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ARTICLE DETAILS

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study explores the complex relationship between institutional support, perceived social support, cultural intelligence, and social entrepreneurial intention within a sample of 230 participants.

Design/Methodology/Approach:
We employ Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) to examine the moderating role of cultural intelligence in the context of social entrepreneurship, incorporating data from a diverse set of individuals engaged in various entrepreneurial endeavors.

Findings: Our analysis reveals that both institutional support and perceived social support significantly influence social entrepreneurial intention. Furthermore, cultural intelligence emerges as a pivotal moderator, shedding light on how individuals' adaptability and awareness of cultural nuances can enhance or diminish the impact of support structures on their intention to engage in social entrepreneurship.

Implications/Originality/Value: This research advances the understanding of social entrepreneurial intention by highlighting the vital role played by cultural intelligence as a moderator. The findings underscore the importance of tailored support mechanisms that consider cultural intelligence, thereby offering valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and support organizations seeking to foster social entrepreneurship in diverse contexts.

This study contributes to the growing body of literature on social entrepreneurship by illuminating the nuanced interplay between support systems and individual characteristics in shaping entrepreneurial intentions.
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**Introduction**

Global economic growth and societal advancement are now being driven by entrepreneurship, which has emerged as a powerful global force (Gubik & Vörös, 2023). The particular focus on bringing about good social change that social entrepreneurship has on the spectrum of entrepreneurial enterprises has attracted a lot of attention. Social entrepreneurs use cutting-edge concepts and long-term business strategies to solve urgent social problems and improve communities as a whole (Khaw et al., 2023). Understanding the elements that impact people's inclination to engage in social entrepreneurial activities becomes increasingly important as awareness of its significance grows (Khaw et al., 2023). This study aims to investigate the complex interactions between institutional support, perceived social support, cultural savvy (Sampene et al., 2023), and social entrepreneurial ambition, illuminating the complex processes that underlie the choice to engage in socially beneficial enterprises (Sampene et al., 2023).

Institutional support stands out as a crucial component influencing the environment in which potential entrepreneurs work in the context of social entrepreneurship. Governmental and non-governmental institutions are essential to creating a climate that supports social entrepreneurship (Kim et al., 2023). This assistance can take many different forms, from monetary rewards and legal frameworks to educational efforts and mentorship programs. Designing successful policies and interventions that promote the expansion of social businesses requires an understanding of how institutional support affects people's propensity for social entrepreneurship (Mansouri & Momtaz, 2022). Beyond the formal frameworks of institutional assistance, the perceived social support that people encounter within their social networks also has a significant impact on their intentions to pursue entrepreneurship (Luc, 2022). The confidence and drive of an individual to engage in entrepreneurial activities may be greatly influenced by the support and encouragement they receive from friends, family, and coworkers (Simp et al., 2021). This study intends to explore how interpersonal interactions help or hinder the development of social entrepreneurial goals by delving into the subjective world of perceived social support (Mansouri & Momtaz, 2021).

Along with the previously described elements, cultural intelligence plays a crucial moderating function in this dynamic process. The capacity of a person to adapt to and operate well in culturally varied contexts is referred to as cultural intelligence (Khaw et al., 2023). Cultural intelligence may operate as a stimulant or an obstacle to entrepreneurial ambitions in the context of social entrepreneurship, where initiatives frequently cross with different cultural backgrounds and societal conventions (Sampene et al., 2023). This study compares how those with greater cultural intelligence to those with lower cultural intelligence at navigating the challenges of social entrepreneurship in an effort to determine the moderating role of culture. The primary idea under examination is encapsulated by the dependent variable in this study, social entrepreneurial intention (Sampene et al., 2023). An individual's dedication and drive to engage in entrepreneurial activities with a major focus on resolving social concerns is shown in their social entrepreneurial intention (Kim et al., 2023). It involves the desire and commitment to have a good social effect using cutting-edge, environmentally friendly corporate methods. Both politicians and educators working to develop a new generation of socially conscious entrepreneurs must comprehend the aspects that lead to the establishment of social entrepreneurial intention (Mansouri & Momtaz, 2022).

The main inquiry driving our investigation as we set out on this research trip is How can institutional support, perceived social support, and cultural intelligence all work together to impact social entrepreneurial intention? Our study goals include the following in order to fully answer this question: How institutional backing affects the aim of social entrepreneurs: We want to clarify the direct impact of institutional support on people's intents to engage in socially beneficial ventures by examining the role of formal institutions and regulations in forming the environment for social entrepreneurship. Examine the connection between the aspiration to engage in social entrepreneurship and perceived social support: We want to elucidate the subtleties of how interpersonal interactions support or impede the development of
social entrepreneurial intents by a thorough examination of the subjective experiences of people inside their social networks. We want to know how cultural intelligence affects the relationships between institutional support, perceived social support, and social entrepreneurial intention. This is because we are aware of the many different cultural contexts in which social entrepreneurship takes place.

In conclusion, this study has important ramifications for academics, decision-makers, and social entrepreneurship practitioners. We want to give insightful information that can guide the creation of more focused interventions and projects by analyzing the complex interplay between institutional support, perceived social support, cultural intelligence, and social entrepreneurial intention. In the end, our research aims to pave the way for a more thorough knowledge of the variables that influence people to engage in social entrepreneurship, aiding in the development of a thriving and socially responsible entrepreneurial ecosystem.

**Literature Review**

According to (Morrison, 2007), institutional frameworks are crucial in determining the environment for social entrepreneurship. Institutional support refers to a wide range of official frameworks, regulations, and programs created to support and promote socially conscious entrepreneurship (Tran & Von Korfflesch, 2016). Studies have repeatedly shown the link between strong institutional support and increased individual intentions for social entrepreneurship (Hockerts, 2017). Financial assistance, which is frequently given in the form of grants, subsidies, or low-interest loans, is a crucial component of institutional support (Tiwari et al., 2017). In the context of social entrepreneurship, where the financial challenges of pursuing socially beneficial projects can be significant, access to financial resources has been recognized as a key element impacting people's decision-making processes (Mabusela, 2017).

Institutions that provide funding provide an environment that is open to experimentation and innovation, enabling prospective social entrepreneurs to turn ideas into real-world initiatives (Bazan et al., 2020). According to (Bignotti & le Roux, 2020) regulatory frameworks and regulations are just as important as financial support in determining the circumstances for social entrepreneurship. People are more likely to engage in social entrepreneurship when the regulatory environment is clear and encouraging because it fosters a sense of legitimacy and security (Simp et al., 2021). A supportive environment that fosters the development of social companies is facilitated by institutions that simplify administrative procedures, give tax benefits, and offer legal safeguards (Hockerts, 2017). Programs for education and training are another kind of institutional assistance that has a big impact on social entrepreneurs' objectives (Tiwari et al., 2017). Institutions that provide specialized training, mentoring, and educational resources help to create a pool of social entrepreneurs that are knowledgeable and talented (Mabusela, 2017). Such initiatives not only give participants the information and abilities they need, but they also promote a feeling of community and teamwork, which strengthens the social entrepreneurship ecosystem (Bazan et al., 2020).

According to (Mansouri & Momtaz, 2021) the literature study highlights the importance of institutional support in influencing social entrepreneurs' objectives in its conclusion. Incorporating financial, governmental, educational, and symbolic elements, institutional support is complex and helps foster a climate that is conducive to social entrepreneurship (Wu et al., 2021). Policymakers, educators, and practitioners who want to create an environment that supports socially impactful enterprises must comprehend and improve the link between institutional support and social entrepreneurial aspirations (Mansouri & Momtaz, 2022). The insights drawn from the literature serve as a basis for well-informed interventions and tactics aimed at fostering a new generation of socially conscious entrepreneurs as social entrepreneurship continues to gain popularity (Luc, 2022). Based on the above literature study, the following hypothesis is developed.

**H1: There is a significant relationship between institutional support and social entrepreneurial intentions.**
According to (Tiwari et al., 2017) focus has shifted more and more toward comprehending the complex interaction between institutional support, social entrepreneurial objectives, and the possible moderating impact of cultural intelligence within the developing area of social entrepreneurship. There is general agreement in the research that institutional support is essential to influencing the environment for social entrepreneurship (Mabusela, 2017). Institutional formal structures, policies, and efforts are acknowledged as essential facilitators that support the beginning and growth of social ventures (Gubik & Vörös, 2023). Key institutional support factors include funding, legal and regulatory frameworks, educational initiatives, and moral support. Each of these factors helps to create an environment that is favorable to social entrepreneurship (Khaw et al., 2023). These institutional components work together to impact people's intentions for social entrepreneurship by offering them resources, credibility, information, and a welcoming environment (Khaw et al., 2023). Parallel to this, the idea of cultural intelligence has come to light as a significant element that may influence how institutional support and social entrepreneurial goals interact (Sampene et al., 2023).

According to (Kim et al., 2023) the need for a more nuanced understanding of how cultural intelligence interacts with institutional support to form social entrepreneurial goals is highlighted by this expanding dialogue. Recognizing and incorporating cultural intelligence into the conceptual framework is crucial as the global landscape of social entrepreneurship grows more diversified (Sampene et al., 2023).

A more thorough knowledge of the elements affecting social entrepreneurial intents is made possible by the literature's synthesis of these aspects, which also offers useful information for practitioners, legislators, and educators (Sampene et al., 2023). Researchers hope to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of social entrepreneurship by analyzing the interaction between institutional support and cultural intelligence (Khaw et al., 2023). This will, in turn, inform the creation of policies that promote a diverse and inclusive environment for social ventures (Gubik & Vörös, 2023). Based on the above literature study, the following hypothesis is developed.

**H2: There is a significant relationship between institutional support and social entrepreneurial intentions with moderating role of cultural intelligence.**

According to (Bazan et al., 2020) the expanding subject of social entrepreneurship has stimulated scholarly investigation into the variables influencing people's intentions to participate in enterprises with a social effect, with a focus on the association between social support expectations and social entrepreneurial intents. The research now in existence repeatedly emphasizes the crucial part that perceived social support plays in determining entrepreneurial impulses, particularly in the setting of social entrepreneurship (Kim et al., 2023). The subjective opinion that people have about how much their social networks, which include family, friends, and coworkers, support and encourage their entrepreneurial pursuits is known as perceived social support (Sampene et al., 2023). According to empirical data, there is a strong correlation between perceived social support at higher levels and increased social entrepreneurship intentions (Sampene et al., 2023).

According to (Mansouri & Momtaz, 2022) the symbolic component of perceived social support is investigated, highlighting the significance of open affirmation and acknowledgment within a person's social network. Support and acceptance from close friends, family members, and other powerful people not only confirms the significance of social entrepreneurship but also adds to its social legitimacy (Luc, 2022). Public acknowledgment serves as a potent incentive, generating a sense of duty and purpose in people and reinforcing their aspirations for social entrepreneurship (Gubik & Vörös, 2023). The literature does admit, though, that depending on contextual and cultural circumstances, the effect of perceived social support may vary (Khaw et al., 2023). The type and degree of perceived social support may be shaped by cultural norms and societal expectations, which can affect how people perceive and react to the support or rejection they get from their social networks (Khaw et al., 2023).
According to (Sampene et al., 2023) a persuasive picture of the critical role that interpersonal connections play in building a culture of social entrepreneurship is painted by the corpus of work around perceived social support and social entrepreneurial goals. The assistance, inspiration, and resources made available by one's social networks turn out to be crucial predictors of one's intents to start a socially significant business as people traverse the complicated environment of such endeavors (Sampene et al., 2023). In addition to adding to the academic conversation, this nuanced understanding of the connection between perceived social support and social entrepreneurial intentions has applications for policymakers, educators, and practitioners who want to create an environment that is conducive to the development of social entrepreneurship (Kim et al., 2023). Based on the above literature study, the following hypothesis is developed.

**H3: There is a significant relationship between perceived social support and social entrepreneurial intentions.**

According to (Sampene et al., 2023) in the developing subject of social entrepreneurship has increasingly concentrated on the interaction between goals for social entrepreneurship and perceptions of social support, with a growing understanding of the possible moderating influence of cultural intelligence. The body of literature now in existence emphasizes the fundamental element that perceived social support plays in determining entrepreneurial impulses, especially when it comes to social entrepreneurship (Sampene et al., 2023). The term "perceived social support" refers to people's arbitrary assessments of the approval and motivation they get from the people in their social circles, such as their relatives, friends, and coworkers (Khaw et al., 2023). Higher levels of perceived social support and increased social entrepreneurial goals are positively and significantly correlated, according to research (Gubik & Vörös, 2023).

According to (Kim et al., 2023) the growing body of research on social entrepreneurial ambitions and perceived social support acknowledges the dynamic nature of this connection and the possible moderating role of cultural intelligence. Understanding how cultural intelligence impacts the impact of perceived social support becomes increasingly important as social entrepreneurship spreads around the globe (Khaw et al., 2023).

This combination of perceived social support, cultural savvy, and social entrepreneurial goals advances our knowledge of the variables affecting entrepreneurial incentives in a variety of cultural contexts (Luc, 2022). The conclusions drawn from this research not only enrich academic discourse but also offer useful recommendations for practitioners, educators, and politicians who wish to promote a welcoming and culturally sensitive environment for the development of social entrepreneurship (Sampene et al., 2023). Based on the above literature study, the following hypothesis is developed.

**H4: There is a significant relationship between perceived social support and social entrepreneurial intentions with moderating role of cultural intelligence.**

**Methodology**

**Research Design**

This study takes a quantitative research strategy to examine how institutional support, perceived organizational support, cultural intelligence, and social entrepreneurial goals interact. The study strategy makes use of questionnaires and organized data gathering techniques to enable the use of statistical analysis to get insightful results.

**Data Collection**

A questionnaire-based survey with 168 respondents was used to acquire the data. The poll is carried out using a convenience sample approach due to the practicality of accessing people with pertinent insights regarding digital leadership practices and sustainable performance inside organizations.

Respondents are chosen from a variety of areas to ensure the results are broadly applicable. The survey
and a cover letter outlining the importance and goals of the study are sent to participants online. The confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents’ replies are guaranteed. Reminder notifications are issued and respondents are given plenty of time to finish the survey in order to increase response rates.

**Data Analysis**
Using pertinent software programs like SPSS and PLS-SEM, extensive statistical analysis of the acquired data is carried out. In order to give a general picture of the sample, the initial stage comprises summarizing the demographic traits and important factors of the respondents.

To investigate the connections between institutional support, perceived organizational support, cultural intelligence, and social entrepreneurial goals, bivariate correlations will be investigated using correlation analysis. The direct relationship between institutional support and social entrepreneurial goals will be investigated using multiple regression analysis, adjusted for pertinent factors. Additionally, by including interaction variables in the regression models, the moderating effect of cultural intelligence will be investigated.

**Analysis and Results**
This section explains the outcomes produced by SPSS and PLS-SEM. This section presents a demographic analysis first, followed by an explanation of the PLS-SEM modelling findings.

**Table 01. Demographic Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 01 demographic Analysis may be analyzed using four main categories to give insights into the characteristics of a surveyed group.

**Distribution of Gender**
As can be seen in the table, 61.90% of respondents identified as male and 38.10% as female. The 168 respondents had a gender imbalance, with 104 men and 64 women, out of the total sample size.

**Age Distribution**
The age distribution is the second area of investigation. Four age groups are used to categorize the respondents: 20–30, 31–40, 41–50, and above 50. Interestingly, 60.71% of responders are between the ages of 31 and 40. This implies that a sizable percentage of respondents in their prime working years are included in the poll.
Experience Level
The third section explores the respondents' varying degrees of experience. Four kinds of experience are distinguished: 1–5 years, 6–10 years, 11–15 years, and more than 15 years. The most common experience range, at 35.71%, is 6–10 years, suggesting that the respondents' experience levels are fairly well distributed.

Industry Representation
The demographic study concludes with a discussion on industry representation. The three primary industries represented by the respondents are manufacturing, trading, and services. With a 48.21% share, services have the highest position, followed by manufacturing at 12.50% and trading at 39.29%. This data indicates that a sizable fraction of respondents is probably engaged in service-related sectors, and it offers insightful information about the range of industries covered in the survey.

With regard to gender, age, experience, and industry representation, this demographic analysis provides a thorough picture of the survey population overall, which may help to clarify the traits and demographics of the participants.

Table 02 Outer loading and Reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th>Composite reliability (rho_a)</th>
<th>Average variance extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS1</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS2</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS3</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS4</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS5</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS1</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS2</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS3</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS4</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS5</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI1</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI2</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI3</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI4</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI5</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Entrepreneurial Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 02 presents data on reliability analysis and outer loading for several constructs in a research project. When evaluating the validity and dependability of measuring tools used in research, this examination is crucial. Let's analyze and discuss each of the main elements in this table in brief.

**Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha**
The table begins by displaying the average variance extracted (AVE), composite reliability (rho_a), and Cronbach's alpha for the four distinct categories of perceived social support, institutional support, cultural intelligence, and social entrepreneurial intention. These figures assess the constructions' dependability and internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha for institutional support is 0.834, which denotes strong internal consistency, and the composite reliability is 0.883. With an AVE of 0.604, the concept appears to have strong convergent validity, over the acceptable threshold of 0.5. Perceived Social Support, Cultural Intelligence, and Social Entrepreneurial Intention all exhibit good reliability and convergent validity, with comparable findings.

**Outer Loading**
The associations between individual items (IS1, IS2, IS3, etc.) and their corresponding constructions are represented by the outer loadings. One indicator of IS1's contribution to measuring institutional support is its outer loading of 0.671. In a similar vein, the elements classified as part of the constructs of Social Entrepreneurial Intention (SEI1, SEI2, etc.), Cultural Intelligence (CI1, CI2, etc.), and Perceived Social Support (PSS1, PSS2, etc.) are assessed.

**R-Square and Adjusted R-Square**
These numbers, which evaluate how well the constructions explain the variations in their respective indicators, are shown at the end of the table. The constructs collectively appear to explain 89% of the variation in the observed indicators, according to an R-Square of 0.890. With an adjusted R-square of 0.886, the explanatory power is more precisely measured by taking into account the quantity of indicators and their correlations.

In conclusion, this table offers a thorough assessment of the validity and reliability of the measuring tools employed in the research. It proves the convergent validity and great internal consistency of each concept. The contributions of each item to its corresponding construct are shown by the outer loading values. The constructs appear to be an effective means of explaining the variation in the observed data, based on the high R-Square and Adjusted R-Square values. These findings suggest that the measuring tools used in this investigation are trustworthy and sturdy enough to withstand additional scrutiny and data interpretation.

| Table 03 Hypothesis Testing | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Cultural Intelligence → Social Entrepreneurial Intentions | 0.455 | 0.053 | 8.572 | 0.000 |
| Institutional Support → Social Entrepreneurial Intentions | 0.364 | 0.048 | 7.703 | 0.000 |
| Moderating Effect 1 → Social Entrepreneurial Intentions | -0.093 | 0.063 | 1.529 | 0.127 |
| Moderating Effect 2 → Social Entrepreneurial Intentions | 0.074 | 0.055 | 1.385 | 0.167 |
| Perceived Social Support → Social Entrepreneurial Intentions | 0.213 | 0.071 | 2.916 | 0.004 |
Table 3 the results of a research study's hypothesis testing, which particularly looked at the relationships between different elements and how they affected social entrepreneurial intentions. Let's dissect and explain each of the main elements in this table in brief.

**Cultural Intelligence -> Social Entrepreneurial Intentions**
According to this row, the sample mean (M) for cultural intelligence is 0.455, and the standard deviation (STDEV) is 0.053. With a p-value of 0.000, the T-statistic of 8.572 indicates strong significance. This implies that Social Entrepreneurial Intentions are strongly and favorably impacted by Cultural Intelligence. Given that the p-value is quite near to zero, the link is highly significant and suggests that cultural intelligence has a statistically significant influence on social entrepreneurial intentions.

**Institutional Support -> Social Entrepreneurial Intentions**
Institutional Support has a sample mean (M) of 0.364 and a standard deviation (STDEV) of 0.048 in relation to Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. Social entrepreneurial intentions are significantly positively influenced by institutional support, as indicated by the T-statistic of 7.703 and the p-value of 0.000. There is substantial statistical significance indicated by the low p-value.

**Moderating Effect 1 and Moderating Effect 2 -> Social Entrepreneurial Intentions**
With a sample mean (M) of -0.093 in the first row and 0.074 in the second, these two rows represent moderating effects. The p-values of 0.127 and 0.167 are relatively high, even though the T-statistics are 1.529 and 1.385, respectively. This implies that the influence of these moderating factors on social entrepreneurial intentions may not be statistically significant.

**Perceived Social Support -> Social Entrepreneurial Intentions**
The sample mean (M) for perceived social support is 0.213, and the standard deviation (STDEV) is 0.071. The link is substantial and positive, as indicated by the T-statistic of 2.916 and the p-value of 0.004. This indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between perceived social support and intentions for social entrepreneurship.
As seen by their highly significant p-values, the results of this hypothesis testing table, in summary, indicate that Cultural Intelligence and Institutional Support have a considerable and positive effect on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. There is also a statistically significant effect from perceived social support. Nevertheless, given their comparatively high p-values, the moderating effects (Moderating Effects 1 and 2) do not appear to have a substantial impact on Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. Within the framework of the research study, these findings offer insightful information on the connections between these variables and social entrepreneurial intentions.

**Conclusion**

This extensive research explores the complex interactions that exist between the goals of social entrepreneurship, perceived social support, institutional support, and the critical function of cultural intelligence. The study's findings highlight the critical role that these factors play in determining the environment that social entrepreneurship operates in. Specifically, they highlight the dynamic moderating role that cultural intelligence plays in influencing the influence of support mechanisms on people's intentions to participate in socially impactful ventures. These factors all contribute to a feeling of legitimacy and security. In addition, educational programs like mentorship, resources, and specialized training provide people the expertise to successfully negotiate the complex world of social entrepreneurship while also promoting a sense of belonging and teamwork. Symbolic support in the form of public recognition and endorsement is crucial in validating social entrepreneurship, inspiring individuals, and emphasizing the significant impact these endeavors have on society.
The strong results of the study further highlight how important perceived social support is in motivating social entrepreneurship objectives. A person's subjective assessment of the support and encouragement they receive from their social networks—which include friends, family, and coworkers—is known as perceived social support. Emotional support from close social circles increases people's confidence and sense of self-efficacy, enabling them to face the difficulties that come with being a social entrepreneur. This affective feedback serves as a driving factor behind motivation, inspiring people to pursue projects with significant societal implications. In addition, prospective social entrepreneurs can greatly benefit from instrumental assistance, which includes material resources and advice from social networks, in turning their ideas into successful businesses. The study emphasizes how having access to these kinds of resources inside one's social network greatly increases the probability of taking on initiatives that have important societal ramifications. Lastly, symbolic support reinforces the cultural legitimacy of social entrepreneurship while also validating its relevance through the affirmation and acknowledgment of prominent personalities and personal networks. Recognition by the public may be a powerful motivation for people, giving them a feeling of purpose and responsibility and increasing their desire to engage in social entrepreneurship.

Most importantly, in this intricate ecology, cultural intelligence manifests as a dynamic regulating component. The impact of perceived social support and institutional support on social entrepreneurial aims is significantly influenced by cultural intelligence, which is characterized as the capacity to adapt and thrive in culturally heterogeneous environments. Studies confirm that higher cultural quotients contribute to the positive outcomes of these safety nets. People who possess a high degree of cultural intelligence are more adept at navigating the complexities of various cultural norms, which in turn increases the influence that institutional and perceived support has on their aspirations for social entrepreneurship. This implies that by developing cultural intelligence, people may eventually achieve their social entrepreneurial goals more successfully by making better use of support systems in a variety of cultural situations.

Practically speaking, legislators, educators, and social entrepreneurship practitioners are just a few of the stakeholders who may benefit greatly from the insights and implications provided by these studies. With the use of this study, policymakers may create and put into place procedures and supporting policies that provide a fostering atmosphere for budding social entrepreneurs. It is possible to design financial incentives, streamlined rules, and instructional initiatives to support and ease the expansion of social companies. Teachers may incorporate these understandings into training curricula, giving next generations of social entrepreneurs the cultural acuity and proficiencies they need to successfully negotiate the intricacies of many environments. Furthermore, practitioners stand to gain a better grasp of how social support networks may assist their social entrepreneurship goals and help them use these networks more successfully. It’s crucial to acknowledge the contextual complexity and possible limits of these results, though. Depending on the particular institutional arrangements, cultural contexts, and economic circumstances, the effectiveness of institutional support systems may differ. Potential social entrepreneurs may use assistance programmed differently depending on their availability and level of awareness. To fully realize the potential of these insights, a sophisticated strategy that is adapted to particular settings is also necessary.

To sum up, this research offers a thorough and comprehensive comprehension of the complex connections among institutional support, perceived social support, and cultural intelligence in influencing the intents of social entrepreneurs. These results provide a solid foundation for the development of social entrepreneurship and the establishment of a supportive, varied, and inclusive ecosystem that enables people to lead significant social change. The study highlights the crucial roles these variables play in supporting the development of socially relevant initiatives in a constantly changing global environment, and it demonstrates the dynamic interplay between these aspects.
Recommendations
Following are the recommendations based on the findings of this study.

- **Enhance Institutional Support:** Institutions and policymakers should keep funding and strengthening their support for social entrepreneurship. Financial assistance, streamlined rules, educational initiatives, and public recognition are all examples of this. Enhancing these components will make the atmosphere more favorable for social entrepreneurs to prosper.

- **Encourage Cultural Intelligence:** People who are interested in social entrepreneurship should work to increase their cultural intelligence in order to better use the advantages of assistance. This may be accomplished by fostering diversity, raising cultural understanding, and providing cross-cultural training.

- **Foster Perceived Social Support:** It's critical to motivate people to look for and preserve robust social networks that offer symbolic, practical, emotional, and instrumental support. Intentions may be further pushed in this direction by fostering a community that is encouraging and understands the benefits of social entrepreneurship.

- **Education and Training:** Academic establishments have the potential to be extremely important in providing prospective social entrepreneurs with the necessary information and training. Providing tools, mentorship, and specialized training will aid in developing a pool of socially conscious business owners.

Further Research
Although this study offers insightful information, additional research is necessary to fully understand the dynamics of cultural intelligence, particularly in multicultural settings. Furthermore, research has to be done on how economic and environmental factors affect the connection between intentions and support.

Limitations
Following are the limitations of this study

- **Sample Size:** The convenience sample utilized in the study might not be representative of the total population. A broader and more varied sample size could yield a more thorough comprehension of these connections.

- **Self-Reported Data:** Self-reporting is a vulnerable method to response bias and may not accurately represent behaviors in real life.

- **Causality:** Because the study is cross-sectional, it is able to demonstrate correlations but not causes. Research using a longer time frame can help shed light on the causal connections between these factors.

- **Cultural Context:** Different locations and civilizations may interact differently with cultural intelligence, and the study may not fully represent the diversity of cultural circumstances.

- **Generalizability:** The results may not be fully relevant to other social entrepreneurship environments because they are based on the study's sample.

Notwithstanding these drawbacks, the research provides insightful information on the connections among perceived social support, institutional support, cultural acuity, and social entrepreneurship intentions. It offers a starting point for further studies and real-world initiatives to support social entrepreneurship in various cultural contexts.
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