope score and social entrepreneurial intentions score.
3. To determine if a positive relationship exists between individuals’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.
4. To determine to what extent hope will moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions such that the higher the hope score, the more likely will individuals have greater social entrepreneurial intentions.

Procedures

The target population for this study was full time African American and Hispanic undergraduate students enrolled in research extensive universities in the southern portion of the United States. The accessible population for this study was African American and Hispanic fulltime undergraduate students who attended the institution where this study was conducted during the spring 2010 semester. Data collected for this study were analyzed to meet the objectives of this study using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software program. Throughout the process of data collection, no personal identification information (i.e. name, social security number)
was collected from survey participants. Each subject was assigned an identification number for the purpose of data entry and follow-up with non-responders. The frame for this study included African American and Hispanic fulltime undergraduate students during the spring 2010 semester. The frame of the accessible population was identified through the registrar at the institution where this study was conducted. A simple random sample of n = 176 was drawn from the population of N = 2,545 African American and Hispanic undergraduate students at the institution where this study was conducted.

The students received an email from the researcher describing the research and inviting them to participate. The data collection procedure included a web-based survey. An internet link was sent to the students via email. Reminder notices were sent a week after the initial email was sent.

**Summary of Findings**

**Objective One**

Objective one was to describe the students who participated in the study on specific demographic characteristics. Findings of objective one indicated that female was the most frequently reported gender of the respondents (n = 136, 63.6%). The greatest number of respondents were between 18 and 25 years of age (n = 210, 98.1%). The classification level of the largest group of respondents was seniors (n = 66, 30.8%); the second largest group of respondents was sophomores (n = 59, 27.6%). Regarding ethnicity of the study participants; the majority of the participants (n = 164, 76.6%) indicated their ethnicity as African American. Fifty subjects (23.4%) reported their ethnicity as Hispanic.

**Objective Two**

This objective was to measure the research participants’ proactive personality score, state hope score, and social entrepreneurial score as measured by the proactive personality scale, the state
hope scale, and the social entrepreneurial intentions scale. The mean proactive personality score for the respondents was 5.65 (SD = .88). The mean state hope score was 6.51 (SD = 1.01). The mean social entrepreneurial intentions score was 3.11 (SD = .87).

**Objective Three**

Objective three (hypothesis one) of the study was to determine if a positive relationship exists between individuals’ proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient was employed to determine if proactive personality was a positively related to social entrepreneurial intentions. Results of the Pearson’s correlation coefficient indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions (r = .397, p < .001); therefore hypothesis one was supported.

**Objective Four**

Objective four (hypothesis two) of the study was to determine whether the proposed moderating variable, hope, strengthened the relationship between the proposed predictor, proactive personality, and the criterion variable, social entrepreneurial intentions. Accordingly, proactive personality, the predictor variable, and hope, the proposed moderator variable, were entered in Step 1 of the analysis. In Step 2, the interaction term reflecting the product of the predictor and moderator variables was entered. The addition of the product term resulted in an R squared change of .000. This result shows that hope does not moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions; therefore hypothesis two was not supported.

**Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations**

From the findings of this study, the researcher derived the following conclusions, implications, and recommendations.
Conclusion One

Findings of objective one indicated that female was the most frequently reported gender of the respondents. These findings reflected the trend in universities that most of the undergraduate African American and Hispanic undergraduate students are women (King, 2006). There is a need to reach out to underrepresented minorities in order for them to attend college and gain the skills necessary for them to become change agents in their communities. There is also a need to reach out to African American and Hispanic men. In a previous study, King (2000) stated that African American and Hispanic males lag behind their female peers in educational attainment and are far outpaced by whites and Asian Americans. The percentage of Hispanic undergraduates aged 24 or younger who are male has declined from 45 percent in 1999–2000 to 42 percent in 2007–08. Hispanic young men also have the lowest bachelor’s degree attainment level of any group studied, at only 10 percent (King, 2010). Based on these trends it is recommended that universities and other institutions increase their efforts in recruiting Hispanic and African American men.

Conclusion Two

The African American and Hispanic undergraduate students demonstrated moderate levels of proactive personality as measured by the proactive personality scale. It may be that most of the African Americans and Hispanics who attend college have a proactive personality in which they identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative, take action, and persevere until meaningful change occurs (Crant, 2000). Those proactive individuals probably see college as an opportunity in which they can impact their life, family, and communities. Even though the researcher measured proactive personality as a dispositional variable, which is consistent with previous research (Crant, 1995; Seibert et al., 1999), it is possible that individual proactivity can be influenced by situational factors (Crant, 2000) as well as manipulated in an experimental setting. Future research should
examine the possibility of how African American and Hispanic undergraduate students can be made more proactive. It is possible that organizational climate, training and development, and other factors may contribute to a person becoming more or less proactive.

**Conclusion Three**

African American and Hispanic undergraduate students exhibited moderate hope scores as measured by the state hope scale. Previous research (Adams et al, 2003) stated that African Americans exhibited high levels of hope which they draw on as a way of remaining resilient in the face of adversity and enhancing their subjective well-being. Previous research (Edwards et al, 2007) demonstrated that as young Hispanics identify and develop goals across various life arenas, they may need to marshal agency and pathways thoughts to navigate around obstacles such as poverty, discrimination, etc. It would be important for researchers to conduct research to examine the factors that can increase levels of hope amongst African American and Hispanic college students. Factors that may reduce hope may be the current economic climate in the United States and the high levels of unemployment and poverty in African American and Hispanic communities. Practitioners and researchers alike need to identify ways to increase the levels of hope in African American and Hispanic undergraduate students in order to give them the willpower and way-power to overcome all obstacles that life has in store for them. It is also important to acknowledge that the state hope scale used in the study may not be adequately measuring hope as it is perceived by African American and Hispanic undergraduate students. It is possible that Caucasian undergraduate students conceptualize hope differently from other ethnic groups. Researchers may need to conduct a qualitative study to explore the construct of hope and eventually design new instruments that adequately measures hope as it pertains to African American and Hispanic undergraduate students.
Future studies should also examine hope among undergraduate students at historically black colleges or universities, and at Hispanic serving institutions.

**Conclusion Four**

African American and Hispanic undergraduate students have moderate social entrepreneurial intentions as revealed by the scores. This conclusion suggests that African American and Hispanic students do have a desire to make a difference by creating non-profit or for-profit social enterprises and ventures that can impact their communities and society in general; Greenleaf (2002), pointed out that one of the flaws in the U.S education system is it does not prepare individuals for leadership and does not encourage the poor to improve the communities in which they were raised. Universities and other institutions may use these results as justification to prepare and equip minority college students with the skills and resources to enable them to positively impact their communities through social entrepreneurial ventures. These students may not have high social entrepreneurial intentions because of a lack of knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to carry on such a venture. Qualitative research may need to be conducted to identify additional factors that will increase African American and Hispanic students’ social entrepreneurial intentions. Social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic students may be increased if they have access to social networks/professional networks etc. Research in this area needs to be conducted.

**Conclusion Five**

The findings demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between having a proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic undergraduate students. These findings support the conclusions of Crant (1996) which stated that proactive college students tend to have intentions to become entrepreneurs. Based on this
Conclusion it can be said that proactive African American and Hispanic students have a desire and intend to make a difference and become social entrepreneurs. The study demonstrated that the proactive personality scale can be used to identify African American and Hispanic students with social entrepreneurial intentions. The next step would be for researchers and practitioners to conceptualize frameworks that can aid in training and developing social entrepreneurs in order to solve some of the complex problems facing the African American and Hispanic communities in the United States. Critical pedagogy and the Center for Creative Leadership’s Assessment, Challenge, and Support (ACS) model may be utilized (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004). The students may be 1) Assessed to determine if they are proactive and have social entrepreneurial intentions; 2) challenged by a curriculum that allows them to think critically about issues affecting their communities and to formulate innovative business plans, and, 3) supported by mentors, and other social entrepreneurs, etc.

Conclusion Six

The findings of the study contribute to the understanding of both social entrepreneurial intentions and proactive personality constructs. The results provide a model of social entrepreneurial intentions by adding a dispositional variable. The findings suggest that dispositional variables (i.e., proactive personality) have the potential to explain variance in social entrepreneurial intentions in addition to that accounted for by other individual and organizational variables. This result also contributes to the research literature on proactive personality and may be one of the first to empirically demonstrate that proactive personality is associated with social entrepreneurial intentions. Proactive personality has previously been linked to leadership, sales performance, personal achievements, and entrepreneurial intentions. The findings indicate that social entrepreneurial intentions are also associated with proactive personality.
Conclusion Seven

The findings regarding the proactive personality scale are consistent with the interactional psychology perspective (Bandura 1977; Schneider, 1983), which postulates that there is a mutual influence between individuals and their environments. Individuals select, interpret, and alter situations. People may be expected to seek out environments that offer opportunities to capitalize on individual strengths and needs (Schneider 1983), and the characteristics of an environment are in part determined by the types of people who dominate that environment (Holland, 1985). Thus, one explanation for these findings is that more proactive people tend to envision creating situations such as creating social enterprises or ventures that will allow them to capitalize on their personality. Entrepreneurship favors proactive individuals who discern and actively seek opportunities that can benefit them and those in their community. Researchers and practitioners may want to investigate how state and local government support can influence social entrepreneurial activity in terms of assisting the social entrepreneur via grants, workshops, and other initiatives.

Conclusion Eight

The findings demonstrated that hope did not moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. This was surprising; however, it may be that African American and Hispanic undergraduate students need more than hope to stimulate their desire to become social entrepreneurs and transform their communities. It is also likely that the moderated relationship was not supported because some students may not yet possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to create social enterprises. Future research should consider other possible moderating mechanisms involved in the proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions relationship. It is possible that entrepreneurial parents, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, socio-economic status, and other variables may moderate the relationship between
proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions. There is also general agreement that social networks play a major role in the entrepreneurial process by providing the fundamental resources necessary for starting a business (Boyd, 1989). This has implications for social entrepreneurship. There is also a need to determine if a social network plays a role in an individual having social entrepreneurial intentions because African American and Hispanic undergraduate students may not have social networks and professional-support networks that can give them advice and counsel in the establishment of a social venture. Universities may want to provide these social and professional networks to their minority students by inviting successful entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, and venture capitalists to hold special workshops that will aid students in developing their networks and to gain skills in formulating business plans and accessing much needed funding to get the enterprise off the ground. The finding also highlights the need for a social entrepreneur development program that gives young African American and Hispanic undergraduate students the self efficacy and skills necessary for them to become social entrepreneurs. Researchers need to conceptualize social entrepreneurial development frameworks that can be utilized to develop individuals who can make positive impacts in their communities (Prieto, Osiri & Gilmore, 2009). This will link social entrepreneurship with human resource development and it will aid in developing individuals who have a desire to challenge the status quo in communities that are facing poverty, crime, etc. Future research may also want to consider sampling different groups such as MBA students and other individuals that may have the entrepreneurial KSAs to see if hope moderates the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions.

The finding that hope does not moderate the relationship between proactive personality and social entrepreneurial intentions also demonstrates the need for corporations who engage in social entrepreneurship to aid minority college students by offering internships that focus on corporate
social responsibility and corporate social entrepreneurship in order to give them valuable knowledge, skills, and abilities. Individuals who operate within a corporation in a socially entrepreneurial manner are known as corporate social entrepreneurs (Hemingway, 2005). Organizations can play a major role in developing corporate social entrepreneurs. In terms of recruitment, organizations that are focused on diversity and corporate social responsibility/corporate social entrepreneurship may want to hire proactive minorities with social entrepreneurial intentions in order to aid them in formulating or reinvigorating community initiatives. Research needs to be conducted to determine if internships and cooperative assignments (co-ops) that focus on corporate social responsibility/corporate social entrepreneurship increase social entrepreneurial intentions among African American and Hispanic college students.
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Thank you very much for participating in this study. I am conducting a study that examines the influence of proactive personality on social entrepreneurial intentions. I am requesting your participation by filling out a Web-based questionnaire, which only takes 10 to 15 minutes to complete. The survey contains questions relating to students' intentions to become social entrepreneurs. Your valuable responses can greatly help universities and other institutions understand what drives students' social entrepreneurial intentions.

You have been selected to participate in this study out of a database of African American and Hispanic undergraduate students enrolled at Louisiana State University. Your participation is completely voluntary and you can decide at any time not to participate in this study. Your responses will remain confidential and you will not be identified in any way in the final reports. By completing this survey, you are agreeing to participate in this study.
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Leon Prieto
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Lprieto@lsu.edu

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Matthews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
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I am in the early stages of my dissertation entitled "The Influence of Proactive Personality on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among African American and Hispanic Undergraduate Students". I would love for you to give me feedback and suggestions as I develop an appropriate instrument to capture "social entrepreneurial intentions" for the purposes of my study. I believe that your expertise will be extremely valuable and will help me achieve face/content validity.

I first looked at the social entrepreneurship literature to determine if an appropriate instrument existed; seeing none I came across a scale entitled the Entrepreneurial Decision Scale developed by Chen, Green, and Crick (1998) which was designed to predict the likelihood of an individual being an entrepreneur in the paper entitled "Does entrepreneurial self efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers?". I then modified the items to suit the needs of my study in order to capture "social entrepreneurial intentions".

Can you please give me suggestions and feedback on the items on the social entrepreneurial intentions scale I am designing for my study. Thank you in advance for all of your assistance.

I have attached the "social entrepreneurial intentions scale" to the email.
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Leon Christopher Prieto
**Proposed Social Entrepreneurial Intentions Measure**

1) I am interested in creating and/ or leading an organization and/or initiative that strives to advance positive social change.

2) I have considered setting up an organization and/or initiative that strives to advance positive social change.

3) I am prepared to set up my organization and/or initiative that strive to advance positive social change.

4) I am going to try hard to set up my organization and/or initiative that strive to advance positive social change.

5) How soon are you likely to set up your own organization and/or initiative that strive to advance positive social change? *(Select the response that most closely matches your plans).*
Social Entrepreneurial Intentions Scale (adapted from Chen, Greene, and Crick (1998) Entrepreneurial Decision Scale)

Directions: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

Directions: Please circle the appropriate number based on your response to the questions below.

1) I am interested in launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

2) I have considered launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

3) I am prepared to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

4) I am going to try hard to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

5) How soon are you likely to launch your social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change? (Select the response that most closely matches your plans).

1 = never   2 = After 10+ YEARS   3 = Within 6-10 YEARS   4 = within 1-5 YEARS   5 = Within 1 YEAR
Scale: Social Entrepreneurial Intentions

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

PROACTIVE PERSONALITY SCALE
Shortened Version Bateman and Crant (1993) Proactive Personality Scale

Directions: Using the scale shown below, please select the number that best describes you and put that number in the blank provided. 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Mildly Disagree, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Mildly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

1. I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life.
2. Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change.
3. Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality.
4. If I see something I don’t like, I fix it.
5. No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen.
6. I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others’ opposition.
7. I excel at identifying opportunities.
8. I am always looking for better ways to do things.
9. If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen.
10. I can spot a good opportunity long before others can.
APPENDIX E

STATE HOPE SCALE
Snyder (1996) Six-Item State Hope Scale

Directions: Using the scale shown below, please select the number that best describes how you think about yourself right now and put that number in the blank provided. Please take a few moments to focus on yourself and what is going on in your life at this moment. Once you have this "here and now" set, go ahead and answer each item according to the following scale: 1 = Definitely False, 2 = Mostly False, 3 = Somewhat False, 4 = Slightly False, 5 = Slightly True, 6 = Somewhat True, 7 = Mostly True, and 8 = Definitely True.

1. If I should find myself in a jam, I could think of many ways to get out of it.
2. At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my goals.
3. There are lots of ways around any problem that I am facing now.
4. Right now I see myself as being pretty successful.
5. I can think of many ways to reach my current goals.
6. At this time, I am meeting the goals that I have set for myself.
APPENDIX F

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS SCALE
Social Entrepreneurial Intentions Scale (adapted from Chen, Greene, and Crick (1998) Entrepreneurial Decision Scale)

Directions: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

Directions: Please circle the appropriate number based on your response to the questions below.

1) I am interested in launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

2) I have considered launching a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

3) I am prepared to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

4) I am going to try hard to launch a social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change.

5) How soon are you likely to launch your social enterprise or venture that strives to advance positive social change? (Select the response that most closely matches your plans).

1 = never   2 = After 10+ YEARS   3 = Within 6-10 YEARS   4 = within 1-5 YEARS   5 = Within 1 YEAR
APPENDIX G

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Demographic Information

Gender: ______Male          ______Female

Ethnicity: _____African American   ____Hispanic

Class level _____Freshman   _____Sophomore   _____Junior   _____Senior

Age: ___18-25  ___26-35  ___36-45  ___46-55  ___56-65  ___66-75  ___76-85  ___86 and older
Hi Dr. Crant,

I am a doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University and my dissertation topic is The Influence of Proactive Personality on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among African American and Hispanic Students: The Moderating Role of Hope.

I am requesting permission to use your proactive personality scale; looking forward to your response.


Leon Christopher Prieto

________________________________________

"I live in the shadows of great men before me, but that won't stop me from illuminating the world with my presence"

---

Hi Leon,

Anyone is welcome to use the proactive personality scale for research purposes, so you have our permission. Good luck with the project.

Mike

___________________________

Mike Crant
Professor and Department Chair
Department of Management
102G Mendoza College of Business
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
APPENDIX I

PERMISSION TO USE HOPE SCALE
Hi Dr. Borders,

I am a doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University and my dissertation topic is The Influence of Proactive Personality on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among African American and Hispanic Students: The Moderating Role of Hope.

I am requesting permission to use your State Hope Scale you developed with C. R. Snyder, looking forward to your response.

Leon Christopher Prieto

"I live in the shadows of great men before me, but that won't stop me from illuminating the world with my presence"

Hi, Leon.

I am glad that you are interested in the State Hope Scale. Dr. Snyder passed away about 2-3 years ago. I am sure that he would be delighted to have others use the scale. I believe that it is available in the article that we published (with Snyder CR as lead author) in the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.

-TFB
APPENDIX J

PERMISSION TO USE ENTREPRENEURIAL DECISION SCALE
Hi. Dr. Chen,

I am a doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University and my dissertation topic is The Influence of Proactive Personality on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among African American and Hispanic Students: The Moderating Role of Hope.

I am requesting permission to use your Entrepreneurial Decision Scale you developed with Greene and Chick, looking forward to your response.

---

Leon Christopher Prieto

__________________________

"I live in the shadows of great men before me, but that won’t stop me from illuminating the world with my presence."

---

Hi Leon,
Sure you have my permission. For your convenience, here is the scale. Chao
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