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EXPLAINING ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS BY MEANS OF

THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR

Introduction

Entrepreneurship is an important vocational option. Individual work preferences are increasingly favouring self-reliance and self-direction (Baruch, 2004; Gibb, 2002a, 2002b; Hall, 2002). At the same time, changes in the political and the socio-economical environment have resulted in fewer opportunities for continuous organisational employment. On the macro-level, econometric research shows that new and small businesses contribute significantly to job creation, innovation and economic growth (Carree and Thurik, 2003).

Entrepreneurship is a concept that has been defined in various ways (Bruyat and Julien, 2001), ranging from narrow meanings such as starting one’s own business, to broad conceptualisations such as a work attitude that emphasises self-reliance, initiative, innovativeness, and risk-taking. However regardless of definitional emphasis, entrepreneurship is of relevance to recent career concepts such as the Protean Career, the Boundaryless Career, the Post-Corporate Career, and Employability. The Protean Career (Hall, 2004) describes a career orientation in which the person, not the organization, is in charge. Success criteria are subjective (psychological success) and the person’s core values drive career decisions (Hall, 2004). Protean Careers rely equally on adaptability to fit new situations and on a strong sense of identity. Entrepreneurship can be a vehicle for those pursuing a Protean Career as it offers opportunities for flexibility and self-expression simultaneously.

The Boundaryless Career, a related concept (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1994; Arthur and Rousseau, 1996), refers to a career in which people voluntary cross organisational boundaries, and possibly also industry and international ones. In the Boundaryless Career there is independence from, rather than dependence on, traditional career arrangements (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996). Inkson (2006) notes that it
may be more accurate to speak of a boundary-crossing, as boundaries still exist. The reduced constraint of boundaries is exemplified in entrepreneurship (DeFillipi and Arthur (1994) and Arthur and Rousseau (1996) refer extensively to Silicon Valley and its entrepreneurial culture). Here, the entrepreneur can break away from the organisation in pursuit of his or her own venture, possibly in a different industry or region. Entrepreneurship can be transient: Setting up a venture, selling it, including, for a limited time, one’s own labour, after which new ventures may be pursued.

In writings on the Post-Corporate Career (Peiperl and Baruch, 1997) the emphasis on self-employment and entrepreneurship is explicit. These new careers take place outside of large organizations, with individuals often serving the organizations they have left. These careers provide independence to individuals as well as the flexibility to respond quickly to demands and opportunities. Employability, finally, is the capability to move self-sufficiently within the labour market gaining initial employment, maintaining employment, and obtaining new employment if required (Fugate, Kinicki, and Ashfort, 2004). The concept of employability can easily be stretched to contain self-employment. Starting and running a business greatly contributes to (self-)employability as the entrepreneur is required to engage with a widely diverse set of tasks and challenges. Especially when the enterprise is small there is a holistic quality to it, as one not only sets the corporate strategy but also puts the rubbish bin out. A variety of skills and knowledge are acquired in the process, and the network expands as entrepreneurs often need to call on others in order to be successful (Gibb, 2002a, b).

What all new career concepts have in common are the notions that the individual is responsible for his or her career, that skills are preferably transferable across work settings, and that success does not just concern salary and position but also satisfaction, learning, work-life balance and autonomy. This resonates very well with entrepreneurship, if only because entrepreneurship comes in all shapes and sizes. In terms of Derr’s success measures, entrepreneurship can mean ‘getting ahead’ (growing a large business, acquiring wealth), ‘balance’ (accommodating demands from other life spheres e.g. by running a home-based business or a part-time business), ‘autonomy’ (self-employment comes with increased possibilities to decide on the what, how, and when aspects of work), ‘challenge’ (entrepreneurship offers
ample opportunities for challenge and learning), and even ‘security’ (with organisational employment offering less certainty, taking fate into one’s own hands may enhance one’s sense of perceived security).

Given the increasing importance of entrepreneurship in contemporary careers, this study aims to uncover the determinants of entrepreneurial intentions: why some intend to start their own business whereas others do not. We study this question among samples of business students, for whom this choice has particular relevance. With the exception of accountants, graduation will not provide business students with an institutionalised professional identity, in comparison to, for example, doctors, engineers and lawyers. There is still leeway in terms of whether the business student will identify with a profession (such as a manager), an industry (e.g., a real estate developer, a retailer), or employment status (for instance, an entrepreneur). In addition, business students, being well educated and having multiple options, typically choose entrepreneurship because they feel pulled towards it, rather than being pushed into it. Finally, business students form a very important clientele for entrepreneurship education institutions. So in order to serve their educational needs well, it is important to know what determines their career choices and intentions (Peterman and Kennedy, 2003).

In this study we built on previous research arriving at an optimal design to investigate entrepreneurial intentions. we use the term ‘entrepreneurial’ in a narrow sense as entrepreneurial intentions refer to intentions of setting up one's own business in the future, rather than as a type of attitude or interest (e.g., Holland’s E-Type). The terms entrepreneurship, setting up a business, and self-employment will be used as synonyms. We study samples of undergraduate business students at four different universities in the Netherlands. We conclude by drawing implications for career choice and entrepreneurship education.

**Previous research and research design development**

Early studies of entrepreneurial career choice mainly focused on issues such as personality variables, demographics, personal history, and social contexts in their explanations of individuals’ choices
and preferences with respect to their entrepreneurial status (Gibb Dyer Jr., 1994). As these explanations are all distal (Rauch and Frese, 2000), they merely apply to broad classes of behaviour, and their explanatory power turned out to be low, which makes it difficult to formulate guidelines for intervention. In the 1990s, researchers started to use social psychological models involving more proximal variables. The explanation of entrepreneurial intentions (EI) is an area of research where a sizeable body of comparable studies has emerged. So far research has focused on the prediction of EI, rather than on its realisation. Meta-analyses show that intentions are strong predictors of actual behaviour in other applied settings (Sutton, 1998; Armitage and Conner, 2001). To date, two models dominate the literature.

The first is Ajzen’s (1988, 1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), which explains intentions by means of attitudes, perceived behavioural control (PBC), and subjective norms. The second model is proposed by Shapero and Sokol (1982), and explains EI on the basis of perceived desirability, perceived feasibility and the propensity to act. Although Krueger, Reilly and Carsrud (2000) regard these models as competing, they overlap to a large degree. Shapero’s perceived desirability and perceived feasibility correspond to Ajzen’s attitudes and perceived behavioural control, respectively (Krueger, 1993; Kolvereid, 1996b; Autio, Keeley, Klofsten, and Ulfstedt, 2001). So in both models intentions are explained by willingness and capability. Both models have consistently received empirical support. In a direct comparison of the two models, Krueger, Reilly and Carsrud (2000) conclude that both models provide satisfactory predictions (Shapero model adj. r sq. 0.41 (p<0.00) and TPB model adj. r sq. 0.35 (p<0.00)). Effects for the PBC/feasibility component tend to be stronger than for the attitude/desirability component (Autio et al., 2001; Davidsson, 1995; Kolvereid, 1996b; Krueger, 2000; Tchakev and Kolvereid, 1999).

In our research design we use the Theory of Planned Behaviour. This means that we (a) do not use the Shapero model and (b) disregard additional variables outside of the TPB that might explain EI. Our reasons for not using the Shapero model are related to its specification. Shapero and Sokol (1982, p. 83) conceptualise desirability in terms of social norms, while propensity to act is operationalised in terms of
control measures (Krueger, 1993). Both specifications are confusing. The theoretical specification of the TPB is more detailed and consistent, and a great deal of research has been devoted to testing, advancing and criticising the TPB in a wide variety of fields (Fayolle, Gailly and Lassas-Clerc, 2006; Shook, Priem and McGee, 2003).

With regard to issue (b), additional variables - such as gender, work experience, parental role models, and personality traits - do in fact enhance our understanding of EI. However, we assume that the effect of these variables is mediated by the influence of the components of the TPB on EI. For example, DePillis and Reardon (2007) show that differing cultural perceptions of entrepreneurship in Ireland and the U.S.A. affect the level of EI, which would be mediated in the ‘subjective norms’ component of the TPB. Drennan, Kennedy and Renfrow (2005) demonstrate that parental business experience as well as a difficult childhood have a positive impact on both perceived desirability and perceived feasibility of starting one’s own business. Whether the effects of these variables on EI are indeed only indirect is not the focus of this paper. By solely concentrating on the components that make up the TPB, we facilitate comparisons with previous research.

The attitude/desirability component has been researched with more specificity than the PBC/feasibility component. For example, attitude to autonomy was found to be related to EI by Douglas and Shephard (2002) and by Kolvereid (1996b), although Davidsson (1995) did not find such an effect. Douglas and Shepherd further found attitudes towards risk to be related to EI, while work load and income attitudes were not. Davidsson reports that attitudes toward achievement and towards change explain EI. A range of other studies explaining EI by means of attitudes only report outcomes for attitude on a generic level (see Table 1). This goes for nearly all studies investigating the PCB/feasibility component (see Table 1), with the exception of Kristiansen and Indarti (2004). They find EI to be explained by self-efficacy as well as by instrumental readiness, a contextual variable reflecting the individual’s situation with regard to access to capital, information and networks. It is very useful to
establish results on the level of the variables that make up the attitude and PBC components. Detailed knowledge of this kind is necessary for the design of interventions that may influence EI.
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In addition, these variables should be selected with care. Attitudes, PBC, and subjective norms are theorised to be determined by two elements: beliefs about outcomes and evaluations of these outcomes. Pre-selection of relevant beliefs should be done carefully, as beliefs can be expected to vary among different populations. Younger people, for example, might have a different perception of the desirability or undesirability of factors associated with self-employment than older people. In order to capture the beliefs relevant to our population sample, we therefore included pilot studies in our research. Applying this procedure to our research project resulted in factors associated with students’ perceived attractiveness or unattractiveness of self-employment as well as factors related to the perceived feasibility of starting or running one’s own business. Still, we also included variables found to be important in the literature if they were hardly mentioned by the students. No previous studies (see Table 1) selected variables based on the samples they studied, although Kolvereid (1996a) empirically derived career reasons from a sample of MBA students which he later (1996b) applied to the study of EI among university students.

While Kolvereid (1996a) found no such conflicting perceptions, Brenner et al. (1991) report that students sometimes favour organisational or self-employment for the same reasons: both groups expected to earn a higher income, to work with people they respect, and to have greater opportunities for development in their preferred employment mode as opposed to their non-preferred one. This means that these variables will only predict career status choice within the groups of preference, while for the aggregate sample the effects will cancel out. This adds another feature to our design, not included in
previous studies (see Table 1): to correct, if necessary, for association beliefs concerning the attributes of organizational employment versus self-employment.

We now turn to the dependent variable. Intentions represent a person's motivation to make an effort to act upon a conscious plan or decision (Conner and Armitage, 1998). However, in the social psychological literature controversy has emerged about the measurement of intentions (Warshaw and Davis, 1985; Bagozzi, 1992; Bagozzi and Kimmel, 1995; Armitage and Conner, 2001). Depending on the formulation of the questions, these measures represent desires (do you want to start a business?), preferences (if you could choose between being self-employed and being employed by someone, what would you prefer?), plans (are you planning to start a business?), or behavioural expectancies (estimate the probability that you will start your own business in the next five years?).

This is especially relevant when studying the EI of samples of undergraduate students. Some students are as yet undecided when it comes to their career preference, and are still exploring their options (Nabi, Holden and Warmsley, 2006; Schein, 1978; 1990). Others have goals that often change, in other words, they suffer from goal instability (Multon, Heppner, and Lapan, 1995). In a review on career decidedness types, Gordon (1998) postulates seven different subtypes ranging from very decided to chronically indecisive. In addition, it has been argued that behavioural expectancies provide better predictions of behaviour than other measures of intention (Warshaw and Davis, 1985). This is because behavioural expectancies include considerations regarding the possible choice of other, competing behaviours (Armitage and Conner, 2001; Silvia, 2001). Non-committal measures, such as desires, take no account of facilitating or inhibiting factors.

Different operationalisations of EI result in differing explanations and predictions. Empirical evidence (Bagozzi and Kimmel, 1995; Armitage and Conner, 2001 shows measures of perceived behavioural control (PBC) to be more closely associated with commitment measures, such as behavioural expectations. In studies of EI, Phan et al. (2002) found attitude to be a stronger predictor of interest in self-employment than of likelihood to start. Most studies listed in Table 1 have ignored this issue, or
investigated other types of dependent variables (such as, planning to start in one’s own field or a different one (Lee and Wong, 2001). In this study, we operationalise EI in several ways, and verify whether this results in different levels of importance of the explanatory variables. In the remainder of this paper we will use the label ‘entrepreneurial intention’ (EI) as an overarching term.

Replication is the final feature of our design. The obvious rationale for testing the robustness of our findings is to ascertain the stability and reliability of the results. Deploying multiple datasets in a single study to test a theoretical model makes it possible to test for the stability of results (Davidsson, 2004). In previous studies on EI using replication designs, results were found to be stable across countries (Autio et al, 2001; Kristiansen and Indarti, 2004), regions (Davidsson, 1995), and samples of MBA and university students (Wilson et al., 2007).

**Pilot studies and hypothesis development**

*Pilot studies.* Pilot studies were conducted among undergraduate students of business administration of the Free University of Amsterdam (n=200) and the University of Amsterdam (n=173). Rather than working with individual beliefs, it is customary in studies based on the TPB to focus on modal beliefs identified in pilot studies (Ajzen, 2002). Usually a frequency-of-elicitation procedure is used, according to which the beliefs most often mentioned are included in the major study. So outcomes, referents and inhibitory/facilitating factors are not assessed per individual, but they are pre-selected. Using modal beliefs has the advantage that the whole sample can be compared on the basis of similar variables.

For the attitude formation open questions were used to gather data on outcome beliefs. Two questions were asked: (a) What aspects do you think are attractive about self-employment?; (b) What aspects do you think are unattractive about self-employment? The answers were used to select the attitude variables in our study (see below). Open questions were also used to determine the students’ control
beliefs: (a) What is needed to set up a business?; (b) What is needed to successfully run a business? The answers were used to select the PBC variables in our study (see below). Subjective norms were not investigated in our pilot studies. We assumed that they are related to spouse, family, friends and ‘important others’ (Kolvereid, 1996b).

**Attitudinal variables in the model.** The answers to the open questions in the pilot study were content-analysed. Four outcomes occurred with the highest frequency: autonomy and challenge (attractive aspects), and lack of financial security and work load (unattractive aspects). Based on these beliefs, we hypothesised the importance attached to autonomy and challenge to be positively related, and the importance attached to financial security and the avoidance of work load to be negatively related to the students’ intentions of setting up a business. In addition, based on the literature, we decided to add the importance attached to the accumulation of income and wealth as an additional variable. It is likely that students mention these factors less often out of social-desirability considerations (materialism is not regarded as a favourable trait by the Dutch, although one would hardly guess that from their behaviour). Wealth in the context of self-employment refers to the increase in the value of the firm as well as in salary and benefits. When working for an organization the amount of wealth that one can accumulate is relatively fixed, whereas in self-employment the opportunities to acquire wealth are (at least theoretically) infinite.

**Hypothesis 1:** Students who attach more importance to autonomy, challenge, and wealth accumulation, and less importance to financial security and work load avoidance, are more likely to have intentions of starting a business.

**Perceived behavioural control variables in the model.** The answers to the two questions regarding PBC beliefs were generally identical. In the opinion of the students, starting as well as successfully running a business primarily depend on perseverance and creativity. Based on the student beliefs, we hypothesise perseverance and creativity to be positively related to EI. In addition, based on the literature,
we decided to add measures of entrepreneurial alertness and self-efficacy. Entrepreneurial alertness (Kirzner, 1973) was added, since business students might have overlooked that sensitivity to detecting business opportunities is a precondition for entrepreneurship. Self-efficacy was added as it is a common operationalisation of PBC. PBC was originally formulated as the perceived ease or difficulty with which the behaviour involved is performed. According to this formulation, PBC is compatible with Bandura’s (1977; 1982) concept of perceived self-efficacy (Ajzen, 1991). Previous work based presents empirical support for the relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and EI (Kolvereid, 1996b, Krueger, Reilly and Carsrud, 2000; Wilson et al., 2007).

**Hypothesis 2**: Students who rate themselves higher in terms of perseverance, creativity, entrepreneurial alertness, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, are more likely to have intentions of starting a business.

**Subjective norms**: Previous EI research has proven subjective norms to be important (Krueger 1993; Kolvereid, 1996b). One reason for this might be that generally students are still in the stage of finding out their career choice preferences. The opinions of parents, partners, friends and important others might be influential in this process.

**Hypothesis 3**: Students whose subjective norms towards self-employment are more positive are more likely to have intentions of setting up a business.
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**Method**

**Samples.** The population studied consisted of undergraduate university business students. As mentioned above, pilot studies were conducted at the Free University of Amsterdam and the University of
Amsterdam to ascertain modal beliefs with respect to attitudes and PBC. In order to diminish the possibility of capitalising on chance, the main study was replicated with still other samples of undergraduate business administration students. In order to test for the robustness of the results, the study was conducted at four different universities. Samples were taken from the North (University of Groningen), the West (Erasmus University Rotterdam), the East (Radboud University Nijmegen), and the South (University of Maastricht) of the Netherlands. Of the total sample of 1301 students, 3.8% (49 students) already owned a business. As our research design is limited to the explanation of intentions, we excluded the students who already owned a business from the sample, plus 17 students who had not disclosed whether they currently owned a business. The remaining samples consisted of 291 (Groningen), 185 (Rotterdam), 420 (Nijmegen), and 339 (Maastricht) respondents, totalling 1235. The students were in the 2nd, 3rd or 4th grade year of their study. The average age of the sample was 22, with 63% male and 37% female students.

**Operationalisation of the dependent variables.** Table 2 lists the questions and the responses for the dependent variables. Questions 1 and 5 were taken from Davidsson (1995), question 2 from Krueger (1993), and questions 3 and 4 from Brenner, Pringle and Greenhaus (1991). Questions 2, 4, and 5 can be considered as behavioural expectancies. Question 2, however, is a behavioural expectancy without engagement or commitment. Question 1 concerns past interest in entrepreneurship and question 3 refers to career preference. The five variables run from relatively uncommitted (question 1) to specific behavioural expectancies (question 5). Using standardised scores they can also be conceived of as a composite, of which the descriptive results are given in Table 3.
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**Operationalisation of the independent variables.** Table 3 gives the scale characteristics (including Cronbach’s alphas) of the explanatory variables. Whenever reliable and valid measures were available in
the literature, they were used. Autonomy was measured by asking for the aspects of worker autonomy as indicated by Breaugh (1999): freedom with regard to the what, how and when of work. To account for the context of self-employment two items were added concerning the preference for a high level of responsibility (van Gelderen and Jansen, 2006). The importance attached to money and wealth was measured by using items supplied by Mitchell and Mickel (1999) and Tang (1995). Measures of challenge, financial security and work load avoidance were derived from a domain analysis of the answers of the respondents to the open questions asked in the pilot studies. The measure of self-efficacy was taken from Kolvereid (1996b), as it is specific to the situation of starting a business and has shown to be reliable in his research. Entrepreneurial alertness was measured by items supplied by Busenitz (1996). Perseverance measurement was based on an adaptation of an NEO-FFI scale for entrepreneurship (Driessen, 1996). Creativity was assessed by means of a scale used in a Dutch policy study on successful entrepreneurship (Wennekes, 2001). Subjective norms were measured in the same way as in Kolvereid (1996b).

Following Brenner et al. (1991), we investigated whether groups of respondents that differed in their preference for self-employment or organizational employment, also differed in their perceptions regarding the attributes of self-employment and organizational employment. The relevance of this check can be illustrated by means of two examples. One possibility is that students who prefer organizational employment believe that they can make more money when working for an organization. At the same time, students who prefer self-employment may believe that more money can be made by starting their own business. Similarly, students who prefer organizational employment may believe that they will not have to work as hard, or for such long hours, as in the case when they would have their own business. Vice versa, students who prefer self-employment may believe that they can work less hard and long when
having their own business because they can hire people to do the work for them. This would imply that the variables “importance of money” and “work load” are strong predictors of career preference for each respective group, but not in the sample as a whole.

For all independent variables, it was ascertained how the students associated these with self-employment and with organizational employment. The sample was split by dependent variable 3 (the question about career choice when free of restraints) and modal beliefs were computed for two groups. Both groups believed that self-employment was related to more autonomy, challenge, financial insecurity, and work load, and that it required more creativity and perseverance. Variables such as entrepreneurial alertness and self efficacy were not investigated as they exclusively refer to self-employment.

However, with respect to the possibility of earning a large amount of money, both the advocates of organizational employment (M=4.92 versus M=4.63, 7-point scales) and those of self-employment (M=4.98 versus M=4.80) believed that their respective choices offered better possibilities to achieve this goal. A paired sample T-test for the mean difference (the difference between -0.29 and .18, totalling .47) proved to be statistically significant (T=5.46, p<.00). Thus, a high degree of importance attached to wealth attainment is likely to inhibit EI if people believe that they will earn more money when working for an organization than when having their own firm. Therefore, an interaction term was used in the regression models, according to which the importance attached to money was multiplied by the level and sign of the individual’s association regarding earning money with organizational employment (-) or with self-employment (+).

**Results**

The figures in Table 2 show that in each of the samples approximately about half of the respondents have intentions to set up a business (similar figures were obtained in the two pilot studies). The difference in response between Question 3 and Question 4 shows the impact of asking about a career preference or about a behavioural expectancy. About 75% of the students who prefer to operate their own business do
not pursue this when considering actual constraints. This may be less dramatic than it seems, as in response to an open question posed to students who prefer self-employment, but actually think they will opt for organisational employment, many indicate that they first want to gain more work experience in an organisational employment setting. The percentage of positive answers to each of the five variables ranks almost identical across all the universities sampled.

Table 4 presents the correlations for the whole sample. For the subsamples we found similar patterns. All variables have significant first order correlations with the composite index of EI measures. Multicollinearity is not problematic though, given tolerance test statistics (lowest tolerance = .74) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001, p.84) and the variance inflation factor (VIF) (highest VIF = 1.57). However, a factor analysis by means of varimax rotation (unreported) performed on all items of the explanatory variables, showed that autonomy and challenge items load on the same factor. Entrepreneurial alertness and creativity items also load on a single factor. Whereas empirically these variables appear to be singular constructs, theoretically they are distinct. Therefore we chose not to collapse the items into composite variables. When regressing them to a dependent variable composite, to both the whole sample and the subsamples applied that the first- and second-order correlations of autonomy (.22 and .12) were higher than those of challenge (.15 and .08). Entrepreneurial alertness showed higher first- and second-order correlations (.43 and .27) than creativity (.29 and -.02). From the negative partial correlations we concluded that challenge and creativity work as suppressor variables, and therefore they were dropped from the analysis.
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Table 5 displays the results of the hierarchical logistic regression analyses, using the total sample, for the first four dependent measures. Table 6 shows the results of the hierarchical linear regression
analysis for the fifth dependent measure and the composite scale, also for the total sample. Gender and age were used as control (age correlating .49 with grade year). For the composite dependent measure, the model explains 38% of the variance in EI (Table 6, second column). Need for financial security, importance of wealth, entrepreneurial alertness, self-efficacy and social norms all explain EI on the 1% significance level, and work load avoidance and autonomy on the 5% significance level. Only perseverance is not related to EI. Need for financial security and entrepreneurial alertness consistently explain EI, regardless of the dependent variable used. Analysis of the data of all dependents on the subsample level (unreported here, detailed outcomes be obtained from the corresponding author upon request) revealed that social norms are often important when the dependent variable is relatively non-committal, while self-efficacy is often important when the dependent variable is a strict behavioural expectancy. Results for the subsamples also show that only need for financial security and perseverance are consistently related to EI in each sample, whereas self-efficacy and subjective norms show most instability in their contribution.
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**Discussion**

This study provides evidence for the usefulness of the Theory of Planned Behaviour in explaining Entrepreneurial Intentions, and adds to the literature through it detailed findings. The perceived behavioural control component of the TPB was tested by means of four variables, with entrepreneurial alertness receiving consistent support, and perseverance consistent lack of support in explaining EI. The participating students themselves nominated perseverance as an important variable affecting feasibility, which makes its lack of explanatory power puzzling. One possibility is that the operationalisation reflected conscientiousness rather than perseverance, for example in the case of items like ‘I usually finish what I’ve started’. Consistent support was received for entrepreneurial alertness, which indicates that
having an idea for setting up a business has motivating properties. The third variable making up the PCB component, self-efficacy, got inconsistent support, being important in some samples but not in others, and being important with some dependent variables, but not with others.

Out of the variables making up the attitude toward EI, a preference for financial security is a consistent predictor across samples and dependent variables. This finding is consistent with Douglas and Shepherd (2002). The risks involved put a lot of students off. Expectations of wealth and income attainment do not compensate for that, as those preferring organisational employment generally expected to earn more working for an organisation, whereas those preferring self-employment expected to attain more wealth and income being self-employed (a similar result was obtained by Brenner et al. (1991)).

Attitude towards autonomy, in line with Davidsson (1995) but in contrast to Kolvereid (1996b) and Douglas and Shepherd (2002), is a poor predictor across samples and dependents. Autonomy is in fact highly valued by all students, whether their preference is for self-employment or for organisational employment, and this restriction of range is an explanation for the limited power of the autonomy measure to distinguish the two groups of students.

Social norms were important with many dependent variables and in many samples. Business students often have self-employed family members or friends, which may results in positive social norms with regard to self-employment (although negative experiences with self-employment could result in negative social norms). In addition, university business schools tend to look relatively favourably on entrepreneurship, reinforcing positive social norms.

Social norms were often a significant explanatory variable when the dependent variable was non-committal, and so was self-efficacy in the case of behavioural expectancies. Even when using a multi-item scale, it is important to be aware of the implications of the type of intention measure used. Similarly, the use of multiple samples provided solid evidence for the explanatory power of some variables (notably attitude towards financial security, and perseverance), while in the case of other variables a mixed picture emerged.
Half of the business students prefer self-employment over organisational employment were they free to choose. This is a sizeable amount that is in line with previous research findings (Henderson and Robertson, 2000). However, although half of the students prefer self-employment, only a third of those actually expect to become self-employed when considering actual constraints. Similar figures were obtained by Brenner, Pringle and Greenhaus (1991). When queried about the reasons for this discrepancy most students respond that they prefer to gain organisational employment first (see also Galloway, Brown, Anderson and Wilson, 2006). There they hope to acquire the skills, knowledge, and networks that will help them to become entrepreneurs later in their career journey.

This has interesting implications for existing businesses. The construct of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) has been developed to describe the degree of entrepreneurialism of companies (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Lumpkin, 2007; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005). (Other terms describing a company starting a new venture are corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship). If a firm’s strategy and actions can be characterized as innovative, pro-active, autonomous, risk-taking, and competitively aggressive, that firm is said to be high in EO (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Lumpkin, 2007; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005). Those firms will aim to hire team members that are capable of enterprising behaviour. Their challenge is that these people may ultimately want to venture out on their own. Organisational career management should aim to provide these employees with challenging assignments, learning opportunities, and skill development. In some cases enterprising individuals may start corporate spin-offs or venture out on their own while retaining their former employer as a business partner (Peiperl and Baruch, 1997).

Our sample consisted of students, which makes the knowledge gained in this study particularly relevant to entrepreneurship education. The dependent variables show that the degree of interest that students take in entrepreneurship is high. We observed that a large number of people who prefer self-employment (if they are free to choose) opt for organizational employment (when considering the actual restraints), possibly to gain skills, knowledge and experience first. Still, the discrepancy also suggests that
there is room for entrepreneurship education to have an impact (Collins, Hannon and Smith, 2004; Henderson and Robertson, 2000). Entrepreneurship education can increase awareness, confidence and enthusiasm, but also realism, so increasing the level of EI should not necessarily be the aim. However, should one want to increase the EI of their students, our results provide guidance.

One variable with high explanatory power appears to be entrepreneurial alertness. Sensitivity to opportunities can be trained by having students engage in idea generation exercises as well as in knowledge acquisition of industry trends and practices. Both form a basis for generating ideas (DeTienne and Chandler, 2004; van Gelderen, 2006). Although Shook, Priem and McGee (2003) claim that intentions precede opportunity discovery, this does not necessarily have to be the case. Our research cannot establish the direction of causality, but the correlations suggest that having an idea for setting up a business has motivating properties. This may be explained by expectancy theory (Vroom 1964): developing ideas about business opportunities creates expectations about the gains that can eventually be made.

The need for financial security is a reversed predictor of EI. This suggests that students are not encouraged by the love of risk. Rather, they are discouraged by a fear of financial insecurity. Financial security can perhaps best be targeted at the belief level. At the belief level, the association of financial insecurity with self-employment can be modified by teaching students strategies that reduce this risk. Training students in developing self-efficacy may reduce the expectation that self-employment will inevitably mean financial insecurity. Training may build students’ confidence that self-employment may offer a path to financial independence. The ideas of students about financial risks and gains may also be changed when they are brought into contact with entrepreneurs who can serve as role models (Henderson and Robertson, 2000). They could learn, for example, that many entrepreneurs have started their businesses without investing large amounts of money, but instead relied on bootstrapping strategies to mobilise their required resources (Sarasvathy, 2001). The other side of the coin is that entrepreneurship
education should provide students who are over-optimistic, and who underestimate the possible financial consequences of self-employment, with a reality-check.

This study provides evidence for the usefulness of the TPB in explaining EI. Analysing the full sample, the model explains about 38% of the variance in EI with the composite dependent measure. This is comparable with previous findings (explained variance is hardly reduced without the controls). In research by Krueger, Reilly and Carsrud (2000), the TPB explains 35% of the variance in EI, and in a study by Tkachev and Kolvereid (1999), even 45% is explained. Possibly the characteristics of the population made it difficult to arrive at higher degrees of explanation of EI. As discussed above, people at the average age of 22, and who are still in university, are in general still uncertain and undecided about their career intentions. Although the overall variance in this study is not higher than in previous studies, our results can be argued to be higher in specificity, usefulness and reliability because of the various design features that were used.

Still, there are limitations that remain. One is common method bias: dependent and independent measures were derived from the same source. Another concern is that despite a careful selection of the variables, two couples of variables still showed construct overlap. A third one is restriction of range. It may well be the case that a variable such as autonomy was generally not a strong predictor in this study because autonomy was highly valued by both students who preferred organizational employment and those who preferred self-employment. A fourth limitation is that from a career perspective, having free choice between self- or organisational employment is a prerogative of those who possess skills, experience, and labour market power, like our business students. Other samples may have different considerations (Peel and Inkson, 2004).

Future research should examine the relation between entrepreneurial intentions and subsequent behaviour, possibly with other samples than those of business students (Shook, Priem, and McGee, 2003). Another interesting avenue of further research is to study entrepreneurs from a career development perspective. Much focus, including this study, is on employment status choice. How do serial
entrepreneurs, who set up one venture after another, view career progression? Entrepreneurs start at the top and grow a hierarchy beneath them. Still, there may be career patterns in the quality and quantity of the ventures that they pursue.

The popularity of self-employment is fitting in the present context of the boundaryless, protean, or post-corporate careers, which require increased self-reliance of individuals and which offer fewer career opportunities in the large corporations. We believe our study adds to the understanding of the determinants of employment status choice. For understanding modern careers as well as entrepreneurship, knowledge of the factors that explain entrepreneurial intentions is indispensable.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>SCV</th>
<th>VSDP</th>
<th>CAVO</th>
<th>URDV</th>
<th>RRSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krueger (1993);</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krueger, Reilly, &amp; Carsrud (2000)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidsson (1995)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolvereid (1996a, b)*</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkachev &amp; Kolvereid (1999)*</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autio et al. (2001)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Wong (2001)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raijman (2001)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas &amp; Shepherd (2002)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phan, Wong, &amp; Wang (2002)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthje &amp; Franke (2003)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristiansen &amp; Indarti (2004)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Marlino &amp; Kickul (2004)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Kickul &amp; Marlino (2007)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCV = split components into variables; att = attitudes component; pcb = perceived behavioural control; VSDP = variable selection derived from population; CAVO = check for association of the variables with the outcome (organizational versus self employment); URDV = report on a range of dependent variables; RRSC = replicate results in comparable samples; * = used Theory of Planned Behaviour; ● = design includes feature; 0 = not so.
Figure 1 Research Model
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Table 2 Frequency scores on the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>shorthand #</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>G*</th>
<th>R*</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>M*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. ever start</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. ever considered</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. free to choose</td>
<td>own business</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. likely to choose</td>
<td>own business</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. % chance to start</td>
<td>(preferring their own</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in five years      | business in Q3)              |     |     |     |     |       |

* G=Groningen (N=291), R=Rotterdam (N=185), N=Nijmegen (N=420), M=Maastricht (N=339), T=Total Sample (N=1235)

# Question 1: Do you think you will ever start a business?; Question 2: Have you ever considered founding your own firm?; Question 3: If the opportunity presented itself, and you were free to make any employment choice you desired, would you prefer to ( __ Work for an organization; __ Operate your own business); Question 4: Realistically, however, considering your actual situation and constraints upon your options (for example, lack of money), indicate which employment opportunity you're most likely to choose ( __ Work for an organization; __ Operate your own business); Question 5: How likely do you consider it to be that within five years from now you'll be running your own firm? __% (of those preferring self-employment in question 3)
Table 3 Reliabilities and descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>component variables</th>
<th>sample*</th>
<th>reliability</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>no. of items</th>
<th>range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dependent (composite scale)</td>
<td>entrepreneurial intentions</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>z-score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td>importance of autonomy</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>importance of wealth</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>financial security</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work load avoidance</td>
<td>perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>perseverance</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creativity</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurial alertness</td>
<td>self-efficacy</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective norm</td>
<td>subjective norm</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* G=Groningen (N=291), R=Rotterdam (N=185), N=Nijmegen (N=420), M=Maastricht (N=339),
T=Total Sample (N=1235)
Table 4 Correlation table and Descriptives (total sample, N=1235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. entrepreneurial intentions</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. autonomy</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. importance of wealth</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. challenge</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. financial security</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. work load avoidance</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. perseverance</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. creativity</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. entr. alertness</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. self-efficacy</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. subjective norms</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r > .06  p<.05;  r > .08 p <.01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>importance of autonomy</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance of wealth</td>
<td>- .62**</td>
<td>- .62**</td>
<td>- .62**</td>
<td>- .62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial security</td>
<td>- .15*</td>
<td>- .15*</td>
<td>- .15*</td>
<td>- .15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work load avoidance</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perseverance</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurial alertness</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-efficacy</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective norm</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi-square goodness-of-fit</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>387.6</td>
<td>277.3</td>
<td>188.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagelkerke r square</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% correctly classified</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. ** p < .01. $e^B$ = exponentiated B (odds ratio). Controls (included in a first step) are age and gender (omitted from the table)
Table 6: Multiple linear regression, composite sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th></th>
<th>composite index</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>-33.32</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance of autonomy</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance of wealth</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial security</td>
<td>-3.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work load avoidance</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perseverance</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurial alertness</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-efficacy</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective norm</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusted r-square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F sign</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. ** p < .01.
Explaining entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of planned behavior

Van Gelderen, Marco

2006