



Making a Difference: The Relationship Between Prosocial Motivation and Social Entrepreneurial Intention, with Creativity in Social Work as a Mediating Variable

Rocky Ardian Stanlie¹, Elissa Dwi Lestari^{1(✉)}, and Florentina Kurniasari²

¹ Department of Management, Universitas Multimedia Nusantara, Tangerang, Indonesia
rockyardianstanlie@gmail.com, elissa.lestari@umn.ac.id

² Department of Technology Management, Universitas Multimedia Nusantara, Tangerang, Indonesia
florentina@umn.ac.id

Abstract. Industrialization has had a negative impact on emerging countries such as Indonesia, leading to the emergence of many unresolved socioeconomic issues. The government and business sectors, which are supposed to be capable of resolving societal challenges, have failed to do so consistently. The dissatisfaction and relative inadequacy of the public and private sectors to deal with social problems makes social entrepreneurship a foreseen solution to resolve social issues in Indonesia. Despite its importance, Indonesia's number of entrepreneurs, particularly social entrepreneurs, remains well below that of other countries such as the United States and China. As a result, this study was carried out to determine the factors that influence the formation of social entrepreneurship intention by considering prosocial motivation and creativity components in social work. Purposive sampling was used to recruit 158 students in Indonesia for the study. SmartPLS 3.0 is used to evaluate the data using the PLS-SEM approach. Prosocial motivation and creativity in social work both positively and significantly affect social entrepreneurial intention. Moreover, creativity in social work mediates a partial relationship between prosocial motivation and social entrepreneurial intention.

Keywords: prosocial motivation · creativity in social work · social entrepreneurial intention · student · Indonesia

1 Introduction

Industrialization and economic growth have occurred in much of the world in recent decades. However, poverty remains one of the biggest social problems of the 21st century [1] experienced by most countries, including Indonesia [2]. Indonesia's Central Statistics Agency (BPS) defines poverty as the inability to meet basic needs, both basic food needs and basic non-food needs [3]. World population review ranks Indonesia as the 73rd poorest country in the world in 2022 [4]. In addition to poverty, Indonesia is still struggling to overcome other social problems, such as high unemployment, social inequality, crime, juvenile delinquency and low levels of education [4].

© The Author(s) 2023

Nairobi et al. (Eds.): ICEBE 2022, AEBMR 241, pp. 470–483, 2023.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-064-0_49

Therefore, as a representation of society, the state faces many social problems that they are not good enough to deal with, such as increasing social needs and concerns [5, 6]. On the other hand, non-profit organizations and the private sector also do not help much to solve the many social problems that arise [7, 8]. Dissatisfaction with the relative inability of the public and private sectors to deal with social issues in society explains why social entrepreneurship is one of the alternative solutions that are considered capable of providing solutions and direct impacts on various social problems that develop in society [7, 9].

According to [10], Social entrepreneurship (SE) is about finding new solutions to complex social problems. An innovative form of business which successfully combines social goals and commercial practices. Social entrepreneurship has emerged in response to chronic social issues such as unemployment, poverty, community fragmentation, etc. [6]. Previous studies have shown that many SEs increase their social impact through ecosystem growth strategies through three forms of activity: advocacy work, supporting the creation of new SE and young SE growth, and building new industries and/or maturing nascent sectors to addressing specific social problems [8].

Even though it has a significant impact, most business types in Indonesia are still profit-oriented. In fact, with so many social problems that exist in Indonesia, it requires the role of a sociopreneur. According to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor records in 2017, the average number of social entrepreneurs globally was 4.5%, ranging from the lowest in Asia, 0.4%, to the American highest, 11.6%. Compared to commercial entrepreneurs in the same region, it yields an average of 8.7%, with the smallest in India, 19.9%, to the American 25.4%. Southeast Asia, including Indonesia, is the region with the least sociopreneur, with a value of 5%, compared to America and China at 30% [11].

The lack of sociopreneurs, when compared to the potential social and business impacts that SE practices may create, therefore, attracts the attention of many researchers to find out the factors that drive an individual to engage in SE activities [12–14]. Understanding entrepreneurial intentions are the first step to understanding entrepreneurial behavior [15]. In the context of student entrepreneurial intentions, [16] explained that activities to run a business in the future are a form of planned career choice. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) has been recognized as the most vigorous theoretical framework for explaining the formation of entrepreneurial intentions [16–18]. Therefore, studying the factors that shape the intention to carry out social entrepreneurial activities is a salient aspect of theoretical development regarding SE [12]. Thus, the question of what factors affect an individual's Social Entrepreneurial Intention (SEI) is a study that is still wide open to be explored more deeply, especially in the context of developing countries such as Indonesia, where the SE level is much lower than that of developed countries.

To answer questions regarding SEI, it is crucial to identify the factors that make up the SEI process. The results of previous studies stated that moral assessment in the form of prosocial motivation affects the formation of SEI [12, 19]. In entrepreneurship, motivation is significant; motivation in individuals ensures the enthusiasm possessed by each individual to work happily and voluntarily [20]. Prosocial Motivation theory shows that prosocially motivated individuals will strive to develop innovative and creative ideas to be helpful to others [21]. Suppose in the context of this study. There is prosocial

motivation that individuals have when carrying out social actions. In that case, it is easier for an individual to develop new ideas in social work [22]. Although essential, [23] states that more than Prosocial motivation is needed to stimulate an action. Therefore, this study adds a creativity factor to understand how prosocial motivation can create and develop innovation capabilities in the SEI process.

Creativity is an essential factor in influencing the progress of the entrepreneurial activity. An entrepreneur's success can also depend on how he utilizes creative and innovative ideas in running a business. An entrepreneur must have the principle of creative and innovative ideas to create a business model that can compete with competitors [24]. Previous research has shown that social entrepreneur has a higher level of creativity and risk-taking than entrepreneurs in general [14]. Individuals with high creativity in social work have innovative ideas that can identify various aspects of social problems so that they can create and improve their positive attitudes towards behaviour in entrepreneurship so that they can further increase individual intentions in entrepreneurship [25]. Although it is an essential aspect of SEI, the study of the relationship between creativity in the context of SEI still needs to be explored [14]. Therefore, this research was conducted to fill the gap in research still wide open about SEI by examining the relationship between prosocial motivation and aspects of creativity that are important in the process of social innovation needed in the SEI development process.

2 Literature Review

A. *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurial Intention*

Social entrepreneurship is a business activity to solve or reduce social problems. Social entrepreneurship is a combination of a social mission and a commercial approach. Aiming to solve some social issues, the entrepreneur attracts resources to achieve his mission and receives income from such activities [6]. The literature review conducted by [26] shows that, in general, there are two main characteristics of SE: carrying out business commercialization activities to generate income while simultaneously pursuing social goals. According to [27], a social entrepreneur acts as an agent of change in the social sector by running a business that has a business with a mission of creating and maintaining social value, making various efforts to achieve this mission by carrying out a process of learning, adaptation and innovation on an ongoing basis by utilizing the resources owned to achieve goals.

[28] menyatakan bahwa niat suatu keadaan pikiran seorang individu untuk mencapai tujuan atau path tertentu. According to the TPB, intention is the strongest predictor of entrepreneurial behaviour [16, 18]. Intention reflects that motivational factors influence an individual's behaviour to do something. Social Entrepreneurial Intention (SEI) refers to an individual's intention to start a social enterprise. It is a psychological behaviour that encourages the individual to implement a social plan and eventually become a social

entrepreneur [29]. Social Entrepreneurial Intention (SEI) is an individual's willingness to develop future business activities which help solve social problems [23].

B. *Prosocial Motivation and Social Entrepreneurial Intention*

Prosocial motivation refers to an individual's desire to benefit another person or a community. In organizations, prosocial motivation becomes essential because an individual's impulse to behave does not arise solely because of personal interests but because of the urge to engage in behaviour that can benefit others [30]. Highly motivated individuals tend to place the importance of placing the well-being and interests of others. Highly motivated individuals tend to place importance of placing the well-being and interests of others [31].

Studies conducted by [12] show that an individual's prosocial motivation can increase SEI. Gratitude from others can encourage one's intentions and behaviours to be more vital to help others because it can strengthen the experience of self-efficacy [32]. People usually refrain from helping others because they are unsure of their ability to give excellent and correct assistance. The research conducted by [33] shows that individuals with high prosocial motivation and experience in social work are more able to identify the opinions of others to know what others need., so that they can feel they have the ability to help others. Prosocial motivation can also increase the capacity of individuals to identify opportunities in the realm of social entrepreneurship. Identifying entrepreneurial opportunities is also a driving factor for strong entrepreneurial intention [34]. Gratitude from others will be meaningful for someone already helping in social work so they can be more confident and motivated. Individuals with high prosocial motivation will intend to do things that can benefit others / other-oriented values [12]. Social entrepreneurship arises because of a sense of wanting to help others, benefit others and provide social benefits. Research by [23] also shows a positive influence between prosocial motivation and SEI. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: There is a positive influence between Prosocial Motivation and Social Entrepreneurial Intention.

C. *Prosocial Motivation and Creativity in Social Work*

Creativity is creating new ideas in various fields that are useful/have results and can solve a particular problem [35]. The theory of prosocial motivation mentions that individuals with a high prosocial motivation tend to place more importance on protecting the well-being of others in general and will tend to develop their ideas and efforts to benefit others [21]. Thus, motivated individuals can exchange opinions with others. This can make it easier for them to adopt the views of others, develop and test their innovative ideas and share their experiences with others in social work [22]. Similarly, in terms of communication, feedback from others can stimulate an individual's innovative ideas to increase his creativity in social work [12]. Prosocial motivation can make a unique contribution to a person's creativity. Having prosocial motivation help an individual to focus more on the usefulness of the results of his ideas than the intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy factors [36]. Prosocial motivation makes individuals better understand what the other person needs by thinking about the problem and considering the opinions of others who may differ from it [21]. Similarly, research [37] proves a positive and

reciprocal relationship between prosocial motivation and creativity. For this reason, the following hypothesis is proposed.

H2: *There is a positive influence between Prosocial Motivation on Creativity in Social Work*

D. Creativity in Social Work and Social Entrepreneurial Intention

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) explains that attitude and perceived behavioural control can increase an individual's intention to behave. In addition, entrepreneurial event theory (EET) also explains that individuals with a positive perception and perception of control over entrepreneurial behaviour have a greater intention to be entrepreneurial-owned. Individuals with high creativity in social work have innovative ideas that can identify various aspects of social problems. Creativity in social work creates a self-positive perception about someone's perceived behavioural control to improve their SEI [25]. Individuals with high creativity in social work usually have innovative ideas that can help identify problems and their solutions, hence this becomes an opportunity for them to generate ideas in terms of social entrepreneurship. Individuals with high creativity in social work usually have innovative ideas that can help identify problems and their solutions. Hence this becomes an opportunity for them to generate ideas about social entrepreneurship [38]. Research by [25] also found that creativity is the primary antecedent to Entrepreneurial Intention. Because of this, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H3: *There is a positive influence between Creativity in Social Work and Social Entrepreneurial Intention*

In addition, creativity in social work is also expected to influence mediating prosocial motivation and SEI, as in research conducted [12] which shows that creativity in social work plays a fully mediating role between prosocial motivation and SEI; therefore, the following hypothesis is also proposed:

H4: *Creativity in Social Work has the effect of mediating Prosocial Motivation and Social Entrepreneurial Intention.*

3 Methodology

This research uses a quantitative descriptive research design. The research was conducted using research models and variables used in previous studies, which aim to describe the influence of Prosocial Motivation, Creativity in Social Work on Social Entrepreneurial Intention. This study used non-probability sampling with judgemental sampling techniques on 158 respondents with criteria of students who had been involved in social work activities, had received entrepreneurship education and did not have a business. Data collection was carried out using google forms in April and May 2022.

The Measurement of variables in this research uses measurements taken from previous studies. Meanwhile, the prosocial motivation variable adapts from [30]. The Measurement of variables in this research uses measurements taken from previous studies. Meanwhile, the prosocial motivation variable adapts from [39]. Meanwhile, the Measurement of social entrepreneurial intention variables adapts the research conducted by

[40]. This study used a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Data analysis was conducted using the Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Model method through Smart PLS 3.0 software to test the proposed hypothesis. The first analysis evaluates the measurement model, including convergent testing validity, discriminant validity, and reliability. It is then continued by assessing the structural model, including testing R-square, path coefficient, F-square, and T-statistic using one-tailed tests to find the influence between variables and the mediating role of the variable's creativity in social work.

4 Result and Discussion

A. *Descriptive Analysis of Research*

In this study, of the 181 responses that came in, only 158 respondents or 87.3%, could be further analyzed because they met the established sampling criteria. Regarding respondent profile, the majority of respondents or 60% of respondents, are female and come from the Faculty of Education (36.7%) and the Faculty of Economics and Business (31%). In terms of the frequency of participating in social activities, the majority of respondents or 62.7% have participated in social activities 1–3 times and 23.4% have been involved in social activities 4–6 times before.

B. *Measurement Analysis (Outer) Model*

This study used a variant-based Structural Equation Modeling Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS) whose data was processed with SmartPLS 3 software. Data analysis using SEM PLS was performed in two sequential steps. In the first step, a measurement (outer) analysis of the model is carried out, which is then continued with the model's structural (inner) analysis. Analysis of the measurement model is carried out to check the level of reliability and validity of the research model [41].

The reliability of the research variables was measured by looking at the value of Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach Alpha. To declare good reliability, CR and Cronbach Alpha values must be greater than 0.7 [41, 42]. Based on Table 1, the CR and Cronbach Alpha values in this study are greater than 0.7, and thus the variables in this study have good reliability. Furthermore, the study's convergent validity was measured by looking at the outer loading and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values. To have good convergent validity, the outer loading value of each research item must be greater than 0.7, and the AVE value of each variable must be greater than 0.5. From Table 1 and Table 3, it can be seen that the outer loading value of each research item is greater than 0.7, and the AVE value is greater than 0.5. Finally, the measurement of the discriminant validity of the study was carried out by looking at the cross-loading value. To be valid, the value of the research cross-loading constructs must be greater than 0.7 [41, 42]. Based on Table 3, the value of cross-loading constructs in this study is greater than 0.7 so it can be said that the discriminant validity of this study is good.

Table 1. MEASUREMENT MODEL

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Composite Reliability</i>	<i>Average Variance Extracted</i>
Prosocial Motivation	4	0.869	0.909	0.714
Creativity in Social Work	9	0.916	0.931	0.601
Social Entrepreneurial Intention	9	0.953	0.96	0.727

C. Analysis of Structural (Inner) Model

The next stage after the research construct is declared reliable and valid is to conduct a structural analysis (inner) of the model, in contrast to covariance-based SEM, which uses the Goodness of Fit parameter. PLS-SEM structural model analysis looks at the predictive capabilities of the research model from the determinant coefficient (R2), the degree of significance of the coefficient path (β value) and the Statistical T value (T value) [41–43].

The R2 value of the two endogenous variables in this study was 0.167 or 16.7% for the creativity in social work (CSW) variable and 0.592 or 59.2% for the social entrepreneurial intention (SEI) variable. This means that 16.7% of the variance of the CWS variable can be explained by the Prosocial Motivation (PM) variable. A further 59.2% variance of the SEI variable can be explained by the CWS and PM variables (Table 2).

The hypothesis test in this study was carried out by looking at the significance value of the path coefficient (β value) and the Statistical T value (T value). Based on Table 4, all hypotheses in the study are accepted. First, the results showed that the Prosocial Motivation variable positively affected creativity in social work ($\beta = 0.415$, $T = 5.417$, $P = 0.000$, with moderate effects of $f^2 = 0.207$). Second, the results of the study also showed that the social entrepreneurial intention (SEI) variable was influenced by the Prosocial Motivation $\beta = 0.152$, $T = 2.337$, $P = 0.000$, with weak effects of $f^2 =$

Table 2. FORNELL- LACKER CRITERION (DISCRIMINAT VALIDITY)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>PM</i>	<i>CSW</i>	<i>SEI</i>
Prosocial Motivation (PM)	0.845		
Creativity in Social Work (CSW)	0.415	0.775	
Social Entrepreneurial Intention (SEI)	0.441	0.761	0.853

0.048), and the creativity in social work variable ($\beta = 0.698$, $T = 16.32$, $P = 0.000$, with substantial effects of $f^2 = 1.002$).

Table 3. OUTER- LOADING AND CROSS- LOADING

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>PM</i>	<i>CSW</i>	<i>SEI</i>
PM1	0.841	0.258	0.300
PM2	0.858	0.315	0.376
PM3	0.802	0.324	0.311
PM4	0.878	0.456	0.462
CSW1	0.288	0.753	0.547
CSW2	0.257	0.742	0.592
CSW3	0.208	0.727	0.552
CSW4	0.306	0.703	0.529
CSW5	0.404	0.793	0.564
CSW6	0.396	0.78	0.641
CSW7	0.360	0.841	0.607
CSW8	0.304	0.783	0.580
CSW9	0.338	0.843	0.676
SEI1	0.379	0.591	0.782
SEI2	0.423	0.661	0.863
SEI3	0.391	0.559	0.819
SEI4	0.397	0.621	0.86
SEI5	0.375	0.669	0.921
SEI6	0.349	0.69	0.861
SEI7	0.346	0.725	0.846
SEI8	0.383	0.686	0.89
SEI9	0.349	0.612	0.826

Table 4. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

	<i>Path Hypothesis</i>	<i>Standardized Beta (β)</i>	<i>T Statistic</i>	<i>P Value</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>R2</i>	<i>f2</i>
H1	PM -> CSW	0.415	5.417	0.000	Supported	0.167	0.207
H2	PM -> SEI	0.152	2.337	0.01	Supported	0.592	0.048
H3	CSW -> SEI	0.698	16.32	0.000	Supported		1.002

Table 5. MEDITATION ANALYSIS

	<i>Path Hypothesis</i>	<i>Standardized Beta (β)</i>	<i>T Statistic</i>	<i>P Value</i>	<i>Decision</i>
H4	(X1) PM -> (X2) CSW -> (Y) SEI	0.289	4.734	0.000	Supported

Furthermore, the mediation analysis in this study carried out the coefficient values of indirect relationships between the PM, CSW and SEI variables, the values of the interval coefficient and the p-value as seen in Table 5. Based on Table 5, it can be seen that CSW mediates the relationship between PM and SEI (p-value is 0.000 or less than 0.05). Furthermore, the results showed that the direct relationship between PM variables and SEI had a positive and significant effect. The indirect effect between the PM and SEI variables where there is a CSW variable as a mediator also has a positive and significant influence. Thus, it can be implied that the presence or absence of CSW variables as mediators can still have a positive and significant effect between PM and SEI variables in other words, creativity in social work (CSW) has the role of partial mediation.

D. Discussion

Industrialization and modernization cause many social problems issues that need to be solved. As a developing country, Indonesia is struggling to solve many social problems like poverty, unemployment, criminality, etc. Government and private sector's inability to solve social problems make social entrepreneurship one of the best choices for solving social problems. Unfortunately, the level of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia still low.

[44] states that the understanding of entrepreneurial intention is at the core of the study of entrepreneurship because the intention is the first step in exploring, creating and developing business opportunities. Therefore, in this study context, understanding social entrepreneurial intention becomes critical to understanding SE behaviour, especially for developing countries like Indonesia.

This study examines factors forming the social entrepreneurial intention of students in Indonesia. This research uses prosocial motivation and creativity in social work as antecedents' variable that develops SEI.

This study found that prosocial motivation positively and significantly influences social entrepreneurial intention. This result explains that individuals with a high prosocial motivation from their experience in social work will cultivate an intention to build their social entrepreneurship. Therefore, prosocial motivation influences students' intention to start social entrepreneurship. This finding aligns with previous study results [12, 23, 33]. When carrying out social activities, the gratitude received from others increases the prosocial motivation of students. Prosocial motivation then strengthens the desire from within them to help others, make themselves feel full, and increase personal satisfaction, so that the higher the prosocial motivation, the greater the tendency to become a social entrepreneur.

In addition, prosocial motivation also has a positive and significant influence on creativity in social work, which explains that individuals with high prosocial motivation

from their experience in social work will tend to increase their creativity in social work further. Therefore, prosocial motivation is important in increasing individual creativity in social work. This finding also aligns with previous research study results [12, 21, 45]. Individuals with high prosocial motivation will be eager to solve the problems they encounter during social activities. To be able to solve problems in social activities they need creativity to develop opportunities and business ideas that can provide benefits to others.

The third finding shows that creativity in social work positively and significantly influences social entrepreneurial intention. This result explains that individuals with high creativity in social work will have high intentions in social entrepreneurship. Therefore, that creativity in social work has an essential role in social entrepreneurial intention. These findings also align with previous research results [12, 25, 38]. Where individuals with a high level of social creativity can create innovative business ideas. This will then increase social entrepreneurial intentions.

Moreover, this study further examines the mediating role of creativity in social work on prosocial motivation with social entrepreneurial intention. The result found that creativity in social work partially mediates the relationship between prosocial motivation and social entrepreneurial intention. This result explains that whether or not there is a role of creativity in social work as a mediator continues to have a positive and significant influence between prosocial motivation and social entrepreneurial intention.

5 Conclusions, Implications and Suggestions of Research Limitations

This study discusses some factors that can influence social entrepreneurial intention among students. The findings reveal that individuals with high prosocial motivation can not increase their creativity in doing social work through their social activities. And in the end, they can look for opportunities to produce social entrepreneurship. In addition, creativity in social work partially mediates prosocial motivation and social entrepreneurial intention. In the presence or absence of high individual creativity, it can still increase social entrepreneurial intention through high prosocial motivation.

A. Research Implication

The results of this study make a theoretical contribution to the study of social entrepreneurship, particularly the study of social entrepreneurial intentions. First, this study's results confirm the positive influence of intrinsic motivational variables in the form of prosocial motivation on the formation of SEI. Second, the results of this study also confirm the critical role of creativity in creating and developing important social innovations in the construction of SEI. Third, the results of this study also confirm the role of creativity in social work as a mediator of the relationship between prosocial motivation and SEI. Fourth, this research enriches the literature on SEI for developing countries that still need to be widely studied empirically.

This study may provide some important managerial implications based on the results. First, prosocial motivation can increase social entrepreneurial intention. Therefore,

researchers suggest that relevant institutions provide an overview or lesson on the importance of doing good to fellow humans and the environment. It can be through a seminar program that is collaborated with influencers and business actors who also care about social and environmental.

Second, prosocial motivation can increase creativity in social work. Therefore, researchers suggest that related institutions bridge students to external communities related to social service so that they can participate in various social activities to trigger creative thinking in social work. For example, the external organization Gerakan Mengajar Desa (GMD) focuses on educational equity programs throughout Indonesia. This aligns with the vision and mission of related institutions to produce professional teaching graduates. By wheezing the organization, students can increase motivation and creativity in their social work.

Third, creativity in social work can increase social entrepreneurial intention. Therefore, researchers suggest that related institutions can provide the latest information about economic and social issues by subscribing to news platforms such as TechinAsia, MoneyKompas, DailySocial, and others. To be accessed by students so that it can provoke individuals to think creatively in finding a platform to solve the problem from an economic and business point of view. So that individuals can have a high sense of confidence to accept the risks of the decisions they make and believe that any considerable risk will significantly impact society and the economy.

B. *Research Limitation*

The study has some limitations that need to be noted to provide opportunities for future research. First, this study uses the variables of prosocial motivation, creativity in social work, and social entrepreneurial intention. The creativity in social work variable in this study was influenced by 16.7% by prosocial motivation, and the social entrepreneurial intention variable was influenced by 59.2% by prosocial motivation and creativity in social work. Therefore, researchers recommend considering new variables that may influence social entrepreneurial intentions that are not studied in this study to reach more broadly what factors affect a person's intentions in social entrepreneurship, such as entrepreneurial self-efficacy, attitude, subjective norms, or perceived behavioural control. Second, this study used a limited sample of respondents with sample of 158 respondents. Therefore, researchers suggest expanding the research reach by enriching respondent criteria and increasing the number of respondents so that the research findings will be more accurate than this study.

Third, this study used 22 question indicators in the questionnaire. Therefore, researchers suggest enriching the question indicators through other supporting journals to provide a broader understanding of different sides than this study.

References

1. S. A. Alvarez, J. B. Barney, and A. M. B. Newman, "The poverty problem and the industrialization solution," *Asia Pacific J.Manag.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 23–37, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-014-9397-5>.

2. M. A. Lingga, “Kemiskinan Masih Jadi Tantangan Besar Indonesia,” *kom-pas.com*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://ekonomi.kompas.com/read/2018/10/25/154008526/kemiskinan-masih-jadi-tantangan-besar-indonesia>.
3. A. Soleh, “Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Kemiskinan di Indonesia,” *Ekombis Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 197–209, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.23917/reaksi.v3i1.5609>.
4. A. Rahmah, “7 Contoh Masalah Sosial di Indonesia dan Faktor Penyebabnya,” *detik.com*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.detik.com/edu/detikpedia/d-6041632/7-contoh-masalah-sosial-di-indonesia-dan-faktor-penyebabnya.%0A>.
5. M. Shahverdi, K. Ismail, and M. I. Qureshi, “The effect of perceived barriers on social entrepreneurship intention in Malaysian universities: The moderating role of education,” *Manag. Sci. Lett.*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 341–352, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2018.4.014>.
6. I. Kostetska and I. Berezyak, “Social Entrepreneurship as an Innovative Solution Mechanism of Social Problem of Society,” *Manag. Theory Stud. Rural Bus. Infrastruct.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 1822–6760, 2014.
7. H. Prodanov, “Social Entrepreneurship And Digital Technologies,” *Econ. Altern.*, no. 1, pp. 123–138, 2018. S. M. Islam, “Unintended consequences of scaling social impact through ecosystem growth strategy in social enterprise and social entrepreneurship,” *J. Bus. Ventur. Insights*, vol. 13, no. January, p. e00159, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2020.e00159>.
8. J. Kickul and T. S. Lyons, *Understanding Social Entrepreneurship: The Relentless Pursuit of Mission in an Ever Changing World*, 3rd Editio. New York, NY: Routledge, 2020.
9. P. Dey and C. Steyaert, “Social entrepreneurship: critique and the radical enactment of the social,” *Soc. Enterp. J.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 90–107, 2012, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508611211252828>.
10. F. Suhariadi, “Opini Entrepreneurship Sosial,” <https://news.unair.ac.id/>, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://news.unair.ac.id/2021/12/06/opini-entrepreneurship-sosial/?lang=id>.
11. C. Yu, B. Ye, and S. Ma, “Creating for others: linking prosocial motivation and social entrepreneurship intentions,” *Manag. Decis.*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 2755–2773, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-06-2019-0815>.
12. A. Salamzadeh, M. A. Azimi, and D. A. Kirby, “Social entrepreneurship education in higher education: Insights from a developing country,” *Int. J. Entrep. Small Bus.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 17–34, 2013, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2013.055691>.
13. C. Y. Ip, C. Liang, S. C. Wu, K. M. Y. Law, and H. C. Liu, “Enhancing Social Entrepreneurial Intentions through Entrepreneurial Creativity: A Comparative Study Between Taiwan and Hong Kong,” *Creat. Res. J.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 132–142, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2018.1446744>.
14. E. D. Lestari, H. S. Kusuma, and W. F. Marlim, “Entrepreneurial Intentions : The Effect of Proactive Personality in Perspective of Planned Behavior Theory as an integrated approach in the Indonesian Context,” *ADI Int. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1–17, 2021.
15. N. F. Krueger, M. D. Reilly, and A. L. Carsrud, “Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions,” *J. Bus. Ventur.*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 411–432, 2000, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(98\)00033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(98)00033-0).
16. I. Ajzen, “From Intentions to Actions : A Theory of Planned Behavior,” in *Action Control*, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1985, pp. 11–39.
17. J. N. F. Krueger and A. L. Carsrud, “Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour,” *Entrep. Reg. Dev. An Int. J.*, vol. 5, pp. 315–330, 1993, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1364/ao.20.002184>.
18. P. Tiwari, A. K. Bhat, and J. Tikoria, “Mediating Role of Prosocial Motivation in Predicting Social Entrepreneurial Intentions,” *J. Soc. Entrep.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 118–141, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2020.1755993>.

19. H. Guclu and S. Guney, "The Effect of the Motivation Techniques Used by Managers to Increase the Productivity of their Workers and an Application," *Bus. Manag. Dyn.*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 1–18, 2017.
20. A. M. Grant and J. W. Berry, "The Necessity of Others is the Mother of Invention: Intrinsic and Prosocial Motivations, Perspective Taking, and Creativity," *Acad. J. Manag.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 73–96, 2011, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0765.1983.tb00357.x>.
21. J. Hu and R. C. Liden, "Making a Difference in the Teamwork: Linking Team Prosocial Motivation to Team Processes and Effectiveness," *Acad. Manag. J.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 1102–1127, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.1142>.
22. R. Yamini, D. Soloveva, and X. Peng, *What Inspires Social Entrepreneurship? the Role of Prosocial Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, and Gender in Forming Social Entrepreneurial Intention*, vol. 12, no. 2. 2022.
23. Novita Mega Angel Virdianasari, "Analisis Pengaruh Kreatif Dan Inovatif Di Dunia Bisnis Kewirausahaan Dalam Perspektif Ekonomi Islam," *Niqosiya J. Econ. Bus. Res.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 37–47, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21154/niqosiya.v1i1.81>.
24. A. Biraglia and V. Kadile, "The Role of Entrepreneurial Passion and Creativity in Developing Entrepreneurial Intentions : Insights from American Homebrewers," *J. of Small Bus. Manag.*, vol. 00, no. 00, pp. 1–19, 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12242>.
25. B. Doherty, H. Haugh, and F. Lyon, "Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda," *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 417–436, 2014, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12028>.
26. J. G. Dees, "The Meaning of 'Social Entrepreneurship,'" *Grad. Sch. Business, Stanford Univ.*, pp. 1–5, 2001.
27. B. Bird, "Implementing Entrepreneurial Ideas: The Case for Intention," *Acad. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 442–453, 1988, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306970>.
28. L. P. Tan, A. N. H. Le, and L. P. Xuan, "A Systematic Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurial Intention," *J. Soc. Entrep.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 241–256, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2019.1640770>.
29. M. L. Frazier and C. Tupper, "Supervisor Prosocial Motivation, Employee Thriving, and Helping Behavior: A Trickle-Down Model of Psychological Safety," *Gr. Organ. Manag.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 561–593, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116653911>.
30. A. M. Grant, J. M. Berg, and ' Affiliation, "Prosocial Motivation at Work: When, Why, and How Making a Difference Makes a Difference," *Handb. Posit. Organ. Scholarsh.*, pp. 28–44, 2010.
31. G. V. Caprara, G. Alessandri, and N. Eisenberg, "Prosociality: The contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs," *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 102, no. 6, pp. 1289–1303, 2012, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025626>.
32. E. Prandelli, M. Pasquini, and G. Verona, "In user's shoes: An experimental design on the role of perspective taking in discovering entrepreneurial opportunities," *J. Bus. Ventur.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 287–301, 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.02.001>.
33. N. Mary George, V. Parida, T. Lahti, and J. Wincent, "A systematic literature review of entrepreneurial opportunity recognition: insights on influencing factors," *Int. Entrep. Manag. J.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 309–350, 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-014-0347-y>.
34. M. M. Al-Ababneh, "The Concept of Creativity: Definitions and Theories," *Int. J. Tour. Hotel Bus. Manag.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 245–259, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.1971.tb00449.x>.
35. D. Liu, K. Jiang, C. E. Shalley, S. Keem, and J. Zhou, "Motivational mechanisms of employee creativity: A meta- analytic examination and theoretical extension of the creativity literature," *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.*, vol. 137, pp. 236–263, 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.08.001>.

36. M. J. C. Forgeard and A. C. Mecklenburg, "The two dimensions of motivation and a reciprocal model of the creative process," *Rev. Gen. Psychol.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 255–266, 2013, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032104>.
37. M. M. Gielnik, M. Frese, J. M. Graf, and A. Kampschulte, "Creativity in the opportunity identification process and the moderating effect of diversity of information," *J. Bus. Ventur.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 559–576, 2012, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2011.10.003>.
38. P. Tierney, S. M. Farmer, and G. B. Graen, "An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships," *Pers. Psychol.*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 591–620, 1999, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00173.x>.
39. B. Urban and L. Kujinga, "The institutional environment and social entrepreneurship intentions," *Int. J. Entrep. Behav. Res.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 638–655, 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-08-2014-0146>.
40. J. F. Hair, G. T. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*, vol. 46, no. 1–2. 2014.
41. J. F. Hair, G. T. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Second Edition*. 2016.
42. C. M. Ringle, M. Sarstedt, R. Mitchell, and S. P. Gudergan, "Partial least squares structural equation modeling in HRM research," *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1617–1643, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1416655>.
43. W. B. Gartner, K. G. Shaver, E. Gatewood, and J. A. Katz, "Finding the Entrepreneur in Entrepreneurship," *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 5–9, 1994, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879401800301>.
44. S. S. Jeong and D. W. T. A. Alhanaee, "Prosocial Motivation as a Driver of Social Innovation in the UAE," *Soc. Sci. Q.*, vol. 101, no. 7, pp. 2450–2464, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12913>.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

