



The Measurement of Cultural Values on Social Entrepreneurship Intention in Agriculture Students using PLS-SEM

Tri Rahayuningsih^{1*}, Radika Mailana², Rani Armalita³, and Liliyana Sari⁴

¹ Department of Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Jakarta

trirahayuningsih@med.unand.ac.id

Abstract. Social entrepreneurship intention is a growing subject of interest in the entrepreneurship literature, defined as the intention to pursue a social mission by starting a business or launching a social enterprise. The social environment of an individual plays an important role in shaping one's cognition, including the university environment. Entrepreneurial intentions are embedded in social and cultural values. The present study aimed to investigate the effect of cultural values on entrepreneurial intentions in agriculture students. A total of 301 students from the Faculty of Agriculture at Universitas Andalas who have taken entrepreneurship courses participated in the study. Participants were recruited by using a proportional stratified random sampling technique. The results showed that Social Entrepreneurship Intention had a significant negative relationship with Power Distance, while Social Entrepreneurship Intention had a significant positive relationship with Uncertainty Avoidance, Collectivism, and Long-Term Orientation, with a variance of 29.9%. However, masculinity did not significantly correlate with Social Entrepreneurship Intention. Generally, the Social Entrepreneurship Intention of students in the Faculty of Agriculture was in the high category.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurship Intention, Cultural Values, Agriculture Students

1 Introduction

Development in Indonesia currently focuses on sustainable agriculture to ensure the food needs of the present generation without compromising the fulfillment of the food needs of future generations. However, human resource development generally focuses on strengthening farmers who are mostly advanced (agricultural aging). At the same time, recovery efforts have received less attention, or it can be stated that Indonesia is currently experiencing a crisis of young farmers (1). Most graduates in Indonesia choose something other than agriculture as a career choice.

Social entrepreneurship is profit making entrepreneurship whose goal is to address a social mission, and the two features involve emphasizing the economic value of sustainable social enterprises and creating social values by providing solutions to social problems (2). Social entrepreneurship, which focuses on working with and for

the community, has opened more inclusive job opportunities for various minority groups, such as women and people with disabilities. This can also be the answer to overcoming poverty and the unequal distribution of wealth in Indonesia.

In addition, the community model of social enterprise often operates outside capital and large cities that extend the reach of economic development to rural areas. Based on a survey, the founders of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia are dominated by young people, with 67% being individuals aged between 18-34 years. However, the study also found that social entrepreneurship is only centered in Java, and social entrepreneurship in provinces with university graduates is more likely to be led and founded by young people (3).

Some existing literature explains that intentions become the first step in starting entrepreneurship, including social entrepreneurship (4,5). A previous study found a relationship between intention and cognition in shaping social entrepreneurship, and this relationship is important given that social entrepreneurs act as change agents, and their ability to act as such lies in their cognition (6,7). Thus, it is critical to investigate the elements that underpin social entrepreneurship intentions. In the entrepreneurial literature, there has been an increasing interest in social entrepreneurship intention, commonly defined as the desire to pursue a social purpose by creating a firm or launching a social enterprise (8).

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) proposed by Ajzen (4) is a major social psychology theory that has been used to investigate Entrepreneurial Intentions. Intention, according to the idea, is a powerful predictor of action, particularly in the case of planned and goal-directed activity. The TPB model, as used in the research domain of social entrepreneurship, is founded on the premise that an individual's intention to execute a certain activity is determined by their need to perform that behavior and their confidence in their ability to accomplish it. According to studies, the TPB model appears to be appropriate as a theoretical foundation for the Social Entrepreneurship Intentions (9-11).

However, some obstacles affect Social Entrepreneurship Intentions among university students. Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior as a framework for investigating barriers to social entrepreneurial intentions, the study showed that students generally perceived lack of competence, lack of self-confidence, and lack of resources as barriers that would affect their social entrepreneurial intentions. The study also reported that social entrepreneurship education can reduce these perceived barriers (12). Thus, the University has an important role in growing Social Entrepreneurship Intention among its students.

Based on the Social Cognitive Theory of Bandura (13), the social environment around the individual has a significant role in shaping one's cognition. Research supports the idea that entrepreneurial intentions are embedded in social and cultural contexts (14). Cultural values refer to the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes members of one human group from another and their respective responses to their environment (15). They distinguish five dimensions of cultural values that can be measured, namely Power Distance, Individualism, Long-Term Orientation, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance.

The relationship between the cultural dimensions and social entrepreneurship is that people in society who show a degree of power distance consider the opinions of others and apply participatory decision-making. Regarding the dimension of individualism, social entrepreneurs are known as collectivists who mainly focus on the needs of others. In terms of uncertainty avoidance, social entrepreneurship is an innovative concept, which will not be supported in a society that is intolerant of new behaviors. The masculinity dimension refers to a preference for cooperation, politeness, caring for the weak, and quality of life,

while the long-term orientation dimension refers to the passion for their mission and pragmatic about market realities, and are known for their practical solutions to social problems (17) The research hypothesis was that higher cultural values would be associated with higher social entrepreneurship intentions, particularly among agriculture student.

2 Methods

The study used a proportional stratified random sampling technique with 301 students from the Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Andalas, who have taken entrepreneurship courses as participants. Two measurements were used in this study, which underwent an adaptation process to Bahasa. Social Entrepreneurship Intention Scale (18) assessed the intentions of social entrepreneurship from aspects of behavioral attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. The measure consisted of 17 items with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.893.

Cultural values in this study were assessed by using the Culture Value Scale (CVSCALE) (20) which consisted of five cultural dimensions of Hofstede (2011), namely Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Collectivism, Long-term Orientation, and Masculinity. The scale consisted of 26 items with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.774 (power distance), 0.815 (uncertainty avoidance), 0.846 (collectivism), 0.833 (long-term orientation), and 0.713 (masculinity). The measurement results from an online survey were then analyzed statistically. The researchers tested the construct validity using confirmatory factor analysis, while the hypothesis was tested using path analysis. The whole process used the PLS-SEM software.

3 Results

This research consisted of some steps of the study. In the pilot study, a validation test was conducted by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for each dimension in the cultural values, as shown in Figure 1. The items on the scale were adapted from previous studies and considered reliable. The confirmatory factor analysis was tested on 301 samples from agriculture students at Universitas Andalas. In the first step, we tested the confirmatory factor. All items in the variable of cultural values as a multi-dimensional construct were good. The validation construct was shown as internal consistency in Table 1.

Table 1. Construct reliability and validity.

Construct	Item	Outer Loading	CR	Cronbach	AVE
Social Entrepreneur Intention	SEI1	0,646	0,901	0,883	0,363
	SEI10	0,632			
	SEI11	0,609			
	SEI12	0,674			
	SEI13	0,606			
	SEI14	0,470			
	SEI15	0,531			
	SEI17	0,628			

	SEI2	0,547			
	SEI3	0,629			
	SEI4	0,640			
	SEI5	0,602			
	SEI6	0,628			
	SEI7	0,579			
	SEI8	0,543			
Power distance	PO1	0,568	0,845	0,787	0,526
	PO2	0,759			
	PO3	0,772			
	PO4	0,672			
	PO5	0,827			
Uncertainty avoidance	UA1	0,707	0,875	0,822	0,584
	UA2	0,798			
	UA3	0,789			
	UA4	0,782			
	UA5	0,741			
Collectivism	CO1	0,669	0,870	0,824	0,530
	CO2	0,732			
	CO3	0,779			
	CO4	0,790			
	CO5	0,756			
	CO6	0,626			
Long-term orientation	LT1	0,653	0,863	0,811	0,513
	LT2	0,731			
	LT3	0,657			
	LT4	0,790			
	LT5	0,741			
	LT6	0,717			
Masculinity	MA2	0,947	0,825	0,627	0,706
	MA3	0,718			

Besides convergent validity, the discriminant validity test was also used. HTMT > 0,85 means less valid, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).

	CO	LT	MA	PO	SEI	UA
CO						
LT	0,305					
MA	0,439	0,194				
PO	0,142	0,130	0,111			
SEI	0,317	0,543	0,205	0,235		
UA	0,343	0,394	0,203	0,321	0,387	

As depicted in the table, both measurements had good validity and were satisfactory. Then, in the last step, structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to analyze the data. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. SEM analysis.

	Std.Beta	Std. Error)	t- value	p-values	Decision
Collectivism -> SEI	0,130	0,063	0.207	0,038	Supported
LongTerm Orientation -> SEI	0,382	0,053	0.719	0,000	Supported
Masculinity -> SEI	0,041	0,056	0.073	0,465	Not Supported
Power Distance -> SEI	-0,123	0,056	0.219	0,029	Supported
Uncertainty Avoidance -> SEI	0,145	0,068	0.214	0,032	Supported

Note: $P < 0,005$ (1 tailed);

$R^2 = 0,299 \rightarrow 29,9\%$ of the variance in SEI on agriculture students determined by exogenous variables like cultural values

4 Discussion

Based on the statistical analysis, the results showed that four dimensions of cultural values, consisting of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and a long-term orientation, all demonstrated a strong association with social entrepreneurship intents. However, masculinity had no significant relationship with social entrepreneurship intention. Furthermore, long-term orientation showed the highest link with the ambition to engage in social entrepreneurship.

The power distance dimension was reported to negatively correlate with social entrepreneurship intention. This negative relationship indicates that the higher the power distance among students, the lower the social entrepreneurship intention of the students. People in society who exhibit power distance accept the hierarchical order, which does not require further justification (15). In such circumstances, the importance of a group is not considered. In contrast, in societies with low power distance, people seek to equalize the distribution of power and demand justification for differences in power, and status rights, because they are traditionally linked to social perceptions. Social inequality occurs when some people achieve greater social power than others due to resources such as wealth or education (20). Groups with low power distance would be less likely to accept adverse conditions from disadvantaged local people as a fact of life and choose to start a business to overcome them. In other words, groups of People with minimal power distance will be more responsive to social entrepreneurship.

The results depicted that the uncertainty avoidance dimension positively correlated with social entrepreneurship intention. Uncertainty avoidance relates to how strongly a society wants rules and order over uncertainty. More precisely, this dimension defines how members of a community or organization lower the risk of future occurrences by depending on cultural standards, rituals, and regulatory routines (20). Groups that exhibit strong uncertainty avoidance maintain rigid beliefs and behavior and are intolerant of behaviors and ideas that contradict their beliefs (21). In contrast,

groups with high uncertainty avoidance have an emotional need and an inner drive to work hard and focus on their will and beliefs (15). According to the results, uncertainty avoidance impacted social entrepreneurship intention among agriculture students, which is related to beliefs to perform social activities depending on the personal assessment and assessment of the material and immaterial rewards expected from this work alternative while considering the perceived risk (22).

The results also showed that the collectivism dimension had a significant positive relationship with social entrepreneurship intention. The positive relationship signifies that a higher level of collectivism in students would be associated with higher intentions for social entrepreneurship. Collectivism represents a preference for a tight-knit framework in a society where individuals can expect relatives or members of a particular group to look after them in exchange for unquestioned loyalty (15). In cultures with high collectivism, Potential entrepreneurs would be able to identify societal socioeconomic issues and frame them as business opportunities to remedy these challenges (21). Sociopreneurs are concerned with the needs of others (23). Collective interest entails the concept of altruism, which relates to the underlying essence of humans and their proclivity to care about others. Everyone possesses some egoism and altruism, which indicates a subjective trade-off between personal and community interests: the more altruistic, the more the individual strives to "innovatively promote society, in an approach that involves society, at the risk of individual cost" (20). Those who score high on collectivism prioritize collective goals over personal goals, and their drives are socially conscious, based on a desire to provide value to the community as a whole (24).

The present study also found that the long-term orientation dimension had a significant positive relationship with social entrepreneurship intention. In other words, the higher level of long-term orientation among students would be correlated with higher social entrepreneurship intention possessed by the students. Individuals with a high long-term orientation are willing to submit to a goal persistence, and continuous effort towards results that are slow to apply frugal behavior (15). Community members characterized by high long-term orientation demonstrate a strong proclivity to save for the future, value long-term achievement, are adaptable and flexible, and see financial achievement and religious fulfillment as a built totality (25). Therefore, social entrepreneurs from the community who have a high long-term orientation are expected to have the intention of taking care of social problems and trying to solve existing social inequalities for a better future.

However, the masculinity dimension did not have a significant relationship with social entrepreneurship intentions in this study. This finding is in line with the research (21) which reported that there was no significant relationship between masculinity and social entrepreneurship intention. This finding contradicts a previous study (16), which found that masculinity had a negative relationship with social entrepreneurship. The dimension of masculinity relates to whether assertiveness or care is the main value in a community. This dimension of masculinity expresses preferences for accomplishment, bravery, assertiveness, and tangible rewards for success. In the meantime, femininity reflects a desire for collaboration, modesty, concern for the vulnerable, and the intrinsic value of an intangible characteristic's quality of life. In general, society is more consensus-oriented. Individually, entrepreneurs are frequently described as having a strong desire for success (21), but masculinity in this study did not have a significant relationship with the intention of social entrepreneurship.

5 Conclusion

The present study found that four dimensions of cultural values had a significant relationship with social entrepreneurship intentions. While social entrepreneurship intention had a negative relationship with power distance, it had a positive relationship with uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and long-term orientation. However, masculinity did not significantly correlate with social entrepreneurship intention. The social entrepreneurship intention of agriculture students in Universitas Andalas was categorized as high. Both constructs were valid for measurement and sufficient to meet the principles of psychometrics.

Acknowledgment

Acknowledgments are addressed to the Faculty of Agriculture at Universitas Andalas, who have agreed to be respondents in this study and for the expert judgment who checked the content validity of scales.

References

1. Anwarudin O, Satria A, Fatchiya A. A Review on Farmer Regeneration and Its Determining Factors in Indonesia. *Int J Progress Sci Technol*. 2018;10(2):218–30.
2. Dacin MT, Dacin PA, Tracey P. Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions. *Organ Sci*. 2011;22(March 2017):240–52.
3. Council B. Developing an Inclusive and Creative Economy The State of Social Enterprise in Indonesia. 2018. 101 p.
4. Engle RL, Dimitriadi N, Gavidia J V., Schlaegel C, Delanoe S, Alvarado I, et al. Entrepreneurial intent: A twelve-country evaluation of Ajzen's model of planned behavior. *Team Perform Manag*. 2010;16(1–2):35–57.
5. Schlaegel C, Koenig M. Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intent: A Meta-Analytic Test and Integration of Competing Models. *Entrep Theory Pract*. 2014;38(2):291–332.
6. Corbett A, Mitchell R, Shelton LM, Wood M. The attitudes, behaviors, and cognition of entrepreneurs: rebels with a cause. *Int J Entrep Behav Res*. 2018;24(5):938–46.
7. Muñoz P. A cognitive map of sustainable decision-making in entrepreneurship: A configurational approach. *Int J Entrep Behav Res*. 2018;24(3):787–813.
8. Bacq S, Alt E. Feeling capable and valued: A prosocial perspective on the link between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions. *J Bus Ventur*. 2018;33(3):333–50.
9. Ernst K. Heart over mind – An empirical analysis of social entrepreneurial intention formation based on the theory of planned behavior. 2011;1–309.
10. Mair J, Robinson J, Hockerts K. Social entrepreneurship. In: *Social Entrepreneurship*. 2006. p. 1–280.
11. Hockerts K. The Social Entrepreneurial Antecedents Scale (SEAS): a validation study. *Soc Enterp J*. 2015;11(3):260–80.
12. Shahverdi M, Ismail K, Qureshi MI. The effect of perceived barriers on social entrepreneurship intention in Malaysian universities: The moderating role of ed-

- ucation. *Manag Sci Lett*. 2018;8(5):341–52.
13. Anderson SL, Betz NE. Sources of Social Self-Efficacy Expectations: Their Measurement and Relation to Career Development. *J Vocat Behav*. 2001;58(1):98–117.
 14. García-Peñalvo, José F. Engineering Contributions to a Multicultural Perspective of the Knowledge Society. *Rev Iberoam Tecnol del Aprendiz*. 2015;10(1):17–8.
 15. Hofstede G. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings Psychol Cult*. 2011;2(Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context):1–26.
 16. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M. *Cultures and Organizations Software of the mind*. mc graw hill. 2011. 22–23 p.
 17. Kedmenec I, Strašek S. Are some cultures more favorable for social entrepreneurship than others? *Econ Res Istraz*. 2017;30(1):1461–76.
 18. Yang R, Meyskens M, Zheng C, Hu L. Social entrepreneurial intentions: China versus the USA - Is there a difference? *Int J Entrep Innov*. 2015;16(4):253–67.
 19. Kusumasari B. The Business Model of Social Entrepreneurship. *Int J Adm Sci Organ*. 2015;22(3):157–67.
 20. Yoo B, Donthu N, Lenartowicz T. Measuring hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE. *J Int Consum Mark*. 2011;23(3–4):193–210.

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.

