
Business Entrepreneur and Social Entrepreneur Attitudes on the Example of Polish and Ukrainian Students

Submitted 18/02/24, 1st revision 16/03/24, 2nd revision 20/04/24, accepted 28/05/24

Wojciech Maciejewski¹, Agnieszka Faron²

Abstract:

Purpose: The article presents a comparative analysis of students from Poland and Ukraine to what extent their declarations align with possessing entrepreneurial characteristics (in the classical sense) and pro-social characteristics (as social entrepreneurs).

Design/Methodology/Approach: An online questionnaire was designed to gather data for this study, available in both Polish and Ukrainian. A total of 573 students participated, including 348 from Poland and 225 from Ukraine. The initial section of the questionnaire comprised 30 questions, each offering a binary choice to either confirm or deny a given statement.

Findings: After analysing the data, it turned out that students declared a high level of decision-making ability, teamwork skills and communication skills. It can also be stated that students from Ukraine showed a higher intensity of entrepreneurial qualities, and the difference in relation to students from Poland is statistically significant. In most cases, students declared a more pro-social approach, there were also differences between students from Poland and Ukraine.

Practical Implications: For further research in the field of entrepreneurial attitudes, for decision-makers in the field of modeling educational programs

Originality/Value: The challenges of the current world and the growing social awareness mean that entrepreneurial qualities are starting to be needed when solving social problems.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship, polish students, Ukrainian students, education for entrepreneurship.

JEL Classification: L26, L31, A13.

Paper type: Research article.

¹Assist. Prof., University of the National Education Commission in Krakow, Faculty of Social Sciences, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0002-5761-0489, wojciech.maciejewski@up.krakow.pl;

²Assist. Prof., Vistula University, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0002-6313-6082, a.faron@vistula.edu.pl;

1. Introduction

The changes taking place in the world have their benefits and drawbacks. Rapid technological progress, innovations that change the environment and improve the quality of life, also become the cause of environmental degradation, social inequalities and exacerbate various types of crises. Entrepreneurship acquires special importance in this regard, because on the one hand it is the driving force of the economy, but on the other hand, the turbulent environment imposes new roles and tasks on it (Norena-Chavez and Thalassinou, 2022a; 2022b).

Recent events like the COVID-19 pandemic and the outbreak of war in Ukraine are testimony to how economies of individual countries are sensitive to change, and the global implications that change can cause. Considering the challenges of the current environment, the challenge for education is not only to shape entrepreneurial attitudes aimed at the success of the enterprise but also to meet social needs. The contemporary world needs leaders who are not only effective but also socially responsible.

Entrepreneurship is more and more often perceived as a key attitude in building a competitive advantage of the economy. This is also how it is perceived by the public opinion - as the ability to create and run an enterprise. The challenges of the current world and the growing social awareness mean that entrepreneurial qualities also start to be needed when solving social problems. Hence, more and more often social enterprises are created, but running them, as in the case of a classic enterprise, requires having unique characteristics.

Developing the entrepreneurial spirit in society contributes to economic development and recovery (Zahra and Wright, 2016; Audretsch *et al.*, 2006; Oosterbeek *et al.*, 2010; Kuzmina *et al.*, 2023) but it does not always mean GDP growth (Van Stel *et al.*, 2005). For this reason, understanding entrepreneurship as starting and running your own business (Low and MacMillan, 1988, p. 141) is insufficient to analyse the impact on wealth progress.

Economic growth improves macroeconomic indicators but is not always accompanied with an improvement in the social situation (Midgley 1999; Beckerman, 1974; 1992; 1994; Moss, 1958), sometimes goes even worse (Zolotas, 1981; Kemnitz and Wigger, 2000). This is one of the reasons why the role of social entrepreneurship is being promoted more and more often in the idea of which, in addition to economic value, social impact on change is also important (Young *et al.*, 2016).

The combination of entrepreneurial and social approach is understood as actions directed at the social goal, recognition of needs, changes in the social space, with simultaneous business orientation (Mort *et al.*, 2002; Mair *et al.*, 2006; Robinson, 2006; Martin and Osberg, 2007).

While it is difficult to generalize globally, the mission of most institutions in nearly all countries is to focus less of the basic disciplines and offer more ~~in the way of~~ professional programs to a far wider range of students, than in the past.

Questions about curriculum and higher education's purpose are particularly salient in developing regions where emerging economies require both specialists trained in science and technical professions as well as strong leaders with generalist knowledge who are creative, adaptable, and able to give broad ethical consideration to social advances (Altbach *et al.*, 2009).

The purpose of this article is to compare entrepreneurial characteristics in the area of pro-social and selfish-utilitarian attitudes in the assessment of Polish and Ukrainian students, as well as verification of differences in the intensity of these features in relation to nationality. Additionally, the intensification of given pro-social features will be assessed.

2. Entrepreneurship in Social and Business Dimension

As already mentioned, the role of entrepreneurship is indisputable. “Entrepreneurs are innovative, opportunity-orientated, resourceful, value-creating change agents” (Dees *et al.*, 2001), which indicates that their education should be a priority. In this paper nevertheless, we draw attention to social aspects of entrepreneurship.

Mair and Marti (2006) define social entrepreneurship as a process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyse social change and/or address social needs. According to Murzyn *et al.* (2020) “Social enterprise is a business, market oriented and usually associated with the local community, addressing important and neglected societal problems or/and making clear social impact by innovative approach”. The European Commission defines social enterprises as three types of entity (European Commission, n.d):

1. Those for who the social or societal objective of the common good is the reason for the commercial activity, often in the form of a high level of social innovation.
2. Those whose profits are mainly reinvested to achieve this social objective.
3. Those where the method of organisation or the ownership system reflects the enterprise's mission, using democratic or participatory principles or focusing on social justice.

Social entrepreneurs may be perceived as a golden mean between for-profit and nonprofit organizations, they have social mission and simultaneously are viewed as ethical enterprises (Gigauri *et al.*, 2022). They work toward the objective of creating solutions to social challenges or providing social added value (Grilo and Moreira, 2022). Social enterprises do not function as legally defined entities.

They can be both enterprises from the second and third sector, but their functioning mainly in four areas is characteristic (European Commission, n.d.):

- Work integration - training and integration of people with disabilities and unemployed people.
- Personal social services - health, well-being and medical care, professional training, education, health services, childcare services, services for elderly people, or aid for disadvantaged people.
- Local development of disadvantaged areas - social enterprises in remote rural areas, neighbourhood development/rehabilitation schemes in urban areas, development aid and development cooperation with third countries.
- Other - including recycling, environmental protection, sports, arts, culture or historical preservation, science, research and innovation, consumer protection and amateur sports.

Based on these areas of activity, there are discernible differences between business and social enterprises whose primary goal is to create changes in the environment. These areas of activity of social enterprises do not exhaust all potential fields of activity, but they are to a large extent coincide with contemporary social challenges.

Social entrepreneurs must be distinguished by a specific set of features or talents that allow them to perform their functions in the business environment. Efficient operating of the enterprise and implementation through its goals is the task of the leader (Drath, 2001; Pearce and Conger, 2003), who in addition to traditionally understood tasks also determines its character and perception by the stakeholders. In each type of organization such people are distinguish, sometimes it results from the organizational hierarchy, and sometimes it happens informally.

Referring to social enterprises, the role of a social leader, in addition to the typical features of a business entrepreneur, are, empathy, social responsibility, emotional intelligence, ethics and virtue, faith in people, desire to change, mission leader, persistent, emotionally charged, socially alert, change agent (Rambe and Ndofirepi, 2019; Wongphuka *et al.*, 2017; Bornstein, 2004; Thompson *et al.*, 2000; Dees, 2001; Brinckerhoff, 2009; Leadbeater, 1997; Zahra *et al.*, 2009).

3. Entrepreneurial Mindset and Education

As Haynie *et al.* (2010) define, the entrepreneurial mindset it is “the ability to be dynamic, flexible, and self-regulating in one’s cognitions given dynamic and uncertain task environments”. The question is what a role of entrepreneurial education in shaping it.

The need for entrepreneurship education has long been talked about, as it is one of the factors influencing the level of entrepreneurship in the economy. Universities, importantly not only business ones, are introducing courses related to business or

management into their curricula so that students gain the knowledge to facilitate a career in business, as well as reinforce the entrepreneurial mindset.

However, entrepreneurial education is not only dedicated courses, because developing entrepreneurial attitudes does not always mean choosing the path of one's own company. Entrepreneurial skills, competences and knowledge are general managerial qualities as well as traits and behaviors are now essential for advancement in any professions.

It is by not straightforward to create a list of typical entrepreneurial qualities (nor is it the purpose of this paper), but they certainly include entrepreneurial leadership, entrepreneurial mindset, entrepreneurial skills, opportunity creation, opportunity identification, and transforming uncertainty into opportunity (Tiberius *et al.*, 2023).

It should be noted that the influence of entrepreneurship education on students' entrepreneurial outcomes is not obvious as indicated by the results of numerous studies (Nabi *et al.*, 2017), but there is a lot of proofs that it positively drives entrepreneurial intentions (Handayati *et al.*, 2020) and behavior (Cui and Bell, 2022).

In research conducted by Alakaleek *et al.* (2023) entrepreneurial knowledge and behaviour have changed under the influence of entrepreneurship education then skills and intentions have remained unaffected, meanwhile, intentions themselves can be influenced by at least influence of the peer group (Falck *et al.*, 2012), or family, culture, etc.

A significant role in fostering students' intention to become an entrepreneur has a favorable entrepreneurial climate at a university and available forms of support (Laspita *et al.*, 2023). Important issue in enhancing entrepreneurial mindset and attitude are student initiatives that are proved to develop entrepreneurial and social responsible management competences (Wihlenda *et al.*, 2023).

In this regard, another task for HEI emerges, not only to provide relevant courses, but to create opportunities or encourage students to take initiative in the university, but also outside. One solution could be the increasingly popular microcredentials, which, admittedly, are not strictly focused on entrepreneurial development but allow you to acquire a coherent set of skills/competences, but most importantly move forward their career path.

Potency is noticeable in also in serious games but their effectiveness in shaping competences and skills and usability is determined by a number of factors (Belotti *et al.*, 2014). Of course there is a lot of other tools and initiatives, not to mention business incubators, internships, volunteering, but what needs to be emphasized is that their role is not limited to the formation of business mindset but properly directed also realizes the social responsibility.

4. Research Methodology

An online questionnaire form has been prepared to collect data for the purposes of this article. The questionnaire was available in Polish and Ukrainian language. The study involved 573 students, 348 of which were students from Poland and 225 were students from Ukraine. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of 30 questions in which participants could choose one of two answers, confirming or denying a given statement.

The questions were formulated so that the interviewee expresses their view, specifying whether their attitude is more in line with a pro-social or more egoistic approach. The authors assumed that the egoistic approach is equated, in theory and practice, with the role of the entrepreneur responsible for maximising business revenue (Kuratko, 2017). In the next part, respondents could identify a personal opinion of 15 entrepreneurial attitudes on a five-step Likert scale.

5. Results and Discussion

Entrepreneurial mindset is a very broad concept and consists of many elements related to the character, manner of action and attitude to the surroundings. For the purposes of this article, 15 elements containing entrepreneurial attitudes have been proposed. The rest of the survey was a metric, and among them, in addition to gender, there were questions about the field and type of study, casual work and whether parents/guardians are doing business.

The Cronbach's alpha test was used to test the reliability of the study of entrepreneurial, prosocial and egoistic traits.

Average correlation of r positions:

Table 1. Measures of reliability Cronbach's alpha for the scale of entrepreneurial, pro-social and egoistic characteristics

	α Cronbach's	Average correlation of r positions
For entrepreneurial features	0,82	0,23
For pro-social and egoistic features	0,76	0,10

Source: Own Research, N=573.

Due to $\alpha=0.69$ with 30 pro-social and egoistic features, the least correlated feature "Responsibility at work as responsibility for the company and the team I work with" has been removed, resulting in an acceptable value in the literature of $\alpha \geq 0.7$.

The table contains data divided into Polish and Ukrainian students, as well as the total intensity of given characteristics in the studied population. The values

presented in the table are the average of the scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means no specific feature, and 5 – very strong intensity.

There are no statistically significant differences between the studied groups in the assessment of activity and perception of market opportunities. In the remaining categories of the assessment of entrepreneurial thinking, the differences between subpopulations are already significant.

Table 2. Intensity of entrepreneurial characteristics among students from Poland and Ukraine

Statement	Mean (standard deviation)			p-Value
	Total (n=573)	Polish students (n=348)	Ukrainian students (n=225)	
I am an active person – I observe and see potential market opportunities	3,842932 (0,884861)	3,824713 (0,849322)	3,871111 (0,938422)	0,145347
I have ideas for running a business through observation and perceiving market opportunities	3,726003 (1,049461)	3,557471 (1,046265)	3,986667 (1,002141)	<0,000001***
I always try to perform activities in such a way as to obtain the best results with the least amount of work	3,849913 (1,076686)	3,744253 (1,049548)	4,013333 (1,099838)	0,000134***
I have enough strength and will to achieve most of my goals in my life	4,092496 (0,900755)	3,991379 (0,893418)	4,248889 (0,891583)	0,000055***
I try not to buy unnecessary things, and save as much as possible	3,708551 (1,111233)	3,614943 (1,11112)	3,853333 (1,098213)	0,0043**
I manage to solve most problems successfully	3,989529 (0,78662)	3,91954 (0,75871)	4,097778 (0,817905)	0,001146**
I have something of an explorer /inventor about me	3,256545 (1,110415)	3,146552 (1,070331)	3,426667 (1,151552)	0,001262**
Before making a decision, I analyse possible scenarios	4,225131 (0,858888)	4,175287 (0,832183)	4,302222 (0,895048)	0,005447**
I try to make decisions without emotions	3,647469 (1,051796)	3,537356 (1,027734)	3,817778 (1,068061)	0,000228**
I am a brave person	3,750436 (1,002891)	3,675287 (1,001882)	3,866667 (0,995526)	0,012022*
I am not afraid to take risks	3,647469 (1,002435)	3,571839 (0,979919)	3,764444 (1,027557)	0,009675**
If I am interested in something, I give my whole heart to it	4,089005 (0,883474)	4,005747 (0,872223)	4,217778 (0,887233)	0,000473***
I am flexible and easily adapt to new circumstances	4,04712 (0,917704)	3,942529 (0,902846)	4,208889 (0,919001)	0,000033***
I am a communicative person and I can cooperate with others	4,260035 (0,825993)	4,195402 (0,836337)	4,36 (0,801338)	0,004281**
I'm an optimist	4,012216 (1,012953)	3,873563 (1,010659)	4,226667 (0,980707)	0,000002***

Note: *Difference statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.05$, ** difference statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.01$, *** difference statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own Research, $N=573$.

Among the ratings of various dimensions of entrepreneurship, the respondents rated their communication and cooperation skills the highest, the average rating for the entire population was 4.260035, for Poles 4.195302, and 4.36 for Ukrainians. In terms of decision-making, the students also highly rated their attitudes, on average 4.225131 for the entire population, 7.175287 for Poles and 4.302222 for Ukrainians.

The surveyed students assessed their predispositions to learn new things and be innovative as relatively low, the average answer in this case was 3.256545, with respectively scores for Poles and Ukrainians, 3.146552 and 3.426667. Despite the high self-esteem of the analytical approach to decision-making, the respondents admitted that emotions influenced their decision. When assessing the ability to undertake them without emotions, the average score was 3.647469 for the entire population, and 3.537456 for Poles, 3.817778 for Ukrainians.

Entrepreneurial thinking requires the ability to take risks and courage in action, but in this area the respondents also rated their attitudes relatively low. Describing himself as a brave person, the average grade was 3.750436 and corresponding to Poles and Ukrainians, 3.675287 and 3.86667. Also against the background of other entrepreneurial characteristics, the courage to take risks was assessed modestly, for the entire population it is 3.647469, for Poles 3.671839 and for Ukrainians 3.764444.

According to the authors opinion, one of the core elements of entrepreneurial thinking is rationality in the economic sense. This applies especially to the assessment of not making unnecessary purchases and being economical, the average score in this case was 3.78551, and for Poles 3.614943 and Ukrainians 3.853333. Also in terms of optimization of activities, the surveyed students assessed themselves quite modestly, with an average of 3.849913 and, respectively, Poles 3,744253 and Ukrainians 4,013333.

The biggest differences between Polish and Ukrainian students were in the assessment of the ability to perceive market opportunities, Polish students rated their skills at 3.557471 on average, while Ukrainians at 3.986667. Also in terms of self-esteem, there were the greatest differences as an optimist, Polish students rated themselves at 3.873563, and Ukrainians at 4.226667.

Recognizing the benefits of developing entrepreneurial attitudes is reflected in the increasing number of entrepreneurship classes in education programs. It can be considered that the decision to study can be relate to an entrepreneurial activity, of course its intensity depends on many factors.

Both Polish and Ukrainian students quite highly assessed possessing entrepreneurial attitudes. The mean value for the entire population was 58.144852 points for the range of values from 15 to 75 points.

According to the data in Table 2, Ukrainian students are characterized by a higher intensity of entrepreneurial features than Polish students. To verify the difference in the intensity of entrepreneurial attitudes the following hypotheses are proposed:

- *H0 – both trials come from one population,*
- *HA – the samples come from populations that differ significantly in the study.*

The study of hypotheses is intended to answer the question: is there a link between nationality and entrepreneurial attitude?

Table 3. *Entrepreneurial intensity of students from Poland and Ukraine*

Intensity of entrepreneurial characteristics (min 15 max 75)	Mean (standard deviation)			p-Value
	Total (n=573)	Polish students (n=348)	Ukrainian students (n=225)	
	58,144852 ($\sigma=7,746528$)	56,775862 ($\sigma=7,395481$)	60,262222 ($\sigma=7,8164$)	<0,000001*

Note: *Statistically significant difference of $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own Research, $N=573$.

To compare the intensity of entrepreneurial attitudes, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to check the equality of the intensity of features in two independent groups. The average intensity of entrepreneurial characteristics among Ukrainian students was 60.262222 on a scale from 15 to 75 points with $\sigma = 7.8164$, while in the case of students from Poland, the average was 56.775862 with $\sigma=7,3955$.

The higher value of the indicator, mean the greater the intensity of the characteristic. If the asymptomatic significance of p-Value $p < 0.05$ then the differences between the two groups are statistically significant. Thus, the H0 hypothesis is rejected and the HA hypothesis is adopted, which means that Polish and Ukrainian students differ in terms of the intensity of entrepreneurial attitudes.

The differences in the intensity of attitudes are presented in Table 3, the higher the numerical value, the greater the intensity of a given theorem in a given population, the scale is positive. Statistically significant differences are for statements whose p-Value is marked with an asterisk. The goal of developing entrepreneurial attitudes and mindset is most often equated with economic development and running one's own business. Thus, it seems that the overriding goal of undertaking business initiatives for economic profit.

However, the growth in the macro scale itself is not the only solution to transformations in the socio-economic sphere and the reality requires looking at the micro scale. This is one of the reasons why social entrepreneurship is becoming more and more popular. It seems that using the entrepreneurial potential to solve social problems from the bottom up should counteract them more effectively.

In an attempt to verify pro-social attitudes among the surveyed students, 30 statements were proposed, the content of which they could agree or reject. Agreeing with a given claim means being pro-social.

As mentioned earlier due to the weak correlation with the whole test, the statement “*Responsibility at work as responsibility for the company and the team I work with*” has been removed and the final 29 statements are presented.

As indicated by the data in Table 3, in most cases students declare pro-social attitudes, with the strongest features in situations of possible financial support for those in need, they also understand the role and importance of volunteering as an activity supporting social activities.

They also express their pro-community by participating in democratic elections, they also recognize the role of the state and the importance of taxes in meeting the needs of broadly understood social importance.

Table 4. *Pro-social attitudes in certain areas of Polish and Ukrainian students*

Statement	Number (%) of students agreeing with the opinion			p-Value
	Total (n=573)	Polish students (n=348)	Ukrainian students (n=225)	
1. In business operations, it is more important to take into account the needs and interests of the environment in which it operates	340 59,3%	188 54,023%	152 67,556%	0,00128**
2. If an entrepreneur has the opportunity to introduce two innovations – one will increase the quality of life in society and the other will give him the opportunity to be a leader in his industry, then he should develop and introduce one that will improve the quality of life of buyers	311 54,3%	183 52,586%	128 56,889%	0,312668
3. If I have two job offers to choose, I will choose the one with a better climate and development opportunities	436 76,1%	250 71,839%	186 82,667%	0,003003**
4. The problem of poverty in the world probably stems from difficult to diagnose social problems	399 69,6%	251 72,126%	148 65,778%	0,106547

5. Being employed in an enterprise that has seen an increase in profits, I would like the company to introduce positive (non-wage) changes in the company and its external environment	169 29,5%	78 22,414%	91 40,444%	0,000004***
6. A strong market position is gained by building an ethical image of the company	387 67,5%	241 69,253%	146 64,889%	0,275931
7. The introduction of social innovations allows to eliminate social exclusion	190 33,1%	113 32,471%	77 34,222%	0,663731
8. Running my own business would be a priority for me to create working conditions in which I would like to work	285 49,7%	165 47,414%	120 53,333%	0,166367
9. As a beginner entrepreneur, my goal would be to positively influence the quality of life of employees and people who are my contractors and business partners	428 74,7%	264 75,862%	164 72,889%	0,424049
10. Employee efficiency can be increased, through democratic management – by increasing the degree of employee participation in management	405 70,7%	225 64,655%	180 80%	0,000081***
11. I am more motivated by non-wage benefits (training, integration activities, recognition)	199 34,7%	104 29,885%	95 42,222%	0,002453**
12. When making decisions, I weigh all the pros and cons, I pay attention to the impact of my decision on others	457 79,8%	271 77,874%	186 82,667%	0,163196
13. When someone asks me for financial help, I help as much as possible	522 91,0%	319 91,667%	203 90,222%	0,553196
14. Social exclusions in most cases result from conditions that we have no control over	291 50,8%	193 55,46%	98 43,556%	0,005378**
15. Tax collection by the state allows income to be redistributed to those in need	309 53,9%	164 47,126%	145 64,444%	0,000049***
16. The best way to solve social problems is to motivate people to take up work through training, encouraging retraining	407 71,0%	226 64,943%	181 80,444%	0,000065***
17. Part of the company's profits should be allocated to the implementation of tasks supporting the development of the local community	228 39,8%	133 38,218%	95 42,222%	0,338962
18. I am aware of contemporary social problems but I try not to deepen them	368 64,2%	235 67,529%	133 59,111%	0,040092*
19. Society could prevent many social problems by providing support to those in need	239 41,7%	149 42,816%	90 40%	0,504373
20. Taxes are high but are necessary to implement the state's social policy	461 80,4%	275 79,023%	186 82,667%	0,282785
21. Tax avoidance by looking for tax loopholes is unethical behavior that should	320 55,8%	182 52,299%	138 61,333%	0,033437*

be socially unacceptable				
22. General elections are important because we co-decide on a common state	515 89,9%	313 89,943%	202 89,778%	0,949089
23. Charity and volunteering are important in terms of selfless help to others	463 80,8%	272 78,161%	191 84,889%	0,045837*
24. The state should spend more money on support programs for those most in need (e.g. housing program, higher pensions)	196 34,2%	73 20,977%	123 54,667%	<0,000001** *
25. I believe that enterprises that carry out active social responsibility activities (e.g. philanthropic or environmental activities) are motivated by the desire to share their profits and attempt to compensate the public for their activities	237 41,4%	122 35,057%	115 51,111%	0,000139***
26. As a customer, if I have two products to choose from, I will choose the one that offers the company with a good social reputation	113 19,7%	74 21,264%	39 17,333%	0,248129
27. I comply with the law because I feel like it should be done	410 71,6%	248 71,264%	162 72%	0,848835
28. As a consumer, I stop buying products or services of a dishonest company	323 56,4%	207 59,483%	116 51,556%	0,061684
29. If I have different views / values than the other person I work with I can take that person's perspective and strive to understand him	441 77,0%	276 73,333%	165 79,31%	116

Note: *Difference statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.05$, ** difference statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.01$, *** difference statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own Research, $N=573$.

In the case of 13 items, the equations between the examined students are statistically significant. The chi-squared test for the Yates amendment, which checks the equality of the proportion of people who reject and approve of defined claims, was used to verify the differences in pro-social attitudes. The following hypotheses were proposed:

- H_0 – the proportion of people who agree with those who disagree in groups of Poles and Ukrainians is equal.
- H_A – one-sided proportion in one group is higher than in the other, i.e., the samples come from populations that differ significantly from the test.

The null hypothesis was rejected, so there is statistically significant differences regarding the pro-social approach between the studied population, this means that students from Ukraine turn out to be more pro-social. The hypothesis testing aims to answer the question: Is there a relationship between nationality and the intensity of pro-social attitude?

Table 5. Pro-social attitudes in general of Polish and Ukrainian students

Pro-social attitudes (min 0 max 29)	Mean (standard deviation)			p-Value
	Total (n=573)	Polish students (n=348)	Ukrainian students (n=225)	
	17,188482 ($\sigma=4,378836$)	16,649425 ($\sigma=4,44798$)	18,022222 ($\sigma=4,143028$)	0,0001*

Note: *Statistically significant difference of $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own Research, $N=573$.

Is there a correlation between the intensity of pro-social attitude and egoistic attitude?

People with entrepreneurial characteristics could more effectively implement pro-social activities. Properly targeted actions and the ability to make effective decisions. As the results in Table 5 indicate, there is no correlation between egoistic and pro-social attitudes in the opinion of the surveyed students. Pearson's r correlation coefficient, if $p < 0.05$ - there is no statistically significant correlation between the intensity of pro-social attitude and egoistic attitude in any group or among the general respondents.

Table 6. Correlation of pro-social and egoistic characteristics

Pro-social and Entrepreneurship attitudes	Pearson's R correlation coefficient		
	Total (n=573)	Polish students (n=348)	Ukrainian students (n=225)
	$r_p = 0,078385$ $p = 0,060777$	$r_p = 0,047502$ $p = 0,37699$	$r_p = 0,038573$ $p = 0,564897$

Note: *Statistically significant difference of $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own Research, $N=573$.

6. Conclusions

In the study authors compared two groups of students – from Poland and Ukraine. Nowadays at Polish universities those two groups dominate. Ukrainian students, even before the outbreak of war, chose to study in Poland in quite large numbers and this phenomenon intensified after the war broke out.

Both the one and the other nationality group studied the same program in Poland, so the authors wanted to find out whether their entrepreneurial attitudes differed, which could be rooted in many factors, such as previous education, upbringing, entrepreneurial traditions in the family, environment, economic and political situation, etc.

The results of the study allow us to understand what attitudes are closer to students from Poland and Ukraine. It turns out that the surveyed students show both entrepreneurial and pro-social attitudes in their declarations.

At the same time, the intensity of these features is greater in the case of students from Ukraine, which allows us to conclude that the surveyed students from Ukraine are more enterprising and more pro-social. At the same time, the presence of egoistic features does not correlate with the occurrence of pro-social features. This conclusion allows us to formulate some recommendations:

- a more thorough analysis should be made of why individuals who declaring entrepreneurial qualities do not show pro-social attitudes,
- it should be verified whether the curricula adequately shape both entrepreneurial and pro-social attitudes,
- more in-depth research can be done on the occurrence of statistically significant differences between students from Poland and Ukraine, both in egoistic and pro-social attitudes
- further analysis can be made of the reasons for the lower intensity of entrepreneurial and pro-social attitudes among Polish students

The conclusions have some limitations resulting from the size of the study sample and the different directions of education of the study population.

References:

- Alakaleek, W., Harb, Y., Harb, A.A., Al Shishany, A. 2023. The impact of entrepreneurship education: A study of entrepreneurial outcomes. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21.
- Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L., Rumbley, L.E. 2009. *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education.
- Audretsch, D.B., Keilbach, M.C., Lehmann, E.E. 2006. *Entrepreneurship and economic growth*. Oxford University Press, New York, USA.
- Beckerman, W. 1974. *Defense of Economic Growth*. Jonathan Cape, London.
- Beckerman, W. 1992. Economic Growth and the Environment. *World Development* 20(4), pp. 481-496.
- Beckerman, W. 1994. Sustainable Development: Is it a Useful Concept? *Environmental Values*, 3, pp. 191-204.
- Bellotti, F., Berta, R., De Gloria, A., Lavagnino, E., Antonaci, A., Dagnino, F., Ott, M., Romero, M., Usart, M., Mayer, I.S. 2014. Serious games and the development of an entrepreneurial mindset in higher education engineering students. *Entertainment Computing*, 5, pp. 357-366.
- Bornstein, D. 2004. *How to change the World, Social Entrepreneurs and the Power on New Ideas*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Brinckerhoff, P.C. 2009. *Mission-based management: Leading Your Not for Profit in the 21st*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Cui, J., Bell, R. 2022. Behavioural entrepreneurial mindset: How entrepreneurial education activity impacts entrepreneurial intention and behaviour. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 20.
- Dees, J.G. 2001. The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship".

- https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wpcontent/uploads/sites/7/2015/03/Article_Deeds_MeaningofSocialEntrepreneurship_2001.pdf.
- Dees, J.G., Emerson, J., Economy, P. 2001. *Enterprising Nonprofits*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Drath, W.H. 2001. *The deep blue sea: Rethinking the source of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- European Commission. 2023. https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/social-economy/enterprises_en.
- Falck, O., Heblich, S., Luedemann, E. 2012. Identity and entrepreneurship: do school peers shape entrepreneurial intentions? *Small Business Economics* 39, pp. 39-59.
- Gigauri, I., Panait, M., Apostu, S.S., Raimi, L. 2022. The Essence of Social Entrepreneurship through a Georgian Lens: Social Entrepreneurs' Perspectives. *Administrative Sciences*, 12, 75.
- Grilo, R., Carrizo Moreira, A. 2022. The social as the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship: An emerging area or an old crossroads? *International Journal of Innovation studies*, vol. 6, issue 2, 53-66.
- Haynie, J.M., Shepherd, D., Mosakowski, E., Earley, P.C. 2010. A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25, 217-229.
- Handayati, P., Wulandari, D., Soetjipto, B.E., Wibowo, A., Narmaditya, B.S. 2020. Does entrepreneurship education promote vocational students' entrepreneurial mindset? *Heliyon*.
- Kemnitz, A., Wigger, B.U. 2000. Growth and social security: the role of human capital. *European Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 673-683.
- Kuratko, D.F. 2017. *Entrepreneurship. Theory, process, practice*. Tenth Edition, Cengage Learning Inc., Boston.
- Kuzmina, J., Atstāja, D., Grima, S., Noja, G.G., Cristea, M., Thalassinos, E.I. 2023. Calculating Financial Well-being: The Case of Young Adults in Latvia. In *Digital Transformation, Strategic Resilience, Cyber Security and Risk Management* (pp. 49-59). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Laspita, S., Sitaridis, I., Kitsios, F., Sarri, K. 2023. Founder or employee? The effect of social factors and the role of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business Research*, 155.
- Leadbeater, C. 1997. *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*. Demos London. <https://www.demos.co.uk/files/theriseofthesocialentrepreneur.pdf>.
- Low, M.B., MacMillan, I.C. 1988. Entrepreneurship: past research and future challenges. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 139-161.
- Mair, J., Marti, I. 2006. Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business* 41, 36-44.
- Mair, J., Robinson, J., Hockerts, K. 2006. Introduction. In: M. Johanna, J. Robinson and K. Hockerts (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 1-13). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, R.L., Osberg, S. 2007. Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 34-35.
- Midgley, J. 1999. Growth, Redistribution, and Welfare: Toward Social Investment, *Social Service Review* 73, no. 1, 3-21.
- Moss, M. 1968. Consumption: A Report on Contemporary Issues. In: E. Sheldon and W. Moore (eds.), *Indicators of Social Change*. Russell Sage Foundation, NY.
- Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., Carnegie, K. 2002. Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualization. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), pp. 76-88.

- Murzyn, D., Czyżewska, M., Lupa-Wójcik, I., Maciejewski, W. 2020. Innovative Social Entrepreneurship with Youth Engagement. Needs Analysis in Poland, Italy, North Macedonia and Jordan. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, Kraków.
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., Walmsley, A. 2017. The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 16(2), 277-299.
- Norena-Chavez, D., Thalassinou, E.I. 2022a. The mediation effect of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in the relationship between entrepreneurial passion and leadership styles. In *The New Digital Era: Other Emerging Risks and Opportunities* (pp. 99-125). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Norena-Chavez, D., & Thalassinou, E.I. 2022b. Transactional Leadership and Innovative Behavior as Factors Explaining Emotional Intelligence: A Mediating Effect. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(12), 545.
- Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., Ijsselstein, A. 2010. The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, vol. 54, issue, 3, pp. 442-454.
- Pearce, C.L., Conger, J.A. 2003. All those years ago: The historical underpinnings of shared leadership. In: C.L. Pearce and J.A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rambe, P., Ndofirepi, T.M. 2019. Explaining Social Entrepreneurial Intentions among College Students in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2019.1683878.
- Robinson, J. 2006. Navigating social and institutional barriers to markets: How social entrepreneurs identify and evaluate opportunities. In: J. Mair, J. Robinson, and K. Hockerts (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 95-120). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tiberius, V., Weyland, M., Mahto, R.V. 2023. Best of entrepreneurship education? A curriculum analysis of the highest-ranking entrepreneurship MBA programs. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., Lees, A. 2000. Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, Vol. 38, No. 5, 328-338. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740010340517>.
- Van Stel, A., Carree, M., Thurik, R. 2005. The effect of entrepreneurship on national economic growth. *Small Bus Econ.*, 23, 311-321.
- Wihlenda, M., Brahm, T., Habisch, A. 2023. Responsible management education: Social entrepreneurial competences of civically-engaged students. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 2.
- Wongphuka, K., Teeradej C., Phainoi, S., Boon-Long, P. 2017. Social entrepreneur competencies of social activists involved with children and youths: A case study of Nan province, Thailand Kasetsart. *Journal of Social Sciences*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2016.02.002>.
- Young, D.R., Searing E.A., Brewer, C.V., eds. 2016. *The Social Enterprise Zoo: A Guide for Perplexed Scholars, Entrepreneurs, Philanthropists, Leaders, Investors, and Policymakers*. Cheltenham, UK, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Zahra, S.A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O., Shulman, J.M. 2009. A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(2009), 519-532.

- Zahra, S.A., Wright, M. 2016. Understanding the Social role of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(4), pp. 610-629.
- Zolotas, X. 1981. *Economic Growth and Declining Social Welfare*. New York University, New York.