Determining the Factors Influencing the Performance Measurement of Social Enterprises : A Study of Organisations Operational in the State of Odisha

LOPAMUDRA PANDA*[1], PALLABI MISHRA[2] AND GANESH L.[3]
[1]Ph.D. Scholar, [2]Assistant Professor and [3]Professor & HOD
[1]Utkal University, Bhubaneswar (Odisha) India
[2]MBA Department, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar (Odisha) India
[3]MBA Department, Christ University, Bangalore (Karnataka) India

ABSTRACT

Since its inception in 1980, the term "Social entrepreneurship" has been gaining continuous importance in academic and practitioner circles (Dianne and Krueger, 2012). However, although the phrase "Social Entrepreneurship" is relatively new, its influence can be traced back throughout human history. Some people like Sh. Florence Nightingale (the creator of the first nursing school and developer of contemporary nursing methods), Sh. Vinoba Bhave (the pioneer of India's Land Gift Movement), Sh. Robert Owen (the founder of the cooperative movement) started movements and social enterprises to address social issues and bring positive change to society. In the 19th century, they had already founded these foundations and organizations before the term "Social Entrepreneurship" was used in management and other fields.

Key Words : Social enterprises, Social entrepreneurship, Performance measurement, Social value, Social impact

INTRODUCTION

The combination of economic sense with social service has also opened up new business options for those who want to work both for themselves and equally benefit society. Entrepreneurs such as Sh. Muhammad Yunus (Nobel Peace prize winner in 2006) and Dr. Verghese Kurien (Padma Vibhushan laureate in 1999) were able to come up with amazing ideas to create breakthrough products and services that profoundly enhanced human lives. When compared to non-profit businesses, social enterprises lie in the same category but can be considered as regular growing enterprises that have some experience, and annual revenue (Goyal, 2013). With this difference, social enterprises are self-sufficient firms, while a few traditional non-profits are dependent on charitable donations and government aid (Boschee and McClurg, 2003).

In addition to having a positive impact on society, social entrepreneurs also consider the interests of investors and customers. It is through social enterprise that "individual entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development" (Sengupta *et al.*, 2017). Although, the link between "Social service" and "Entrepreneurship" is still a mystery because it depends on how the results are achieved and profit is shared (Dianne and Krueger, 2012).

To achieve their goal of social transformation, social businesses need to create social value by coming up with innovative solutions to problems (Martin and Osberg, 2007). To have the greatest possible impact on society, social enterprises must find long-term solutions to social problems and be able to scale those solutions up as needed. The paper examines the history of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise. It also discusses the social enterprise concept in comparison to other similar concepts like philanthropy, NGOs (Non-Government

Organizations), and Nonprofit organizations for social value creation. It also explains why this study is important, its objectives, scope, problem statement, gap fulfilled, and study's research plan.

METHODOLOGY

In this paper, the researcher aims to study the demographics of employees of Social Enterprises. The researcher studies on the basis of Gender, age and education of the employees working with the Social enterprises. The researcher also studied the organizational details of the Social Enterprises , like type of the organization, nature of the business firm involved, details regarding the firm's main area of business, number of years of the respondents's firm has been in the business, detail of number of the employees involved in the respondent's firms, Scale of the firm, estimated annual turnover etc. This describes the specifics related to data analysis. With tables, figures, graphs, and other visual aids, the analysis' findings are displayed in various sections of the paper. The analysis is analytical, descriptive, and quantitative. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) is used to categorize, tabulate, and analyze the data. When presenting the data in the paper, both primary and secondary sources of information are practiced. The researcher used a survey questionnaire instrument to collect essential primary data. The instrument is attached in the study's Annexures I & II.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistics of the scale to assess the social enterprises performance:

In the study, the researcher adopted a scale from a study *"Performance Measurement in India- A study of selected Social Enterprises"* uploaded on Shodhganga on 18 April 2021, submitted by Manish Kumar S Patel, guided by Prof. Renuka Garg (https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/). The scale item is then verified individually with its origin. The detailed questionnaire and its item origin source are presented in Appendix I and Appendix II respectively of the study. The used scale and its item origin studies were published in well-reputed indexes and journals.

Social Enterprises performance measurementis a general phenomena. In the study, it is measured through Balanced Scorecard where seven aspects named as (i) Stakeholder Perspective (ii) Internal Processes

Perspective (iii) Learning and Growth Perspective (iv) Multi-Bottom Line Perspective (v) Governance Perspective (vi) Vision Perspective, and (vii) Sustainability Perspective were used used to measure the phenomena. Each aspect had three or more items. The responses were collected through Likert five point scale detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 : Five-point Likert's scale used in the study		
Score	Response	Description
1	No, we don't have any plans or processes. We don't think, we need them	You disagree with no doubt
2	We want to have plans and processes for this, but not now.	You disagree with some doubt
3	We have informal plans and processes for this, which we occasionally review.	You have no views on it
4	We have formal plans and processes in place for this, which we annually review.	You agree with some doubt
5	We have sophisticated plans and processes for this, which we continuously review to improve all the time.	You agree with no doubt at all

In the responses, the Shareholder's perspective all ten items mean value is greater than 3 (S01 (3.03), S02 (3.14), S03 (3.04), S04 (3.1), S05 (3.16), S06 (3.07), S07 (3.04), S08 (3.09), S09 (3.05), and S10 (3.04) respectively. It means that the majority of the respondents agreed that shareholders' perspective plays a vital role in a Social Enterprise performance. All of the item's details are presented in Table 2. For all the ten items, the standard deviation is close to one, demonstrating the consistency of the responses. In the Internal Processes (IP) perspective, the mean value of almost all five items is less than 3, except one. The mean values are 2.79, 2.79, 2.9, 3.04 and 2.96 for IP01, IP02, IP03, IP04, and IP05 respectively. The mean value reveals that the majority of respondents neither completely agree nor disagree that the Internal Process perspective is compatible to measure Social Enterprise performance and being adopted in their social enterprise. In the Learning and Growth Perspective (LnG), all the six items mean value is less than 3 but greater than 2. The mean values are 2.81, 2.84, 2.85, 2.86, 2.87 and 2.92 for LnG01, LnG02, LnG03, LnG04, LnG05, and LnG06, respectively. It reveals that the majority of the respondents had mixed views regarding the importance of Learning and Growth Perspective while measuring the aspect with respect to Social Enterprises

Table 2 : Descriptive statistics of the scale to assess the Social Enterprises Performance

Descriptive Statistics	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
S01: Expansion of your operations to include more customers and beneficiaries	200	3.03	0.776	-0.313	0.766
S02: Improvement in Product / Service quality being offered to customers and beneficiaries	200	3.14	0.825	-0.473	0.272
S03: Focusing on your stakeholder needs	200	3.04	0.801	-0.369	0.587
S04: Gathering necessary sector knowledge	200	3.1	0.792	-0.312	0.899
S05: Making your organizational identity quite similar to your desired image	200	3.16	0.823	-0.524	0.336
S06: Promoting your organization	200	3.07	0.842	-0.287	-0.166
S07: Allocating resources and assets for marketing activities	200	3.04	0.813	-0.243	0.111
S08: Evaluation of the marketing activities for their effectiveness.	200	3.09	0.809	-0.338	0.216
S09: Focus on winning back lost customers	200	3.05	0.807	-0.265	0.202
S10: Focus on the satisfaction level of stakeholders about your methods, systems, processes, products and services etc.	200	3.04	0.795	-0.193	0.172
IP01: Organized Internal Structure to support your work methods.	200	2.79	0.893	0.758	0.263
IP02: Clear internal communication processes	200	2.79	0.879	0.793	0.452
IP03: Quality management system for improvement in quality	200	2.9	0.937	0.507	-0.415
IP04: Flexible approach and methods for changing times	200	3.04	0.92	0.223	-0.5
IP05: Internal performance, evaluation system	200	2.96	0.909	0.413	-0.275
LnG01: Committed Involvement of employees in the training and development process	200	2.81	1.078	-0.26	-0.549
LnG02: Participation and working together as a team.	200	2.84	1.103	-0.256	-0.563
LnG03: Learning through both internal and external knowledge.	200	2.85	1.106	-0.262	-0.579
LnG04: Encouraging learning culture and creativity	200	2.86	1.109	-0.268	-0.594
LnG05: Learning culture inspired by leaders	200	2.87	1.109	-0.254	-0.552
LnG06: Continuous Improvement of your organization as a whole	200	2.92	1.053	-0.334	-0.381
MBL01: Increasing Income of your organization	200	2.68	1.303	0.237	-1.082
MBL02: Lowering cost of your organization	200	2.56	1.31	0.421	-0.978
MBL03: Articulating social aims clearly to maximize impact	200	2.57	1.305	0.386	-1.018
MBL04: Articulating environmental aims clearly to maximize impact	200	2.44	1.231	0.537	-0.697
MBL05: Using both financial and nonfinancial measures to review organization performance	200	2.58	1.316	0.372	-1.034
MBL06: Publishing social accounts of your organization	200	2.69	1.258	0.324	-0.953
MBL07: Analyzing, developing and diversifying your income streams	200	2.55	1.29	0.451	-0.899
MBL08: Focusing on entrepreneurial and innovative characteristics of your organization	200	2.68	1.239	0.357	-0.867
MBL09: Focusing on strategic positioning and financial, social or environmental opportunity recognition	200	2.6	1.232	0.357	-0.878
MBL10: Focusing on your operational and legal structure, capabilities and skills to maximize opportunities	200	2.43	1.184	0.404	-0.859
G01: Understanding and fulfillment of legal responsibilities by your board members	200	3.17	0.882	-0.395	0.15
G02: Board recruitment and diversity policy taking in to account social participation/ representation with, clear roles	200	2.94	0.906	-0.086	-0.081
G03: Board skill analysis and development of your organization	200	2.94	0.914	-0.488	0.271
G04: Conducting regular, well managed, time bound and structured board meetings of your organization	200	2.99	0.967	-0.418	-0.04
G05:Organizational policies, systems and structure of your organization	200	2.97	0.982	-0.326	-0.149
G06:Strategic management and decision making process of your organization	200	3.03	0.964	-0.458	0.125
V01: Business plans of your organization	200	2.82	1.055	0.652	-0.265
V02: Mission statements capturing long term aims and goals of your organization	200	2.95	1.023	0.452	-0.277
V03: Clearly communicating vision of your organization to relevant stakeholders	200	2.99	1.068	0.33	-0.691
V04:Achieving balance between strengths like capability and skills in your organization	200	2.89	1.033	0.564	-0.251
SU01: Operational Sustainability	200	3.45	0.781	-0.662	-0.57
SU02: Human Resource Sustainability	200	3.38	0.754	-0.686	0.35
SU03: Financial Sustainability	200	3.54	0.708	-0.959	0.489

(Source: Primary data)

performance. In the Multi-Bottom Line perspective all ten items have mean value less than 3. The mean values are 2.68, 2.56, 2.57, 2.44, 2.58, 2.69, 2.55, 2.68, 2.6, and 2.43 for MBL01, MBL02, MBL03, MBL04, MBL05, MBL06, MBL07, MBL08, MBL09, and MBL10 respectively. The mean value reveals that respondents don't strongly agree with Multi-Bottom Line perspectives being followed. In the Governance Perspective among all six items, two items have mean value more than 3 and four items have less than 3 mean value. The values of all six items are 3.17, 2.94, 2.94, 2.99, 2.97, and 3.03 for GO1, GO2, GO3, GO4, GO5, and GO6 respectively. The mean value of all the items is either more than 3 or close to 3. It means that these perspectives play a vital role in performance and day-to-day working. The data related to Vision Perspective revealed that a majority of respondents feels that they occasionally follow the standards in their social enterprises. The mean values for four items are 2.82, 2.95, 2.99, and 2.89 for V01, V02, V03, and V04 respectively. The mean values related to Sustainability Perspective revealed that respondents strongly believed in sustainability. The mean value for Operational Sustainability (SU01), Human Resource Sustainability (SU02), and Financial Sustainability (SU03) are 3.45, 3.38, and 3.54, respectively. For all of the items of the scale and for each perspective, the standard deviation value is close to 1. It demonstrates the consistency of the responses. The all seven perspectives have degree of skewness and kurtosis range between 1 to -1. They indicate that the data follows a normal distribution. Depending on the type of study, these are general guidelines for the test of normalcy. The standard approach recommended in the management literature is that both kurtosis and skewness values should be in the range of -2 and +2 (George and Mallery, 2010). Skewness and kurtosis measurements for this study are substantially within the range between -1 and +1 values, as seen in the table below. As a result, the distribution of the data for this analysis is normal. Table 2 provides all the information along with an item description.

Reliability and Validity Analysis:

In quantitative research a researcher can use various statistical tools and techniques. It identifies its reliability, accuracy, validity, consistency, analysis, outcomes, etc. With the use of SPSS software, the researcher applied the two techniques (i) Cronbach's Alpha, and (ii) Factors Analysis to measure the reliability

and validity of the analysis. The foundation of testing theory is the reliability and validity of the data. These tools are widely used in several academic researches and using them through SPSS is highly convenient (George and Mallery, 2010).

Reliability of the instruments:

The reliability test proves the authenticity of results in an analysis. It helps in demonstrating that the results present a certain concept, genuine, legitimate and can be used in a valid and reliable manner. Cronbach Alpha values are identified to demonstrate the data's credibility in relation to the adopted scale. In the study, the researcher used a widely adopted scale to measure the performance of social enterprises. In the social sciences, a scale is said to be reliable if its Cronbach score is greater than 0.7 (Nawi *et al.*, 2020). In the analyses, all aspect values are more than 0.7. Only Sustainability perspective has a value close to 0.7 while all other aspects value is more than 0.9. The scale measured seven aspects. The aspects with number of items and Cronbach Alpha values are presented in the Table 3.

Table 3 : Cronbach's Alpha values		
Scale and Items	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Social Enterprises Performance measurement composite scale	44	0.901
Stakeholder Perspective	10	0.966
Internal Processes Perspective	5	0.927
Learning and Growth Perspective	6	0.985
Multi-Bottom Line Perspective	10	0.973
Governance Perspective	6	0.937
Vision Perspective	4	0.966
Sustainability Perspective	3	0.741

Source: Author's primary data

Validity of the instruments:

Measuring validity of an instrument is an important and necessary step in quantitative research (Henson *et al.*, 2006). In the study, the researcher used SPSS's Principal Component Factor Analysis to check the validity of data. The usefulness of the factor analysis results was evaluated using the KMO and Bartlett's Test. Results from the Varimax Rotation Matrix were used to verify the accuracy of the data with regard to adopted scales. The scale has seven aspects to measure social enterprises performance.

Factor analysis of the data collected through the IT adoption scale:

Table 4 presents the KMO value of the composite scale to measure the social enterprises performance. Its value is 0.768. The KMO value above 0.5 indicates that the factor analysis's findings may be useful (Eze *et al.*, 2021). Bartlett's test values that are shorter indicate better factor analysis results (Eze *et al.*, 2021). The analysis's Bartlett's test value is 0.000, demonstrating the validity of the results. These values indicate that the results of the factor analysis for the social enterprises performance measurement scale are valid, dependable, and indicate that the analysis's findings will be helpful.

Table 4 : KMO and Bartlett's Test for social enterprises performance composite scale

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.89
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	11375.291
	df	946
	Sig.	0

The loadings of the rotated component matrix for social enterprises performance measurement composite scale are presented in Table 5. The loadings reveal that the scale has seven components. A number of metrics were used to measure each component. Each component's loadings display the metrics connected to it. In Table 5, Component 2 is Shareholder's Perspective because all its metrics have high loadings in the component. For example, in the component the metrics SO1, SO2, SO3, SO4, SO5, SO6, SO7, SO8, SO9, and SO10 have loadings 0.916, 0.844, 0.858, 0.875, 0.855, 0.804, 0.863, 0.891, 0.88, and 0.882 respectively. Component 5 is related to the Internal Processes perspective because all its metrics have high loadings in the component. Metics IP01, IP02, IP03, IP04, and IP05 loadings are 0.899, 0.869, 0.722, 0.702, and 0.856, respectively. Component 3 is related to Learning and Growth Perspective. Its metrics are LnG01, LnG02, LnG03, LnG04, LnG05, and LnG06 which have loadings 0.947, 0.949, 0.951, 0.950, 0.951, and 0.908, respectively.

Table 5 : Rotated Component Matrix

Rotated Component Matrix							
	Components						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SO1: Expansion of your operations to include more customers and beneficiaries	-0.029	0.916	0.093	0.159	0.009	-0.015	0.034
SO2: Improvement in Product / Service quality being offered to customers and beneficiaries	-0.014	0.844	0.133	0.142	-0.1	0.128	-0.146
SO3: Focusing on your stakeholder needs	0.016	0.858	0.099	0.118	-0.029	-0.012	0.126
SO4: Gathering necessary sector knowledge	-0.006	0.875	0.131	0.194	-0.025	0.071	-0.084
SO5: Making your organizational identity quite similar to your desired image	0.028	0.855	0.017	0.182	0.002	-0.186	-0.011
SO6: Promoting your organization	0.051	0.804	0.04	-0.056	0.162	-0.092	0.253
SO7: Allocating resources and assets for marketing activities	0.019	0.863	0.054	0.033	0.051	0.056	0.073
SO8: Evaluation of the marketing activities for their effectiveness.	0.011	0.891	0.055	-0.007	0.117	0.021	0.003
SO9: Focus on winning back lost customers	-0.002	0.88	0.065	0.039	-0.005	0.021	0.073
SO10: Focus on the satisfaction level of stakeholders about your methods, systems, processes, products and services etc.	-0.005	0.882	0.059	0.072	-0.034	0.09	0.014
IP01: Organized Internal Structure to support your work methods.	0.077	0.003	0.048	-0.095	0.899	0.087	-0.081
IP02: Clear internal communication processes	0.101	0.05	0.057	-0.143	0.869	0.205	0.075
IP03: Quality management system for improvement in quality	-0.045	0.046	0.032	0.055	0.722	0.397	-0.222
IP04: Flexible approach and methods for changing times	0.15	0.076	0.027	-0.121	0.702	0.498	0.043
IP05: Internal performance, evaluation system	0.123	0.02	0.001	-0.084	0.856	0.25	-0.031
LnG01: Committed Involvement of employees in the training and development process	-0.094	0.086	0.947	0.128	-0.037	-0.027	-0.03
LnG02: Participation and working together as a team.	-0.033	0.107	0.949	0.173	0.03	0.028	0.013
LnG03: Learning through both internal and external knowledge.	-0.042	0.115	0.951	0.15	0.02	0.026	0.022
LnG04: Encouraging learning culture and creativity	-0.01	0.109	0.95	0.198	0.047	0.013	0.007
LnG05: Learning culture inspired by leaders	-0.08	0.086	0.951	0.172	0.037	0.034	0.013
LnG06: Continuous Improvement of your organization as a whole	-0.086	0.128	0.908	0.141	0.032	-0.003	0.071

Contd... Table 5

Table 1 contd…

MBL01: Increasing Income of your organization	0.843	-0.144	-0.248	0.046	0.053	0.024	0.075
MBL02: Lowering cost of your organization	0.947	0.008	-0.079	0.016	0.068	-0.003	-0.06
MBL03: Articulating social aims clearly to maximize impact	0.914	-0.012	-0.06	-0.082	0.099	0.101	-0.159
MBL04: Articulating environmental aims clearly to maximize impact	0.966	-0.003	-0.063	0.033	0.054	0.122	-0.065
MBL05: Using both financial and nonfinancial measures to review organization performance	0.917	-0.024	0.008	0.093	0.132	0.18	-0.009
MBL06: Publishing social accounts of your organization	0.813	0.091	0.017	-0.031	0.068	-0.064	0.006
MBL07: Analyzing, developing and diversifying your income streams	0.927	0.038	-0.012	0.013	0.054	0.041	-0.042
MBL08: Focusing on entrepreneurial and innovative characteristics of your organization	0.776	0.087	0.038	0.037	0.047	0.175	0.012
MBL09: Focusing on strategic positioning and financial, social or environmental opportunity recognition	0.846	-0.014	0.012	-0.053	-0.051	0.15	0.021
MBL10: Focusing on your operational and legal structure, capabilities and skills to maximize opportunities	0.944	0	-0.062	-0.034	-0.015	0.09	-0.137
G01: Understanding and fulfillment of legal responsibilities by your board members	0.059	0.082	0.151	0.826	0.148	-0.156	0.16
G02: Board recruitment and diversity policy taking in to account social participation/ representation with, clear roles	-0.062	0.142	0.244	0.79	-0.12	0.04	0.041
G03: Board skill analysis and development of your organization	-0.032	0.194	0.12	0.771	-0.184	-0.269	-0.053
G04: Conducting regular, well managed, time bound and structured board meetings of your organization	-0.053	0.068	0.062	0.844	-0.185	-0.15	0.054
G05: Organizational policies, systems and structure of your organization	0.086	0.134	0.183	0.873	-0.05	-0.004	0.026
G06: Strategic management and decision making process of your organization	0.061	0.159	0.26	0.876	-0.063	-0.089	0.08
V01: Business plans of your organization	0.273	-0.013	-0.028	-0.185	0.321	0.798	0.092
V02: Mission statements capturing long term aims and goals of your organization	0.194	0.033	0.03	-0.184	0.274	0.86	0.114
V03: Clearly communicating vision of your organization to relevant stakeholders	0.124	0.03	0.031	-0.126	0.308	0.853	0.089
V04: Achieving balance between strengths like capability and skills in your organization	0.245	-0.008	-0.009	-0.17	0.291	0.848	0.077
SU01: Operational Sustainability	-0.166	0.061	-0.063	0.065	0.02	0.128	0.893
SU02: Human Resource Sustainability	-0.118	0.189	0.147	0.221	-0.219	0.192	0.749
SU03: Financial Sustainability	-0.057	0.113	0.17	0.286	-0.365	0.389	0.354

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Source: Author primary data

Component 1 is Multi-Bottom Line Perspective as its metrics MBL01, MBL02, MBL03, MBL04, MBL05, MBL06, MBL07, MBL08, MBL09, and MBL10 have loadings of 0.843, 0.947, 0.914, 0.966, 0.917, 0.813, 0.927, 0.776, 0.846, and 0.944 respectively. Component 4 is Governance Perspective as its metrics GO1, G02, G03, G04, and G05 have loadings of 0.826, 0.79, 0.771, 0.844, and 0.876 respectively. Component 6 is Vision Perspective as its metrics V01, V02, V03, and V04 have loadings 0.798, 0.86, 0.853, and 0.848 respectively. Component 7 is Sustainability Perspective as its metrics SU01, SU02, and SU03 have loading of 0.893, 0.749, and 0.354,

respectively.

Correlation analysis:

The researcher applied Pearson coefficients to gauge the relationship between the various scale components. The analysis is useful to determine the link between variables (Senthilnathan, 2019). It is represented by 'r'. Among the variables +1 can be the highest and -1 can be the lowest correlation between any two variables. As a result, its value ranges from 1 to -1. The values 1 and -1 show perfect positive and negative perfect correlation respectively. Stronger the relation higher the

Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci. | Jan. & Feb., 2023 | **10** (1 & 2)

(54)

Table 6 : Pearson Correlations of the Study

	SHP	IP	LnG	MBL	GP	VP	SP
			Pearson Correlations				
SHP	1						
IP	0.054	1					
LnG	.208**	0.043	1				
MBL	0.006	.177*	-0.106	1			
GP	.258**	-.203**	.363**	-0.013	1		
VP	0.015	.579**	-0.011	.305**	-.274**	1	
SP	.205**	-0.137	.168*	-.158*	.273**	.147*	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

value (Senthilnathan, 2019). There will be a negative correlation between the variables if they move in relational opposition to one another. With correlation analysis a researcher gains insight into how these aspects interact with one another. Additionally, it aids in determining the validity and reliability of the study's features and overall scale. The majority of scale aspects have strong and significant relations at both 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance. The strongest relation is between IP (Internal Perspective) and Vision Perspective (VP) which has a value of 0.579 for the Pearson Coefficient. The detail of all the values is presented in Table 6.

ANOVA Analysis:

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) is a widely used tool for determining if there is any difference of opinion among and within the groups (Sawyer, 2009). It sought to determine whether respondents' responses varied in terms of gender, age, and education among and within the groups.

ANOVA analysis to measure the difference respondents' Gender, Age and Education with respect to social enterprises performance :

In the ANOVA table above the all significant values 0.325, 0.532, and 0.381 are greater than 0.05 which is the study's significant value. It means the difference between groups (Gender, Age, and Education) and within the groups is not significant. Hence, we accept all our hypotheses. The detail of all the hypotheses related to Table 7.

Table 7 : ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
		ANOVA				
Gender	Between Groups	14.359	73	0.197	1.095	0.325
	Within Groups	22.636	126	0.18		
	Total	36.995	199			
Age	Between Groups	79.96	73	1.095	0.979	0.532
	Within Groups	140.915	126	1.118		
	Total	220.875	199			
Education	Between Groups	77.396	73	1.06	1.061	0.381
	Within Groups	125.884	126	0.999		
	Total	203.28	199			

H101 : There is no statistical significant difference among respondents' Gender for measuring the performance of social enterprises (ACCEPTED)

H111 : There is a statistical significant difference among respondents' Gender for measuring the performance of social enterprises (REJECTED)

H102 : There is no statistical significant difference among respondents' Age for measuring the performance of social enterprises (ACCEPTED)

H112 : There is a statistical significant difference among respondents' Age for measuring the performance of social enterprises (REJECTED)

H103 : There is no statistical significant difference among respondents' Education for measuring the performance of social enterprises (ACCEPTED)

H113 : There is a statistical significant difference among respondents' Education for measuring the performance of social enterprises (REJECTED)

Table 8 : ANOVA

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Stage of the organization	Between Groups	30.864	73	0.423	0.755	0.905
	Within Groups	70.531	126	0.56		
	Total	101.395	199			
Number of employees in the organization	Between Groups	16.038	73	0.22	0.7	0.952
	Within Groups	39.542	126	0.314		
	Total	55.58	199			
Estimated annual turnover	Between Groups	42.904	73	0.588	1.427	0.04
	Within Groups	51.876	126	0.412		
	Total	94.78	199			

$H2_{01}$: There is no statistical significant difference among the stages of the organization for the social enterprise's performance. (ACCEPTED)
$H2_{11}$: There is a statistical significant difference among the stages of the organization for the social enterprise's performance. (REJECTED)
$H2_{02}$: There is no statistical significant difference among the number of employees for the social enterprise's performance. (ACCEPTED)
$H2_{12}$: There is a statistical significant difference among the number of employees for the social enterprise's performance. (REJECTED)
$H2_{03}$: There is no statistical significant difference among the annual turnover for the social enterprise's performance. (REJECTED)
$H2_{13}$: There is a statistical significant difference among the annual turnover for the social enterprise's performance. (ACCEPTED)

ANOVA analysis to measure the difference in the Stage of the organization, Number of employees and Estimated annual turnover with respect to social enterprises performance:

Among the organization's demographic variables the significant value of "Stage of the organization" and "Number of employees in the organization" is above 0.05, which reveals that the difference is not statistically significant. Hence, we accept our null hypothesis. But in the "Estimated annual turnover" variable the significant value is 0.04, which is less than 0.05. It states that the difference is statistically significant. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis (Table 8).

Regression Analysis:

A practical and efficient way to determine the impact of one variable on the other is regression analysis (Sarstedt and Mooi, 2014). In the study, the researcher applied the method through SPSS. The aim of the analysis is to measure the impact of Stakeholder Perspective, Internal Processes Perspective, Learning and Growth Perspective, Multi-Bottom Line Perspective, Governance Perspective, Vision Perspective and Sustainability Perspective on the performance of social enterprises.

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Shareholder Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Shareholder's Perspective on Social Enterprises performance is presented in Table 9. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the shareholders' perspective affects the performance of social enterprises. Shareholder Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 28% of the variation in the performance of social enterprises by the R squared value of (0.285).

Table 9 : Model Summary

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.534a	0.285	0.281	16.495
a Predictors: Shareholder Perspective			

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table 10, the relationship between Shareholders Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.00) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study.

Table 10 : ANOVA

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3965.805	1	3965.805	121.991	.000
Residual	12938.635	398	32.509		
Total	16904.44	399			

Shareholder Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.534. The shareholder perspective and social enterprise performance have a significance value of 0.000. The

Table 11 : Coefficients

	Coefficients				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	83.057	5.218		15.916	0
Shareholders Perspective	1.468	0.165	0.534	8.876	0
a Dependent Variable: Social Enterprises Performance					

Hypothesis:

$H3_0$: Shareholders Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)

$H3_1$: Shareholders Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies that the numerous Shareholders Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 53.4% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to shareholders' perspective (Table 11).

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Internal Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Internal Perspective on Social Enterprises performance is presented in Table 12. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the Internal Perspective affects the

performance of Social Enterprises. Shareholder Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 15.8% of the variation in the performance of Social Enterprises by the R squared value of (0.158).

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table 13, the relationship between Internal Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.00) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study.

Internal Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.397. The Internal Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance have a significance value of 0.000. The significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies that the numerous Internal Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 39.7% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to Internal perspective (Table 14).

Table 12 : Model Summary

	Model Summary		
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.397a	0.158	0.154	17.897
a Predictors: Internal Perspective			

Table 13 : ANOVA

	ANOVA				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	11884	1	11884	37.101	.000b
Residual	63422.595	198	320.316		
Total	75306.595	199			
a Dependent Variable: Social Enterprise Performance					
b Predictors: (Constant), Internal Perspective					

Table 14 : Coefficients

	Coefficients				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	100.196	4.769		21.008	0
SUM_IP	1.935	0.318	0.397	6.091	0
a Dependent Variable: Social Enterprises Performance					

Hypothesis:

$H4_0$: Internal Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)

$H4_1$: Internal Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Learning and Growth Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Learning and Growth Perspective on Social Enterprises performance is presented in Table 15. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the Learning and Growth Perspective affects the performance of social enterprises. Learning and Growth Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 21% of the variation in the performance of social enterprises by the R squared value of (0.205).

Table 15 : Model Summary			
Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.453a	0.205	0.201	17.388
a Predictors: (Constant), Learning and Growth Perspective			

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table 16, the relationship between Learning and Growth Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.00) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study.

Learning and Growth Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.453. The Learning and Growth Perspective and Social Enterprise performance have a significance value of 0.000. The significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies that the numerous Learning and Growth Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 45.3% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to Learning and Growth Perspective (Table 17).

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Multi-Bottom Line Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Multi-Bottom Line Perspective on Social Enterprises Performance is presented in Table 18. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the Multi-Bottom Line Perspective affects the performance of social enterprises. Multi-Bottom Line Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 40% of the variation in the performance of social enterprises by the R squared value of (0.401).

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) table above, the relationship between Multi-Bottom Line Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.00) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study (Table 19).

Multi-Bottom Line Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.633. The Multi-Bottom Line Perspective and social enterprise performance have a significance value of 0.000. The significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies

Table 16 : ANOVA					
ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	15440.036	1	15440.036	51.066	.000b
Residual	59866.559	198	302.356		
Total	75306.595	199			
a Dependent Variable: SEP					
b Predictors: (Constant), Learning and Growth Perspective					

Table 17 : Coefficients					
Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	104.346	3.558		29.327	0
SUM_LnG	1.392	0.195	0.453	7.146	0
a Dependent Variable: SEP					

Hypothesis:

H5$_0$: Learning and Growth Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)

H5$_1$: Learning and Growth Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

Table 18 : Model Summary

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.633a	0.401	0.397	15.1

a Predictors: (Constant), Multi-Bottom Line Perspective

Table 19 : ANOVA

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	30161.988	1	30161.988	132.288	.000b
Residual	45144.607	198	228.003		
Total	75306.595	199			

a Dependent Variable: SEP
b Predictors: (Constant), Multi-Bottom Line Perspective

Table 20 : Coefficients

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	100.282	2.652		37.812	0
SUM_MBL	1.083	0.094	0.633	11.502	0

a Dependent Variable: SEP

Hypothesis:
$H6_0$: Multi-Bottom Line Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)
$H6_1$: Multi-Bottom Line Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

that the numerous Multi-Bottom Line Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 63.3% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to Multi-Bottom Line Perspective (Table 20).

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Governance Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Governance Perspective on Social Enterprises performance is presented in Table 21. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the Governance Perspective affects the performance of social enterprises. Governance Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 14.7% of the variation in the performance of social enterprises by the R squared value of (0.147).

Table 21 : Model Summary

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.384a	0.147	0.143	18.007

a Predictors: (Constant), Governance Perspective

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table 22, the relationship between Governance Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.00) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study.

Governance Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.384. The Governance Perspective and social enterprise performance have a significance value of 0.000. The significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies that the numerous Governance Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 38.4% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to Governance Perspective (Table 23).

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Vision Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Vision Perspective on Social Enterprises performance is presented in Table 24. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the Vision Perspective affects the performance of social enterprises. Vision Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 20%

(59)

Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci. | Jan. & Feb., 2023 | **10** (1 & 2)

Table 22 : ANOVA

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	11106.504	1	11106.504	34.254	.000b
Residual	64200.091	198	324.243		
Total	75306.595	199			
a Dependent Variable: SEP					
b Predictors: (Constant), Governance Perspective					

Table 23 : Coefficients

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	100.695	4.87		20.677	0
SUM_G	1.525	0.26	0.384	5.853	0
a Dependent Variable: SEP					

Hypothesis:

H7$_0$: Governance Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)

H7$_1$: Governance Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

Table 24 : Model Summary

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.449a	0.201	0.197	17.43
a Predictors: (Constant), Vision Perspective			

of the variation in the performance of social enterprises by the R squared value of (0.201).

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table 25, the relationship between Vision Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.00) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study.

Vision Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.449. The Vision Perspective and Social Enterprise performance have a significance value of 0.000. The significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies that the numerous Vision Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 44.9% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to Vision Perspective (Table 26).

Table 25 : ANOVA

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	15152.901	1	15152.901	49.877	.000b
Residual	60153.694	198	303.807		
Total	75306.595	199			
a Dependent Variable: SEP					
b Predictors: (Constant), Vision Perspective					

Table 26 : Coefficients

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	102.72	3.813		26.938	0
SUM_V	2.19	0.31	0.449	7.062	0
a Dependent Variable: SEP					

Hypothesis:

H8$_0$: Vision Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)

H8$_1$: Vision Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

Table 27 : Model Summary

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.201a	0.041	0.036	19.103
a Predictors: (Constant), Sustainability Perspective			

Table 28 : ANOVA

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3051.553	1	3051.553	8.362	.004b
Residual	72255.042	198	364.924		
Total	75306.595	199			
a Dependent Variable: SEP					
b Predictors: (Constant), Sustainability Perspective					

Table 29 : Coefficients

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	105.917	7.825		13.536	0
SUM_SU	2.149	0.743	0.201	2.892	0.004
a Dependent Variable: SEP					

Hypothesis:

$H9_0$: Sustainability Perspective has no impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (REJECTED)

$H9_1$: Sustainability Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)

Regression analysis to measure the impact of Sustainability Perspective on Social enterprises performance:

The Model Summary for the regression analysis of Sustainability Perspective on Social Enterprises performance is presented in Table 27. It is a summary of the analysis that shows how the Sustainability Perspective affects the performance of social enterprises. Sustainability Perspective, as a composite component, is shown to account for 4.1% of the variation in the performance of social enterprises by the R squared value of (0.041).

According to the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) table above, the relationship between Sustainability Perspective and Social Enterprise Performance is statistically significant. This is so because the analysis's significant value (0.04) is lower than (0.05) the significant value considered for the study (Table 28).

Sustainability Perspective has a beta coefficient of 0.201. The Sustainability Perspective and social enterprise performance have a significance value of 0.000. The significant value is less than the significant value adopted in the study (0.05). It signifies that the numerous Sustainability Perspective metrics have had a major impact on the performance of Social Enterprises. 20.1% of the change in the performance of social enterprises can be attributed to Sustainability Perspective (Table 29).

Hypotheses result table (Table 30):

Table 30 : Study's Hypotheses with results

Hypotheses to measure the degree of association of respondent's demographic variables with the Social Enterprises Performance	Analysis Tool	P-value
H101 : There is no statistical significant difference among respondents' Gender for measuring the performance of social enterprises (ACCEPTED)	ANOVA	0.325
H111 : There is a statistical significant difference among respondents' Gender for measuring the performance of social enterprises (REJECTED)		
H102 : There is no statistical significant difference among respondents' Age for measuring the performance of social enterprises (ACCEPTED)		0.532
H112 : There is a statistical significant difference among respondents' Age for measuring the performance of social enterprises (REJECTED)		

Contd… Table 30

Table 30 contd…

H103 : There is no statistical significant difference among respondents' Education for measuring the performance of social enterprises (ACCEPTED)		0.381
H113 : There is a statistical significant difference among respondents' Education for measuring the performance of social enterprises (REJECTED)		
Hypotheses to measure the degree of association of organization's variables with their performance		
H201: There is no statistical significant difference among the stages of the organization for the social enterprise's performance. (ACCEPTED)	ANOVA	0.905
H211: There is a statistical significant difference among the stages of the organization for the social enterprise's performance. (REJECTED)		
H202: There is no statistical significant difference among the number of employees for the social enterprise's performance. (ACCEPTED)		0.952
H212: There is a statistical significant difference among the number of employees for the social enterprise's performance. (REJECTED)		
H203: There is no statistical significant difference among the annual turnover for the social enterprise's performance. (REJECTED)		0.04
H213: There is a statistical significant difference among the annual turnover for the social enterprise's performance. (ACCEPTED)		
Objective 4: To determine the value of the selected Social Enterprises by analyzing their performance. (Value in the study is "social value" created by Social Enterprises discussed in the 2.6 section. It is measured through various Performance Indicators mentioned in BSC)		
Objective 5 (Part 2): To examine Performance Indicators (PI) impact on Social Enterprises' performance.		
H31: Shareholder's Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)	REGRESSION	0.000
H41: Internal Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)	REGRESSION	0.000
H51: Learning and Growth Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)	REGRESSION	0.000
H61: Multi-Bottom Line Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)	REGRESSION	0.000
H71: Governance Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)	REGRESSION	0.000
H81: Vision Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)	REGRESSION	0.004
H91: Sustainability Perspective has a statistically significant impact on Social Enterprises Performance. (ACCEPTED)		

Analysis conclusion:

The paper presented the data analysis in detail. It presented the frequency tables related to respondents' demographics. Various types of graphs were used to present the information related to the participatory social enterprises and respondents. To tabulate, categorize, and analyze the data's findings, SPSS software was used. The analysis was analytical, descriptive, and quantitative in nature. The presentations incorporated primary data mainly which was gathered through self-administered questionnaire survey approach. The study's Annexure includes the instrument. In order to demonstrate the scientific correctness of the hypothesis and to ensure the instrument's reliability and validity, the researcher applied the possible necessary statistical techniques. The analysis mainly used mean, standard deviation, Cronbach Alpha, Exploratory factor analysis, ANOVA, and regression analysis. Primarily, The regression analysis revealed that all scale aspects like Stakeholder Perspective, Internal Processes Perspective, Learning and Growth Perspective, Multi-Bottom Line Perspective, Governance Perspective, Vision Perspective, and Sustainability Perspective had a statistically significant relation with the social enterprises performance. The ANOVA analysis revealed that there is no statistically significant difference within the groups with age, gender, and education level regarding social enterprises performance.. In social enterprises details only total

revenue groups had differences among them for the social enterprises performance.

REFERENCES

Curley, C., Krause, R. M., Feiock, R. and Hawkins, C. V. (2019). Dealing with Missing Data: A Comparative Exploration of Approaches Using the Integrated City Sustainability Database. *Urban Affairs Review,* **55**(2) : 591–615.

Dhir, S. and Dhir, S. (2015). Diversification: Literature Review and Issues. *Strategic Change,* **24**(2) : 569-588. DOI: 10.1002/jsc.2042.

Eze, N., Oluchukwu, C. and Eze. C. (2021). Principal Component Factor Analysis of Some Development Factors in Southern Nigeria and Its Extension to Regression Analysis. *J. Advances Mathematics & Computer Sci.,* **6**(5) : 132-160. DOI:10.9734/JAMCS/2021/v36i330351.

Haynes, M. C., Ryan, N., Saleh, M., Winkel, A. F. and Ades, V. (2017). Contraceptive Knowledge Assessment: Validity and Reliability of a Novel Contraceptive Research Tool. *Contraception*, **95** : 190–197.

Henson, Robin and Roberts, J. (2006). Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Published Research Common Errors and Some Comment on Improved Practice. *Educational & Psychological Measurement,* **66** : 393-416. 10.1177/0013164405282485.

George, D. and Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update. 10th ed. Boston: Pearson

MGI (McKinsey Global Institute, 2019). Digital India: Technology to transform a connected nation. Retrieved from www.mckinsey.com/mgi on Feb 22, 2021.

Nawi, F.A.M., Tambi, A.M.A., Samat, M.F. and Mustapha, W.M.W. (2020). A Review on The Internal Consistency of a Scale: The Empirical Example of The Influence of Human Capital Investment on Malcolm Baldrige Quality Principles in TVET Institutions. *Asian People Journal*, **3**(1) : 19-29.

Sarstedt, M. and Mooi, E. (2014). *Regression Analysis. A concise guide to market research*, 193-233. 10.1007/978-3-642-53965-7_7.

Sawyer, S. (2009). Analysis of Variance: The Fundamental Concepts. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy,* **17**(6) : 27E-38E. 10.1179/jmt.2009.17.2.27E.

Senthilnathan, S.. (2019). Usefulness of Correlation Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal.* 10.2139/ssrn.3416918.

Yang, Q. (2017). *Regression.* 10.1007/978-3-319-32001-4_174-1. Texas University.

****