

THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE ON SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP PERCEPTION: A STUDY IN A VOCATIONAL SCHOOL FOR SENIOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Aykut Bedük¹
Mehmet Ali Canbolat²

Original Scientific Article

DOI: 10.35666/25662880.2022.8.42

UDC: 37.03:005.961

Abstract: While social intelligence represents understanding each individual belonging to the society and acting skillfully in human relations, social entrepreneurship is an important type of entrepreneurship in order to eliminate inequalities between people around the world. In this quantitative study, which is planned as a cross-sectional type, it is aimed to determine the effect of social intelligence on the perception of social entrepreneurship of university students who are about to start their profession. Questionnaire technique was used as a data collection tool in the research. The research was conducted with 149 students who were candidates to graduate from a state university vocational school. In line with the findings, a moderate, positive and statistically significant relationship was determined between social intelligence and social entrepreneurship. As a result of the regression analysis, it was determined that 12% of the variance in social entrepreneurship was related to social intelligence.

Key words: Social intelligence, social entrepreneurship, students

INTRODUCTION

Various types of intelligence are defined in order to better understand the human mind. One of them is social intelligence. Social intelligence is to enable the individual to understand and cooperate with others. In parallel with this situation, entrepreneurship also necessitates strong social relations of individuals (Uzun et al., 2017). The increase in some problems in the world (environmental pollution, lack of education, hunger, poverty due to unbalanced income distribution, etc.) and the inadequacy of aids increase the importance of the concept of social entrepreneurship day by day (Çakanel, 2018). The development of social entrepreneurship constitutes the building block of social development and development (Özdevecioğlu and Cingöz, 2009). At the same time, social entrepreneurship includes studies that support each other with social responsibility (Budak, 2015).

¹ Professor, Department of Business, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, University of Selçuk, A. Keykubat Campus, 42130 Konya, Turkey.

² Lecturer PhD, Department of Management and Organization, Vocational School of Social Sci., University of Karamanoglu Mehmetbey, 70100 Karaman, Turkey.

From this point of view, the subject of the research is to investigate the effect of social intelligence on social entrepreneurship. In this context, first of all, the conceptual framework was mentioned and then data analysis was carried out. Finally, the analysis data were examined and the results were interpreted.

SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

The concept of intelligence is basically defined as “the ability to adapt to the environment” (Daniel, 1997). Since the 20th century, alternative intelligence models that go beyond the cognitive dimension of intelligence have begun to be developed in psychology, and one of them is social intelligence (Akkuzu, 2019). Social intelligence is the ability to understand and manage individuals and to act skillfully in human relations (Thorndike, 1920). Individuals with social intelligence have the ability to understand the moods, wishes and desires, joys and anger, impulses, ups and downs of others and adjust their behavior accordingly. In this way, they can get along well with others and communicate well (Doğan, 2006). Individuals who are socially intelligent are more polite and prone to success (Özcan, 2018). Social intelligence basically has two sub-dimensions, behavioral and cognitive (Doğan et al., 2009). Silvera et al. (2001) suggested that social intelligence consists of three dimensions: social information process, social awareness and social skills. Social information process; It consists of various skills such as understanding the feelings and thoughts of the individual in his relationship with other individuals, interpreting the reactions conveyed by body language, and predicting the expectations of the other party. Social awareness; it is the ability of an individual to adapt easily to circumstances. Individuals with high social awareness can have the ability to develop appropriate behavior by being aware of the behavior patterns and the causes of the events they encounter. Social skill is known as sociability transformed into behavior. This sub-dimension indicates that the individual behaves wisely in his social relationships (Çavuş et al., 2019).

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Although social entrepreneurship is considered new as a concept, it is actually quite an old concept. However, it was William Lloyd Garrison who first used the concept in 1833. However, the first person to define the concept of social entrepreneurship was American William Drayton in 1980 (Çakanel, 2018). When analyzed conceptually, it is seen that the concept of social entrepreneurship was used for the first time in the researches conducted in the field of social change in 1972. However, widespread use of the concept took place in the 1990s. The establishment of Ashoka, an organization working to promote social entrepreneurship in 1981, and the Schwab Foundation in 1998 contributed to the spread of the concept (Akar, 2020).

The term “social enterprise” includes two different phenomena, “social” and “enterprise”. The understanding of social entrepreneurship brings with it the recognition of problems and opportunities, correct evaluation, risk-taking and innovative ways, just like in commercial ventures (Karğın et al., 2018). At the same time, the features that an entrepreneur should have; Features such as being visionary, being social, being a manager and being reliable are among the features that should be found in social entrepreneurs (Günlü, 2015). Social entrepreneurship is non-profit activities that focus on the social needs of the society and find solutions to problems (Apaydın and Altun, 2021). It can be said that the differentiation of social entrepreneurship opportunities from profit-oriented entrepreneurship opportunities is due to the fact that social entrepreneurship occurs in a partially different context and tends to a completely different output (Aslan et al., 2012). Basically, social entrepreneurship is defined as innovative activities that emerge for social purposes. Social entrepreneurship is the use of the general rules of the business world for social purposes and innovative solutions that are put forward to create a social impact (Ercan, 2016). The main purpose of social entrepreneurship is to create innovative social enterprises with entrepreneurial approaches in order to focus on social issues and create a social impact (Ercan, 2016). Social entrepreneurship is a construct that bridges the gap between business and philanthropy; in other words, it is the implementation of entrepreneurship in the social field (Uzunaslın and Tek, 2021). The common point in all these definitions is the creation of social value instead of personal interests (Taş & Şimşek, 2017). Although the main purpose of social entrepreneurs is to produce social value; to create social business models, profit-oriented business, entrepreneurship, corporate social responsibility, philanthropy and Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) leadership. The goal here is not just one project. Determination and forward planning are essential. Resources are used for growth and development. They look for a void that has not been filled by the private and public sectors (Taş and Şimşek, 2017). “Social enterprises”, which can be considered as organizations where social entrepreneurs continue their practices, provide solutions to many social problems faced by the disadvantaged society, and also extend a helping hand to the poor who are unable to reach the state and/or private sector and who experience social exclusion (Kumbül Güler, 2011). Voluntary organizations can provide individuals with social entrepreneurship skills through social entrepreneurship training (Coşkun & Sarıkaya, 2016). While it is seen that social entrepreneurship programs are implemented at Harvard University and Stanford University, it is seen that social entrepreneurship awards at Cambridge University and global social entrepreneurship competitions are organized at Berkeley University (Karğın et al., 2018).

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

In the literature, social intelligence and self-esteem (Doğan et al., 2009), depression (Doğan, 2006), emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence (Crowne, 2009), physical intelligence (Ermiş et al., 2012), entrepreneurial intention (Minister & Amırlı, 2021; Uzun et al., 2017), internet addiction (Erdemir & Kutlu, 2018), stress coping style (Dursun & Yücefaydalı, 2020), leadership orientation (Turhal et al., 2020) and It is possible to come across studies examining the possible relationships between life satisfaction. In addition, it is thought that if university students have a high level of social intelligence, their entrepreneurial intentions will be positively affected. When the studies examining the relationships between social intelligence and entrepreneurial intention variables were examined, positive and different levels of relationships were found (Bakan & Amırlı, 2021). In addition, social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship and leadership (Kılıç Kırılmaz, 2013), social work (Apaydın & Altun, 2021), emotional intelligence and social intelligence (Çakanel, 2018), employment (Taş & Şimşek, 2017), ahilik (Durak, 2016) and social innovation (Koç, 2010) it is possible to encounter studies examining the relationships between. The literature shows that the concepts of social intelligence and social entrepreneurship are related to many variables. At the same time, it is seen that both concepts are related to some common variables. Based on this, the hypothesis put forward is:

H₁: Social intelligence has an effect on the perception of social entrepreneurship.

METHOD

Vocational school students are a segment who have received training in a certain profession as "intermediate staff" and are candidates for taking part in the sector. Many of these people will be able to open their own businesses and many of them will be able to practice their profession by working as personnel in the public and private sectors. From this point of view, it is aimed to test the relationship and effect between social intelligence and social entrepreneurship perceptions of these students. In this study, which was designed in a non-experimental and cross-sectional design, questionnaire technique was used as a data collection tool. The questionnaire form consists of three parts. The first part includes questions about demographic information, the second part includes the social intelligence scale, and the third and last part includes the social entrepreneurship antecedents scale. The scales are 5-point Likert-type scales graded in a range ranging from "1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree". In order to test the hypothesis put forward in the research, scales with proven validity and reliability were used.

Social intelligence scale, Silvera et al. (2001) developed under the name Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS). Turkish validity and reliability study was carried out by Doğan (2006). The scale consists of 3 dimensions and 21 items. Items 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20 and 21 consist of reverse items. In this study, the scale reliability level was calculated as $\alpha = 0.76$ (16 items). In this case, it was evaluated that the scale had a good level of internal consistency.

The social entrepreneurship antecedents scale was developed by Hockerts (2015). Its basis consists of the variables of empathy, social moral obligation, social entrepreneurship self-efficacy perception and social support belief, which are stated as the most important predictors of social entrepreneurship intention by Mair and Noboa (2006). Turkish validity and reliability study was carried out by Akar (2020). The scale consists of 4 dimensions and 17 items. Items 2, 5, 13 and 17 consist of reverse items. In this study, the scale reliability level was calculated as $\alpha = 0.89$ (15 items). In this case, it was evaluated that the scale had a good level of internal consistency.

The universe of the research is Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University Social Sciences Vocational School students. There are 276 students who are candidates to graduate in the relevant unit in the 2021-2022 Spring semester. Sample calculation was not made and all students were included in the research. 203 students who were willing to participate in the research were reached. 5 questionnaire forms were canceled because they contained uniform data. In addition, the questionnaire forms that gave the same score to the negative and positive questions of similar significance (items 4 and 10 of the social intelligence scale) in the scale items were eliminated and the research was carried out with 149 valid questionnaires.

RESULTS

Demographic Findings

The majority (58.4%) of the students who are candidates to graduate who participated in the research are women. The mean age is 21 and the majority of the participants (54.4%) do not have the idea of starting a business after graduation.

Social Intelligence Scale Exploratory Factor Analysis

Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) is a type of multivariate analysis that can reduce more than one variable to a small number of components by making use of the relationships between the variables (İslamoğlu & Alniaçık, 2014, 395). In EFA, for all scales, those with a factor load of 0.40 or higher, as suggested by Hair, Anderson, and Tatham (1998), were combined.

The fact that the KMO value used in all scales is higher than 0.70 also shows that the variables are related to each other and share common factors. Principal component factor analysis was performed on the scales and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity test was applied, which tests the hypothesis whether the correlation matrix is equal to the unit matrix. Social intelligence scale EFA (Table 1), KMO value is ,785 and it is at a good level (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity showed a statistically significant χ^2 result ($\chi^2=673,488$ df = 120 Sig = ,000) showing that factor analysis could be applied to variables.

Table 1. Social intelligence scale explanatory factor analysis (n=149)

Pattern Matrix				
	Perception Skill	Adaptation	Harmony	Awareness
14	,735			
17	,707			
6	,700			
1	,614			
19	,566			
9	,552			
10		,781		
4		,745		
7		,737		
12			,709	
8			,702	
3			,590	
16			,586	
11				,808
21				,713
13				,548

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Component Name	Eigenvalues	Variance (%)	α	Items
Perception Skill :	3,857	24,109	0,765	6
Adaptation :	2,895	18,096	0,709	3
Harmony :	1,367	5,545	0,646	4
Awareness :	1,030	6,437	0,639	3
Cumulative %:		57,187		

Social Intelligence EFA revealed that the scale has four components. Components; perception skill, adaptation, harmony and awareness. The eigenvalue, explained variance and reliability (α) coefficients of the social intelligence components are shown in Table 1. The components have eigenvalues over 1 and represent 57,187% of the total variance. The α values of the components show that high internal consistency is achieved. Items 2, 5, 15, 18, and 20 were excluded from the analysis because they had low loading values or loaded on a double factor. Variables with composite values were produced for the components and these composite values were taken as basis in the subsequent analyzes.

Social Entrepreneurship Scale Exploratory Factor Analysis

Social entrepreneurship scale EFA (Table 2), KMO value is ,852 and it is at a good level (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity showed a statistically significant χ^2 result ($\chi^2=1088,749$ df = 105 Sig = .000), showing that factor analysis could be applied to variables.

Social entrepreneurship EFA revealed that the scale has four components. Components; sensitivity, social capital, responsibility and confidence. The eigenvalue, explained variance and reliability (α) coefficients of social entrepreneurship components are shown in Table 2. Components have eigenvalues over 1 and represent 69,593% of the total variance. The α values of the components show that high internal consistency is achieved. Items 5 and 10 were excluded from the analysis because they loaded on two factors. Variables with composite values were produced for the components and these composite values were taken as basis in the subsequent analyzes.

Table 2. Social entrepreneurship scale exploratory factor analysis (n=149)

Pattern Matrix	Sensitivity	Social Capital	Responsibility	Confidence
4	,793			
1	,788			
3	,787			
2	,768			
16		,834		
15		,813		
17		,782		
14		,516		
8			,820	
7			,804	
9			,767	
6			,645	
12				,852
11				,811
13				,762

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Component Name	Eigenvalues	Variance (%)	α	Items
Sensitivity :	5,931	39,541	0,858	4
Sosyal Sermaye :	2,093	13,953	0,828	4
Responsibility :	1,314	8,762	0,823	4
Confidence :	1,100	7,336	0,814	3
Cumulative %:		69,593		

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is a method applied to determine the status of the relationship between two or more variables and, if any, the direction and severity of this relationship (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2015). The results of Pearson correlation analysis for the linear relationship between social intelligence scale and social entrepreneurship scale explanatory factor analysis composite variables are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Pearson Correlations

	Mean	Std.Err.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	3,548	0,042	1	,623**	,705**	,725**	,527**	,342**	,233**	,310**	,177*	,339**
2	3,779	0,054		1	,334**	,172*	-,122	,485**	,293**	,399**	,347**	,465**
3	3,454	0,076			1	,326**	,224**	,228**	,120	,256**	,077	,267**
4	3,567	0,063				1	,434**	,166*	,115	,190*	,058	,144
5	3,154	0,077					1	-,100	,019	-,127	-,115	-,094
6	3,789	0,054						1	,801**	,801**	,748**	,650**
7	3,973	0,076							1	,458**	,535**	,329**
8	3,525	0,072								1	,412**	,541**
9	3,961	0,068									1	,253**
10	3,664	0,067										1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Notes: 1: Social intelligence, 2: Perception Skill, 3: Adaptation, 4: Harmony Awareness, 5: Social Entrepreneurship, 6: Sensitivity, 7: Sosyal Sermaye, 8: Responsibility, 9: Confidence

Accordingly, it has been determined that the awareness sub-dimension of social intelligence is not related to any sub-dimension of social entrepreneurship, the social intelligence scale total has a significant positive relationship with all sub-dimensions, and the social entrepreneurship scale total has a positive and significant relationship with all components except awareness. As can be seen in the table, these relations are at low, medium and high levels.

Regression Analysis

Simple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine how social intelligence determines social entrepreneurship in university students. Simple regression analysis results were statistically significant [$F(1,147) = 19.46, p < 0.001$]. Regression equation for the simple linear relationship between variables; social entrepreneurship = $2.221 + 0.442$ (social intelligence). The corrected R^2 value of the analysis results is 0.12. According to this value, it can be said that the 12% variance in social entrepreneurship depends on social intelligence.

CONCLUSION

This research, which was developed to examine how social intelligence determines social entrepreneurship in university students, was conducted with 149 students. The majority (58.4%) of the students who are candidates to graduate who participated in the research are women. The mean age is 21 and the majority of the participants (54.4%) do not have the idea of starting a business after graduation. According to the results of the correlation analysis, there is a statistically significant and moderately positive relationship between social intelligence and social entrepreneurship. The adjusted R^2 value according to the results of the regression analysis is 0.12. According to this value, it can be said that the 12% variance in social entrepreneurship depends on social intelligence. In this case, as the level of social intelligence increases, it can be considered as an expected result that social entrepreneurship will increase. As the scores of the university students' social intelligence levels increased, it was determined that the internet addiction scores decreased (Erdemir & Kutlu, 2018). In addition, it has been determined that as the scores of university students' social intelligence levels increase, their depression levels decrease (Doğan, 2006). In this case, it can be said that social intelligence has a positive relationship with positive variables and a negative relationship with negative variables. In order for social entrepreneurship to become more widespread, it may be recommended to provide awareness training to individuals with high social intelligence and to repeat the research with a wider audience.

REFERENCES

- Akar, H. (2020). Sosyal girişimcilik öncülleri ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Turkish Studies - Educational Sciences*, 15(2), 579-593.
- Akkuzu, H. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinde sosyal zeka ve sosyal sorun çözme becerisinin somatizasyon ve sağlık anksiyetesi üzerindeki etkisi. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Apaydın, E. & Altun, F. (2021). Sosyal girişimcilik ile sosyal hizmet arasındaki ilişkinin değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 18(39), 777-803.
- Aslan, G., Araza, A. & Bulut, Ç. (2012). Sosyal girişimciliğin kavramsal çerçevesi. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 7(2), 69-88.
- Bakan, İ. & Amırlı, H. (2021). Girişimcilik niyeti ve yaşam doyumunun, sosyal zekâ algısı bağlamında incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(1), 497-527.
- Budak, G. (2015). Yoksulluğa inovatif bir çözüm; Sosyal girişimcilik. *Emek ve Toplum*, 4(8), 26-41.
- Coşkun, E. & Sarıkaya, M. (2016). Sosyal girişimcilik eğitiminde gönüllü kuruluşlar. *Strategic Public Management Journal (SPMJ)*(4), 72-82.
- Crowne, K. A. (2009). The relationships among social intelligence, emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. *Organization Management Journal*, 6(3), 148-163.
- Çakanel, Z. (2018). Duygusal zekâ, sosyal zekâ ve sosyal girişimcilik arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Çavuş, M. F., Pekkan, N. Ü. & Develi, A. (2019). Örgütsel sosyalleşmeye yeni bir öncül: Sosyal zeka. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*(36), 259-272.
- Daniel, M. H. (1997). Intelligence testing: Status and trends. *American Psychologist*, 52(10), 1038-1045.
- Doğan, T. (2006). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal zeka düzeylerinin depresyon ve bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisinin incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Doğan, T., Totan, T. & Sapmaz, F. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinde benlik saygısı ve sosyal zeka. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(May 2009), 235-247.

Durak, İ. (2016). Sosyal girişimcilik ve ahilik teşkilatı: Teorik çerçeve. Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi(47), 101-120.

Dursun, M. & Yücefaydalı, A. R. (2020). Sosyal zeka ve stresle başa çıkma tarzı arasındaki ilişki: Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi turizm rehberliği öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, Special Issue(4), 538-553.

Ercan, S. (2016). Türkiye'de sosyal girişimcilik ve yarattığı etkilerin değerlendirilmesi. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Erdemir, N. & Kutlu, M. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin internet bağımlılığı ile sosyal zeka düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(57), 401-409.

Ermış, E., İmamoğlu, O. & Erilli, N. A. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin bedensel ve sosyal çoklu zeka puanlarında sporun etkisi. *Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 23-29.

Günlü, E. (2015). Sosyal girişimcilik olgusunun kavramsal analizi ve turizmde sosyal girişimcilik. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi* (35), 23-42.

Gürbüz, S. & Şahin, F. (2015). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri* (2.Baskı ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Hockerts, K. (2015). The social entrepreneurial antecedents scale (SEAS): A validation study. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 11(3), 260-280.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.

Karğın, M., Aktaş, H. & Gökbunar, R. (2018). Üniversitelerde sosyal girişimcilik: Fırsatlar ve öneriler. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 25(1), 155-170.

Kılıç Kırılmaz, S. (2013). Sosyal girişimcilerin girişimcilik ve dönüştürücü liderlik algılarının belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 8(1), 103-128.

Koç, O. (2010). Toplumsal sorunlarla mücadelede bir kaldıraç olarak sosyal inovasyon ve sosyal girişimcilik açısından önemi. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 5(2), 205-212.

Kümbül Güler, B. (2011). Yoksullukla mücadelede sosyal girişimcilik: Ashoka üyelerinden sosyal yenilikçi örnek uygulamalar. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(3), 79-111.

Mair, J. & Noboa, E. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed*. İçinden *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 121-135). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Özcan, M. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının sosyal zeka düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Eğitimde Yeni Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, 1(1), 42-51.

Özdevecioğlu, M. & Cingöz, A. (2009). Sosyal girişimcilik ve sosyal girişimciler: Teorik çerçeve. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(84), 81-95.

Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M. & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*(42), 313-319.

Taş, H. Y. & Şimşek, İ. (2017). Türkiye ve Dünya'dan sosyal girişimcilik örnekleri ve istihdama katkıları. *Emek ve Toplum*, 6(16), 480-497.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and Its Use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.

Turhal, S. N., Tutkun, E. & Çelik, A. (2020). Spor yöneticisi adaylarının liderlik yönelimleri ve sosyal zeka düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Sportmetre The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 18(4), 193-202.

Uzun, H., Buran, A. Ç. & Beydilli, E. T. (2017). Sosyal zekânın girişimcilik niyeti üzerindeki etkisi: Meslek yüksekokulu öğrencileri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(5), 1-11.

Uzunaslan, İ. & Tek, S. (2021). Sosyal girişimcilik ve sosyal hizmet. *Journal of Society & Social Work*, 32(3), 1195-1214.