



**HAL**  
open science

## Predicting entrepreneurial behaviour: a test of the theory of planned behaviour

Teemu Kautonen, Marco van Gelderen, Erno T. Tornikoski

► **To cite this version:**

Teemu Kautonen, Marco van Gelderen, Erno T. Tornikoski. Predicting entrepreneurial behaviour: a test of the theory of planned behaviour. *Applied Economics*, 2011, 45 (06), pp.697-707. 10.1080/00036846.2011.610750 . hal-00741505

**HAL Id: hal-00741505**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00741505>**

Submitted on 13 Oct 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



## Predicting entrepreneurial behaviour: a test of the theory of planned behaviour

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-2010-0110.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Mar-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Kautonen, Teemu; University of Turku, TSE Entre van Gelderen, Marco; Massey University Tornikoski, Erno; ESC Saint-Etienne
JEL Code:	J23 - Employment Determination; Job Creation; Labor Demand; Self-Employment < J2 - Time Allocation, Work Behavior, and Employment Determination/Creation < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, J24 - Human Capital Skills Occupational Choice Labor Productivity < J2 - Time Allocation, Work Behavior, and Employment Determination/Creation < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, M13 - Entrepreneurship < M1 - Business Administration < M - Business Administration and Business Econ; Marketing; Accounting
Keywords:	occupational choice, self-employment, entrepreneurship, intention, Theory of Planned Behaviour

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

# Predicting entrepreneurial behaviour: a test of the theory of planned behaviour

## I. Introduction

The extant literature often models participation in entrepreneurship as a utility-maximizing occupational choice between self-employment and paid employment (e.g., Blanchflower *et al.*, 2001; Moore and Mueller, 2002; Rojas and Siga, 2009; Uusitalo, 2001; for an overview, see chapter 2 in Parker, 2009). A recent article in this journal extends this model by analysing the occupational choice of self-employment as an ordinal variable comprising several stages, thus accounting for the process nature of new venture creation (van der Zwan *et al.*, 2010). The econometric models in van der Zwan *et al.* (2010) employ a range of demographic determinants and individual perceptions related to the economic environment. The present article extends this research by introducing psychological constructs to explain an individual's progress across different entrepreneurial engagement levels (entrepreneurial behaviour) by applying Ajzen's (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). Originating from social psychology, the TPB works on the assumption that intention is a significant predictor of behaviour, while intention itself is a function of behavioural beliefs that link the given behaviour to certain outcomes. In the entrepreneurial context, the TPB thus contributes to our understanding of the emergence of entrepreneurial behaviour prior to the onset of any observable action, which has notable implications for policy, for example if the objective is to promote enterprising activity by fostering a culture conducive to entrepreneurship (Kautonen *et al.*, 2009; Liñán and Chen, 2009).

1  
2  
3 A great deal of cross-disciplinary research has been devoted to testing,  
4  
5  
6 advancing and criticizing the TPB (for overviews in social psychology, see the meta-  
7  
8 analyses by Armitage and Conner, 2001 and Sheeran, 2002; for applications of the  
9  
10 TPB to analyse diverse economic behaviours, see for example d' Astous *et al.*, 2005;  
11  
12 East, 1993; Lynne *et al.*, 1995). In the entrepreneurial context, many studies have  
13  
14 applied the TPB to predict the intention to start a business, albeit often using  
15  
16 convenience samples of university students (e.g., Autio *et al.*, 2001; Kolvereid, 1996;  
17  
18 Krueger *et al.*, 2000; van Gelderen *et al.*, 2008). This body of literature also argues  
19  
20 that the TPB provides more predictive power in this context than personality traits or  
21  
22 demographic characteristics (Autio *et al.*, 2001; Krueger *et al.*, 2000), which are  
23  
24 common in the occupational choice literature pertaining to entrepreneurship (see  
25  
26 Parker, 2009 for an overview). As Krueger and his colleagues (2000: 413) put it,  
27  
28 scholars best predict any planned behaviour, such as entrepreneurship, 'by observing  
29  
30 intentions toward that behaviour—not by attitudes, beliefs, personality, or mere  
31  
32 demographics'. The intention construct and its antecedents are 'closer to the action'  
33  
34 than more distal constructs such as traits and demographics, which may predict broad  
35  
36 classes of behaviour well, but not specific actions (Epstein and O'Brien, 1985; Rauch  
37  
38 and Frese, 2007), and whose effects the more immediate, proximal TPB constructs  
39  
40 mediate (Ajzen, 1991; 2011). In other words, distal constructs such as traits and  
41  
42 demographics are antecedents of the more proximal constructs in the TPB model,  
43  
44 where intention is the immediate predictor of behaviour.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 In spite of the established stream of scholarship explaining the formation of  
54  
55 entrepreneurial intentions, the authors of the present article are not aware of a single  
56  
57 empirical study that would use longitudinal data to examine whether the intention to  
58  
59 start a business measured at one point of time translates into subsequent  
60

1  
2  
3 entrepreneurial behaviour. In fact, many scholars identify the lack of such studies as  
4  
5 a major shortcoming of the extant literature on business start-up intentions (e.g.,  
6  
7 Krueger *et al.*, 2000; Souitaris *et al.*, 2007). Moreover, even though the results of  
8  
9 previous research generally support the efficacy of the TPB as a predictor of  
10  
11 entrepreneurial intentions, the predominant use of student samples limits the  
12  
13 generalizability of the results. Therefore, entrepreneurship scholars call for tests of  
14  
15 intentions models on samples of subjects in different stages of life (Peterman and  
16  
17 Kennedy, 2003).

22 The principal contribution of this article is to present a full test of the TPB in  
23  
24 the context of business start-up intentions and subsequent behaviour by examining  
25  
26 two-wave survey data on the working-age population of Western Finland with a  
27  
28 three-year gap between the data collection for the intention (2006) and the behaviour  
29  
30 items (2009). By testing the full TPB model according to Ajzen's (2011) current  
31  
32 specification, this study provides the foundation for further research that aims to  
33  
34 incorporate new developments in the model, and thereby increase our understanding  
35  
36 of the emergence of entrepreneurial behaviour. The study further contributes to the  
37  
38 generalization of the results obtained in previous studies of entrepreneurial intentions  
39  
40 by employing data that comprises working-age individuals (18-64 years) instead of a  
41  
42 convenience sample of students. The contribution of the study is not limited to the  
43  
44 literature on entrepreneurship as an occupational choice, however, but it also  
45  
46 contributes to economic literature more generally by providing an example of the  
47  
48 efficacy of the TPB as a predictor of an economic behaviour that is rare, obscure and  
49  
50 often involves unpredictable time lags (Krueger *et al.*, 2000).

57 The remainder of this article is arranged as follows. Section II introduces the  
58  
59 TPB model and the research hypotheses. Section III presents the empirical data,  
60

1  
2  
3 while Section IV discusses the analysis strategy. Section V provides the econometric  
4  
5 results and Section V concludes.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **II. Theoretical framework and research hypotheses**

11  
12  
13

14  
15 Ajzen (2011) provides a generic definition of intention as ‘a person’s readiness to  
16  
17 perform a given behavior’. In the entrepreneurial context, Thompson (2009, p. 676)  
18  
19 defines intention as ‘a self-acknowledged conviction by a person that they intend to  
20  
21 set up a new business venture and consciously plan to do so at some point in the  
22  
23 future’. In the TPB framework, intention is a function of three antecedents: a  
24  
25 favourable or unfavourable evaluation of the behaviour (attitude), perceived social  
26  
27 pressure to perform or not perform the behaviour (subjective norm), and the  
28  
29 perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour (Perceived Behavioural  
30  
31 Control, PBC) (Ajzen, 1991). Applied to the entrepreneurial context, the more  
32  
33 positive an individual’s evaluations of engaging in entrepreneurial behaviour are, the  
34  
35 more supportive of entrepreneurial behaviour the individual perceives their  
36  
37 significant others to be, and the more capable they feel of performing entrepreneurial  
38  
39 activities, the stronger should be their intention, *ceteris paribus*, to engage in  
40  
41 entrepreneurial behaviour. Prior applications of the TPB in the entrepreneurship  
42  
43 literature suggest that attitude, subjective norms, and PBC typically explain 30-45%  
44  
45 of the variance in intentions (Autio *et al.*, 2001; Kolvereid, 1996; Krueger *et al.*,  
46  
47 2000; Liñán and Chen, 2009; Van Gelderen *et al.*, 2008). Therefore:  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56  
57 H1a. An entrepreneurially favourable attitude is positively related to  
58  
59 entrepreneurial intention.  
60

1  
2  
3 H1b. An entrepreneurially favourable subjective norm is positively related to  
4 entrepreneurial intention.  
5  
6

7  
8 H1c. PBC is positively related to entrepreneurial intention.  
9

10  
11  
12 The TPB further posits that intention provides a link between the three  
13 antecedents and subsequent behaviour. Reviewing different meta-analyses covering  
14 diverse behavioural domains, Sheeran (2002) reports a mean correlation of 0.53  
15 between intention and behaviour, while Armitage and Conner (2001) find a mean  
16 correlation of 0.47 in their meta-analysis focusing on the efficacy of the TPB.  
17  
18 Although there are no full tests of the TPB in the context of business start-ups,  
19 studies exist in the enterprise literature that shed indirect evidence on the intention-  
20 behaviour relationship. For example, Henley (2007) investigated whether statements  
21 of entrepreneurial aspirations precede transitions into self-employment one year  
22 later. He studied employees with no current business ventures, and asked them  
23 whether they would like to start a (new) business in the next 12 months. His data  
24 show that only 8% of individuals with initial aspirations had become self-employed  
25 one year later. Using cross-sectional data from a variety of European countries and  
26 the United States, Grilo and Irigoyen (2006) found that preference levels pertaining  
27 to self-employment are higher than the actual realization levels. Blanchflower and  
28 Oswald (1998) and Blanchflower *et al.* (2001) report similar cross-sectional results.  
29  
30 While these results hint at a possible gap in the intention-behaviour relationship, the  
31 cited studies do not demonstrate whether the underlying cause is people not acting on  
32 their preferences, or these actions not resulting in operational businesses. Based on  
33 the theoretical specification of the TPB and the available indirect empirical evidence,  
34 this study proposes:  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 H2a. Entrepreneurial intention is positively related to subsequent  
7  
8 entrepreneurial behaviour.  
9

10  
11  
12 Further, Ajzen (1991) argues that intention is a sufficient predictor of  
13  
14 behaviour in situations where the individual has a very high degree of volitional  
15  
16 control over the behaviour. However, in situations where there are problems with  
17  
18 volitional control, PBC should be additionally and independently predictive of  
19  
20 behaviour. The rationale is that individuals will exert additional effort given  
21  
22 increased feelings of control and that action not only depends on intentions but also  
23  
24 on non-motivational factors such as the availability of opportunities and resources.  
25  
26 Jointly, Ajzen (1991) argues, these factors constitute people's actual control of the  
27  
28 behaviour in question and to the extent that perceived control is realistic, it can serve  
29  
30 as a substitute for actual control. Since entrepreneurial behaviour is not totally under  
31  
32 the individual's volitional control – for example, dealing with regulations, obtaining  
33  
34 financing and acquiring customers introduce contingencies to the process of new  
35  
36 venture creation that are beyond the aspiring entrepreneur's complete control – PBC  
37  
38 is likely to contribute to the prediction of behaviour over and above its mediated  
39  
40 influence via intention. Hence:  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 H2b. PBC is positively related to subsequent entrepreneurial behaviour, over  
52  
53 and above its mediated effect via intention.  
54  
55

56  
57 Fig. 1 summarizes the TPB model and the hypothesized relationships.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

INSERT FIG. 1 ABOUT HERE

### III. Data

#### *Data collection*

The research team collected the survey data in the provinces of Central Ostrobothnia, Ostrobothnia and South Ostrobothnia in Western Finland in November 2006 (first wave) and November 2009 (second wave) as part of a research project on Ostrobothnian entrepreneurship. Finland as a whole has a moderate level of entrepreneurial activity compared to many other countries in the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor surveys (e.g., Pukkinen *et al.*, 2007; Stenholm *et al.*, 2009). Of course, there are regional variations in the rates of enterprising activity in Finland and the three provinces included in this study represent this diversity fairly well. For example, the province of Ostrobothnia has a relatively low level of entrepreneurial activity, while South Ostrobothnia has one of the highest entrepreneurial activity levels in the country (Hyrsky and Lipponen, 2004). Thus, the empirical results should not be biased because of excessive homogeneity of the regional sample in terms of the level of entrepreneurial activity.

In the first wave of data collection the researchers mailed 5600 questionnaires to a random sample of individuals aged 15-74, obtained from the Finnish Population Register Centre. Hence, this study overcomes the common limitation in entrepreneurial intentions research of using convenience samples consisting of (university) students. The survey was anonymous, but the respondents could indicate their willingness to participate in a follow-up study and provide their contact details.

1  
2  
3 The survey resulted in a total of 1301 responses (response rate: 23.2%). Following  
4  
5 the archival analysis approach to examining non-response bias (Rogelberg and  
6  
7 Stanton, 2007), the researchers compared the sample with the original list received  
8  
9 from the Population Register Centre containing the names, addresses, sex, and year  
10  
11 of birth of all 5600 people to whom the questionnaire was sent. This list of 5600  
12  
13 individuals is representative of the working-age population in the three Western  
14  
15 Finnish provinces. The comparison shows that the average age of the respondents in  
16  
17 the sample is slightly higher (45.1 years) than in the original list (43.4 years).  
18  
19 Moreover, women have a higher comparative participation rate than men, since 58%  
20  
21 of the respondents in the sample are female compared with 49 % in the original list.  
22  
23 Eight percent of the respondents were self-employed already, and were thus excluded  
24  
25 from further consideration in this study. The 2006 data collection covers all variables  
26  
27 in the research model, excluding the primary dependent variable, entrepreneurial  
28  
29 behaviour.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The second-wave survey collected data on entrepreneurial behaviour, and  
37  
38 included those first-wave respondents who were not self-employed in 2006 and who  
39  
40 had given their permission and contact details for a follow-up study (29% of those  
41  
42 not self-employed in 2006). Consequently, the research team sent out 354  
43  
44 questionnaires by post and via e-mail (depending on the respondent's preference),  
45  
46 resulting in 132 responses (response rate: 37.3%). A meaningful analysis of the  
47  
48 intention-behaviour relationship requires a sufficient number of responses from  
49  
50 individuals with high intentions ('intenders'). Whereas for the prediction of  
51  
52 intentions the entire population is of interest, this is far less the case for the intention-  
53  
54 behaviour link, which is concerned with whether intenders subsequently take action,  
55  
56 not with whether non-intenders do not take action. Sheeran (2002) in fact shows that  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 non-intenders showing behaviour are rare. In order to ensure a sufficient number of  
4  
5  
6 intenders in the longitudinal sample, the research procedure included 29 phone calls  
7  
8 to individuals with high intentions in 2006 (6% of the sample had a score of 5 or  
9  
10 higher on our 7-point intention scale, where a high score stands for high intention),  
11  
12 with the purpose of motivating them to return the questionnaire, when they had not  
13  
14 done so by the initial deadline. The downside of the over-sampling strategy is that it  
15  
16 may increase the risk of type II error. However, our research design reduces type II  
17  
18 error by allowing a three-year period to pass between the measurement of intention  
19  
20 and actual behaviour (Sutton, 1998), which limits the risk of people being classified  
21  
22 as not engaging in entrepreneurial behaviour even if they do eventually start a  
23  
24 business after three years.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The following analysis focuses on working-age individuals (18-64 years in  
30  
31 2006; this is also the age bracket employed in the influential Global Entrepreneurship  
32  
33 Monitor, see Kelley *et al.*, 2010) who were not self-employed in 2006, resulting in a  
34  
35 final two-wave sample of 117 individuals.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 *Covariates*

42  
43 The primary dependent variable in this study, *entrepreneurial behaviour*, captures  
44  
45 whether and how the respondent had engaged in entrepreneurial behaviour by the  
46  
47 time of the second survey wave in November 2009. The operationalization of this  
48  
49 variable relies on the concept of the entrepreneurial ladder (van der Zwan *et al.*,  
50  
51 2010). Instead of treating the decision to become an entrepreneur as a binary  
52  
53 occupational choice between paid employment and self-employment, the concept of  
54  
55 the entrepreneurial ladder understands it as a process consisting of a series of  
56  
57 naturally ordered engagement levels where each level represents an increasing level  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of involvement in the entrepreneurial process. Operationalizing entrepreneurial  
4  
5 behaviour in terms of different engagement levels is in line with the TPB (Ajzen,  
6  
7 1985), where behaviour refers to making an effort to start a business rather than  
8  
9 achieving the outcome of having started a business. Thus, the operationalization  
10  
11 based on the entrepreneurial ladder distinguishes between different degrees of effort  
12  
13 the individual has invested in the process of starting a business. The respective  
14  
15 question in the survey instrument for forming this variable is: ‘In the last three years  
16  
17 (that is, from November 2006 on), have you started a business or thought about  
18  
19 starting a business alone or together with others?’ (translated from Finnish). The  
20  
21 respondent could choose between four options: 1) have not thought about starting a  
22  
23 business; 2) thought about it but have not taken action; 3) have not started a business  
24  
25 but have commenced preparations and intend to start up in the near future; and 4)  
26  
27 have started a business. The variable employed in the econometric analysis is  
28  
29 therefore an ordinal variable comprising four engagement levels.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 According to Thompson (2009), having *entrepreneurial intention* is not a  
37  
38 simple yes or no question but a matter of extent ranging from very low to very high.  
39  
40 Hence, this research uses an ordinal scale based on the question ‘How likely is it that  
41  
42 you will start your own business?’ to form the measure of intention. On this scale, a  
43  
44 score of 1 indicates very low intentions and a score of 7 very high intentions to start a  
45  
46 business. This question yields a so-called behavioural expectancy measure of  
47  
48 intention (van Gelderen *et al.*, 2008). Previous literature argues and finds that  
49  
50 behavioural expectancies provide better predictions of behaviour than other measures  
51  
52 of intention (Sheppard *et al.*, 1988; Warshaw and Davis, 1985). The rationale is that  
53  
54 behavioural expectancies include considerations regarding the possible choice of  
55  
56 other competing behaviours (Armitage and Conner, 2001; Silvia, 2001), whereas  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 non-committal measures, such as preferences which entrepreneurship studies also  
4 commonly use (e.g., Kolvereid, 1996), take no account of facilitating or inhibiting  
5 factors. Although the literature often uses psychometric scales to measure  
6 entrepreneurial intentions (for recent scale development efforts, see e.g., Liñan and  
7 Chen, 2009; Thompson, 2009), the use of single-item measures is not uncommon  
8 (Autio *et al.*, 2001; Krueger *et al.*, 2000; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003). In  
9 particular, researchers commonly apply single-item measures when measuring  
10 expectancies and such measures suffice when constructs are sufficiently narrow and  
11 unambiguous to the respondent (Wanous *et al.*, 1997). The intention measure in the  
12 present study fulfils these criteria and is similar to formulations in prior research on  
13 entrepreneurial intentions (Autio *et al.*, 2001; Kolvereid, 1996; Krueger *et al.*, 2000).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The psychometric scale used to measure *PBC* is based on the one developed by  
30 Kolvereid (1996) (see Appendix 1 for the wordings of all psychometric scale items).  
31 Following Ajzen's (2002) arguments against the use of items referring to outcomes  
32 (such as expected chances of success), we excluded three items (items 3, 5, and 6 in  
33 Kolvereid 1996, p. 52) as they do not relate to the actual behaviour in question. Thus,  
34 the initial index for PBC in this study comprised the three items displayed in  
35 Appendix 1. Ajzen's (2002) conceives of PBC as an overarching construct that  
36 entails both self-efficacy and control. However, the item referring to issues outside  
37 one's control that prevent one from starting a business (item 4 in Kolvereid 1996, p.  
38 52) lowered the scale's reliability considerably. Therefore, the authors decided to  
39 apply a two-item index of PBC where a high score signifies that the individual finds  
40 starting a business relatively easy (Cronbach's alpha: 0.82).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 Following Kolvereid (1996), the independent variable, *subjective norm*, is the  
58 product of two sets of psychometric measures, each using a seven-point Likert scale.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The first set contains three items measuring the individual's beliefs concerning  
4 whether their family, friends, and colleagues or other important people think that the  
5 individual should or should not start up in business. The second set of measures  
6 captures the degree to which those people's opinions impact on the individual's  
7 decision as to whether or not to start a business. The researchers first multiplied the  
8 corresponding pairs of the belief and motivation-to-comply items and subsequently  
9 added the three products up to form a final index (Cronbach's alpha: 0.80). A high  
10 score indicates that the individual's significant others are supportive of them starting  
11 a business, and that those people's opinions matter to the individual.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 A total of 15 items adapted from Kolvereid (1996) measure *attitude* in this  
26 survey. Following Kolvereid (1996), the researchers first reduced the 15 items to five  
27 indices by averaging the respective item scores. Three of these indices measure  
28 attitudes favourable to enterprising behaviour: *authority and autonomy* (four items,  
29 Cronbach's alpha: 0.79), *self-realization* (three items, Cronbach's alpha: 0.69) and  
30 *economic opportunity* (two items, Cronbach's alpha: 0.63). The remaining two  
31 indices represent attitudes that favour paid employment: *security* (two items,  
32 Cronbach's alpha: 0.67) and *avoid responsibility* (three items, Cronbach's alpha:  
33 0.70). Next, the researchers reduced the five indices down to two, representing  
34 attitudes favouring business ownership or paid employment, by adding up the  
35 respective index scores. Hence, the index measuring attitudes favourable to business  
36 ownership is the linear sum of *authority and autonomy*, *self-realization* and  
37 *economic opportunity*, while the index capturing attitudes favourable to paid  
38 employment is the sum of *security* and *avoid responsibility*. Finally, the difference  
39 between these two measures forms an index of occupational choice attitude so that a  
40 high positive score indicates an attitude towards work that is conducive to  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 entrepreneurship, while a low positive or a negative score refers to attitudes that  
4  
5 favour paid employment.  
6  
7

8 In order to monitor for effects that might otherwise influence intention or  
9  
10 behaviour, the model specification includes the respondent's *sex* (dummy with  
11  
12 female coded as 1) and *age* in a quadratic specification as control variables. The  
13  
14 researchers chose these particular variables because prior econometric evidence  
15  
16 shows that women are generally less likely to engage in entrepreneurial behaviour  
17  
18 than men (e.g., Kelley *et al.*, 2010) and that age is one of the most important  
19  
20 determinants of entrepreneurship (Parker, 2009).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 *Sample characteristics*

28  
29 Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics including a comparison of the first and  
30  
31 second survey waves. In order to facilitate comparability, the first-wave statistics  
32  
33 include only the 18-64 year old respondents and exclude those who were self-  
34  
35 employed in 2006. The test statistics in the final column show that individuals who  
36  
37 participated in both survey waves have significantly higher scores for entrepreneurial  
38  
39 intentions and their antecedents (attitude, subjective norm, and PBC) than the  
40  
41 respondents who only participated in the first wave. This is most likely due to the  
42  
43 over-sampling of individuals with high intentions. Further, in order to detect  
44  
45 potential sources of multicollinearity, the authors examined the inter-correlations  
46  
47 between the exogenous variables. The analysis revealed significant inter-correlations  
48  
49 between attitude, subjective norms and PBC, with the respective Pearson product-  
50  
51 moment correlation coefficients ranging from 0.22 to 0.50, thus signalling a potential  
52  
53 risk of multicollinearity. However, since all Variation Inflation Factor (VIF) values  
54  
55 for these variables are clearly below the conventional threshold of 10, the highest  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 value being 1.5, multicollinearity does not appear to be a serious problem in this  
4  
5 analysis.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE  
12  
13  
14

#### 15 **IV. Analysis strategy**

16  
17 Since the model includes factors and mediating effects, this study opts for Structural  
18 Equation Modelling (SEM) as the means to test its hypotheses. Given the sample  
19 size of only 117 observations, the analysis applies the total aggregation approach  
20 (Bagozzi and Heatherton, 1994) to the factors in order to optimize sample size  
21 relative to the parameter estimates, while accounting for measurement errors. In  
22 other words, the model treats the indices computed for the psychometric constructs  
23 (attitude, subjective norms, and PBC) as observed variables, which are assigned as  
24 single-item indicators to the corresponding latent variables. Correction for  
25 measurement errors involves fixing the latent-to-manifest parameters to 1, and  
26 assigning a value of 1 minus the reliability (Cronbach's alpha) multiplied by the  
27 variable's variance, to each residual. This procedure is common in SEM (e.g.,  
28 Carlson and Kacmar, 2000; Williams and Hazer, 1986), and the study by Netemeyer  
29 *et al.* (1990) suggests that this procedure generates results that are virtually identical  
30 to a full latent variable model.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The analysis uses the MPlus Version 6 software package, which can  
51 accommodate probit regressions into structural equation models with the WLSMV  
52 estimator (Muthén and Muthén, 1998-2010; Xie, 1999), thus enabling the modelling  
53 of ordinal response variables (intention and behaviour) in the SEM framework. The  
54 WLSMV estimator generates weighted-least-square parameter estimates employing a  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 diagonal weight matrix with robust standard errors and mean and variance adjusted  
4  
5 chi-square test statistics (Muthén and Muthén, 1998-2010), which are suitable for  
6  
7 models with categorical dependent variables (Brown, 2006; Muthén, 1983).  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 **V. Results**

13  
14 Table 2 displays the results of the structural model estimation. The estimated model  
15  
16 shows good fit with the data: the chi-square test of model fit is non-significant; the  
17  
18 comparative fit index (CFI) exceeds the recommend minimum value of 0.95; the  
19  
20 root-mean-square error (RMSEA) score is below the recommended maximum value  
21  
22 of 0.06; and the weighted root-mean-square residual (WRMR) is less than the  
23  
24 recommended maximum value of 0.90 for models with categorical dependent  
25  
26 variables (Hu and Bentler, 1999; Yu and Muthén, 2002).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

38 The path coefficients show that attitude, subjective norms, and PBC exert a  
39  
40 significant impact on intention at the 1% level. Hence, the results support the  
41  
42 hypothesized effects of the three antecedents on intentions (H1a, H1b, and H1c). The  
43  
44 model estimations further show that intention and PBC are significant predictors of  
45  
46 entrepreneurial behaviour, also at the 1% significance level. Moreover, the results  
47  
48 support the proposition in the TPB that intentions mediate the effects of the three  
49  
50 antecedents: the indirect effects from attitude, subjective norms, and PBC on  
51  
52 behaviour via intention (not shown in Table 2) are all significant at the 5% level. The  
53  
54 significant effect of intention on behaviour supports H2a. PBC, having both a  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 significant direct and a significant indirect effect on behaviour, provides support to  
4  
5 H2b.  
6

7  
8 Overall, the model accounts for 41% and 39% of the variance in the continuous  
9  
10 latent variable underlying the ordered categorical measures of intention and  
11  
12 behaviour, respectively. Statistical research shows that this particular pseudo R-  
13  
14 squared (McKelvey and Zavoina, 1975) is very similar to the R-squared in Ordinary  
15  
16 Least Squares (OLS) regression (Hox, 2009; Long, 1997). Thus, this estimate is  
17  
18 reasonably comparable to the OLS R-squared reported in prior tests of the TPB that  
19  
20 use continuous psychometric measures of intention and behaviour (see Section II).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 27 **VI. Conclusion**

28  
29  
30  
31 This study investigates the efficacy of the TPB in predicting entrepreneurial  
32  
33 behaviour in a sample of 117 working-age individuals from Western Finland. While  
34  
35 there is an abundance of studies examining the formation of entrepreneurial  
36  
37 intentions – often with demographically limited samples, such as university students  
38  
39 – there is at the same time a lack of evidence pertaining to the link between  
40  
41 entrepreneurial intention and subsequent behaviour.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 The empirical analysis supports the TPB and prior research in the field of  
47  
48 entrepreneurship and other research domains in showing that attitude, subjective  
49  
50 norms, and PBC are significant predictors of entrepreneurial intentions. The  
51  
52 particular novelty of the paper is in including a test of the ‘right-hand side’ of the  
53  
54 TPB model – the predicted causal effects from intention and PBC on behaviour –  
55  
56 which had not been tested previously in the context of business start-ups. The results  
57  
58 show that intention and PBC are significant predictors of whether an individual  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 subsequently engages in entrepreneurial behaviour. In terms of explained variance,  
4  
5 the results of this research suggest that the predictive relevance of the TPB in the  
6  
7 business start-up context is roughly in line with results from other domains that  
8  
9 involve medium-term goals that require considerable effort to attain, such as health-  
10  
11 related goals (Armitage and Conner, 2001; Sheeran, 2002). In summary, the results  
12  
13 support the predictive validity of the TPB in the context of business start-up  
14  
15 behaviour.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 Two limitations affect the generalizability of the study's results. The first  
21  
22 limitation is the small number of respondents who participated in both waves of the  
23  
24 survey ( $N=117$ ), while the second limitation refers to the geographic scope of the  
25  
26 sample being limited to three Finnish provinces. Only a sufficiently large  
27  
28 international sample would enable us to draw solid conclusions regarding the  
29  
30 causality in the intention-behaviour link in the TPB model. Hence, future studies  
31  
32 should seek to obtain larger, preferably cross-cultural samples to validate the  
33  
34 preliminary findings presented in this article. Moreover, future research should  
35  
36 distinguish between different types of entrepreneurship, such as full-time and part-  
37  
38 time entrepreneurship, sole proprietorships and businesses with employees, lifestyle  
39  
40 businesses and those with growth aspirations, opportunity and necessity-driven  
41  
42 entrepreneurship, or for-profit and social enterprises. These distinctions are of  
43  
44 considerable relevance to policy, for example, in terms of assessing the social and  
45  
46 economic potential of latent entrepreneurship in different segments of the population,  
47  
48 and in targeting and designing enterprise support initiatives.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 In spite of the limitations, this article demonstrates the potential of the TPB in  
56  
57 studying the emergence of complex economic behaviour such as entrepreneurship  
58  
59 prior to the onset of any observable action. This understanding can have notable  
60

1  
2  
3 policy implications. For example, policy-makers wishing to encourage more  
4  
5 enterprising activity may target the attitudes and norms pertaining to  
6  
7 entrepreneurship in initiatives aimed at increasing people's motivation towards  
8  
9 entrepreneurship as an occupational choice. Similarly, policy-makers may design  
10  
11 entrepreneurship education provision to increase the PBC related to entrepreneurship  
12  
13 in the target segment.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **Acknowledgements**

21  
22  
23  
24 This research received support from the Academy of Finland.  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **References**

- 30  
31 Ajzen, I. (1985) From intentions to actions: a theory of planned behaviour, in *Action*  
32  
33 *Control: From Cognition to Behavior*, (Eds) J. Kuhl and J. Beckmann, Springer,  
34  
35 Heidelberg, pp. 11–39.  
36  
37  
38  
39 Ajzen, I. (1991) The theory of planned behavior, *Organizational Behavior and*  
40  
41 *Human Decision Processes*, **50**, 179–211.  
42  
43  
44 Ajzen, I. (2002) Perceived behavioural control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and  
45  
46 the theory of planned behaviour, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **32**, 665–  
47  
48 83.  
49  
50  
51 Ajzen, I., 2011. Theory of planned behavior. Retrieved from:  
52  
53 <http://www.people.umass.edu/aizen/tpb> (accessed 24 February 2011).  
54  
55  
56 Armitage, C. J. and Conner, M. (2001) Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: a  
57  
58 meta-analytic review, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, **40**, 471–99.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Autio, E., Keeley, R. H., Klofstein, M., Parker G. G. C. and Hay, M. (2001)  
4 Entrepreneurial intent among students in Scandinavia and in the USA, *Enterprise*  
5 *and Innovation Management Studies*, **2**, 145–60.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Bagozzi, R. P. and Heatherton, T. F. (1994) A general approach to representing  
11 multifaceted personality constructs: application to state self-esteem, *Structural*  
12 *Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, **1**, 35–67.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Blanchflower, D. G. and Oswald, A. (1998) What makes an entrepreneur?, *Journal*  
18 *of Labor Economics*, **16**, 16–60.  
19  
20  
21  
22 Blanchflower, D. G., Oswald, A. and Stutzer, A. (2001) Latent entrepreneurship  
23 across nations, *European Economic Review*, **45**, 680–91.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Brown, T. A. (2006) *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*, Guildford  
28 Press, New York.  
29  
30  
31  
32 Carlson, D. S. and Kacmar, K. M. (2000) Work-family conflict in the organization:  
33 do life role values make a difference?, *Journal of Management*, **26**, 1031–54.  
34  
35  
36  
37 d'Astous, A., Colbert, F. and Montpetit, D. (2005) Music piracy on the web – how  
38 effective are anti-piracy arguments? Evidence from the theory of planned  
39 behaviour, *Journal of Consumer Policy*, **28**, 289–310.  
40  
41  
42  
43 East, R. (1993) Investment decisions and the theory of planned behavior, *Journal of*  
44 *Economic Psychology*, **14**, 337–375.  
45  
46  
47  
48 Epstein, S., and O'Brian, E. J. (1985) The person-situation debate in historical and  
49 current perspective, *Psychological Bulletin*, **98**, 513-537.  
50  
51  
52  
53 Grilo, I. and Irigoyen, J.M. (2006) Entrepreneurship in the EU: to wish and not to be,  
54 *Small Business Economics*, **26**, 305–18.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Henley, A. (2007) Entrepreneurial aspiration and transition into self-employment:  
4  
5 evidence from British longitudinal data, *Entrepreneurship & Regional*  
6  
7 *Development*, **19**, 253–80.  
8  
9
- 10 Hox, J. J. (2009) *Multilevel Analysis: Techniques and Applications*, Routledge, New  
11  
12 York.  
13  
14
- 15 Hu, L. and Bentler, P.M. (1999) Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure  
16  
17 analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives, *Structural Equation*  
18  
19 *Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, **6**, 1–55.  
20  
21
- 22 Hyrsky, K. and Lipponen, H. (2004) *Yrittäjyyskatsaus 2004*, Publications of the  
23  
24 Ministry of Trade and Industry, 18/204, Edita, Helsinki.  
25  
26
- 27 Kautonen, T., Tornikoski, E. T. and Kibler, E. (2009) Entrepreneurial intentions in  
28  
29 the third age: the impact of perceived age norms, *Small Business Economics*, DOI:  
30  
31 10.1007/s11187-009-9238-y.  
32  
33
- 34 Kelley, D., Bosma, N., Amorós, J. E. (2010) *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2010*  
35  
36 *Global Report*, Babson College, Wellesley.  
37  
38
- 39 Kolvereid, L. (1996) Prediction of employment status choice intentions,  
40  
41 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **21**, 47–57.  
42  
43
- 44 Krueger, N. F., Reilly M. D. and Carsrud, A. L. (2000) Competing models of  
45  
46 entrepreneurial intentions, *Journal of Business Venturing*, **15**, 411–32.  
47  
48
- 49 Liñán, F. and Chen, Y.-W. (2009) Development and cross-cultural application of a  
50  
51 specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions, *Entrepreneurship*  
52  
53 *Theory and Practice*, **33**, 593–617.  
54  
55
- 56 Long, J. S. (1997) *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent*  
57  
58 *Variables*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Lynne, G. D., Casey, C. F., Hodges, A. and Rahmani, M. (1995) Conservation  
4 technology adoption decisions and the theory of planned behavior, *Journal of*  
5  
6 *Economic Psychology*, **16**, 581–598.  
7  
8  
9  
10 McKelvey, R. D. And Zavoina, W. (1975) A statistical model for the analysis of  
11 ordinal level dependent variables, *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, **4**, 103–20.  
12  
13  
14  
15 Moore, C. S. and Mueller, R. E. (2002) The transition from paid to self-employment  
16 in Canada: the importance of push factors, *Applied Economics*, **34**, 791–801.  
17  
18  
19  
20 Muthén, B. O. (1983) Latent variable structural equation modeling with categorical  
21 data, *Journal of Econometrics*, **22**, 43–65.  
22  
23  
24  
25 Muthén, L. K., Muthén, B. O. (1998–2010). *Mplus User's Guide*, 6<sup>th</sup> edn, Muthén &  
26 Muthén, Los Angeles.  
27  
28  
29 Netemeyer, R. G., Johnston, M. W. and Burton, S. (1990) Analysis of role conflict  
30 and role ambiguity in a structural equations framework, *Journal of Applied*  
31 *Psychology*, **75**, 148–57.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Parker, S. C. (2009) *The Economics of Entrepreneurship*, Cambridge University  
37 Press, Cambridge.  
38  
39  
40  
41 Peterman, N. E. and Kennedy, J. (2003) Enterprise education: influencing students'  
42 perceptions of entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **28**, 129–  
43 44.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Pukkinen, T., Stenholm, P., Heinonen, J., Kovalainen, A. and Autio, E. (2007)  
49 *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2006 Executive Report Finland*. Turku School  
50 of Economics, Series B Research Reports, B1 / 2007.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Rauch, A., and Frese, M. (2007) Born to be an entrepreneur? Revisiting the  
56 personality approach to entrepreneurship, in *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship*,  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 (Eds) R.A. Baron, M. Frese, and J.R. Baum, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah NJ, pp.  
4  
5 41-65.  
6  
7  
8 Rogelberg, S. G., Stanton, J. M. (2007) Understanding and dealing with  
9  
10 organizational survey nonresponse, *Organizational Research Methods*, **10**, 195–  
11  
12 209.  
13  
14  
15 Rojas, G. V. M. and Siga, L. (2009) On the nature of micro-entrepreneurship:  
16  
17 evidence from Argentina, *Applied Economics*, **41**, 2667–80.  
18  
19  
20 Sheeran P. (2002) Intention-behaviour relations: a conceptual and empirical  
21  
22 overview, *European Review of Social Psychology*, **12**, 1–36.  
23  
24  
25 Sheppard, B. H., Hartwick, J. and Warshaw, P. R. (1988) The theory of reasoned  
26  
27 action: A meta-analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications  
28  
29 and future research, *Journal of Consumer Research*, **15**, 325–43.  
30  
31  
32 Silvia, P. J. (2001) Expressed and measured vocational interests: distinctions and  
33  
34 definitions, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, **59**, 382–93.  
35  
36  
37 Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S. and Al-Laham, A. (2007) Do entrepreneurship  
38  
39 programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students?  
40  
41 The effect of learning, inspiration and resources, *Journal of Business Venturing*,  
42  
43 **22**, 566–91.  
44  
45  
46 Stenholm, P., Pukkinen, T., Heinonen, J. and Kovalainen, A. (2009) *Global*  
47  
48 *Entrepreneurship Monitor: Finnish 2008 Report*, Turku School of Economics,  
49  
50 Series A Research Reports, A1 / 2009.  
51  
52  
53 Sutton, S. (1998) Predicting and explaining intentions and behaviour: how well are  
54  
55 we doing?, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **28**, 1317–38.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Thompson, E. R. (2009) Individual entrepreneurial intent: construct clarification and  
4  
5 development of an internationally reliable metric, *Entrepreneurship Theory and*  
6  
7 *Practice*, **33**, 669–94.  
8  
9  
10 Uusitalo, R. (2001) Homo entrepreneurs?, *Applied Economics*, **33**, 1631–1638.  
11  
12  
13 Van der Zwan, P., Thurik, R. and Grilo, I. (2010) The entrepreneurial ladder and its  
14  
15 determinants, *Applied Economics*, **42**, 2183–91.  
16  
17  
18 Van Gelderen, M., Brand, M., Van Praag, M., Bodewes, W., Poutsma, E. and Van  
19  
20 Gils, A. (2008) Explaining entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of  
21  
22 planned behaviour, *Career Development International*, **13**, 538–59.  
23  
24  
25 Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E., and Hudy, M.J. (1997) Overall job satisfaction: How  
26  
27 good are single-item measures?, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **82**, 247-252.  
28  
29  
30 Warshaw, P. R. and Davis, F. D. (1985) Disentangling behavioural intention and  
31  
32 behavioural expectation, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **21**, 213–28.  
33  
34  
35 Williams, L. J. and Hazer, J. T. (1986) Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction  
36  
37 and commitment in turnover models: a reanalysis using latent variable structural  
38  
39 equation methods, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **71**, 219–31.  
40  
41  
42 Xie, Y. (1989) Structural equation models for ordinal variables: an analysis of  
43  
44 occupational destination, *Sociological Methods & Research*, **17**, 325–52.  
45  
46  
47 Yu, C. and Muthén, B. O. (2002) Evaluation of the model fit indices for latent  
48  
49 variable models with categorical and continuous outcomes. Paper presented at the  
50  
51 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Appendix 1. Psychometric scale items

---

### *Subjective norm<sup>a</sup>*

I believe that my closest family members think that I should not/should pursue starting my own business and becoming an entrepreneur \* motivation to comply

I believe that my closest friends think that I should not/should pursue starting my own business and becoming an entrepreneur \* motivation to comply

I believe that my colleagues and people important to me think that I should not/should pursue starting my own business and becoming an entrepreneur \* motivation to comply

### *Perceived behavioural control (PBC)*

For me starting my own firm and becoming an entrepreneur would be (very difficult - very easy)

If I wanted to, I could easily pursue a career as an entrepreneur

There are (very few – very many) such issues that I cannot influence myself but that prevent me from starting a business

### *Authority and autonomy<sup>b</sup>*

I look for independence

I want decision-making power

I look for a position of authority

I would like to be my own boss

### *Self-realization<sup>b</sup>*

I would like to make use of my creativity

I would like to carry out my dreams

I would like to create something new

1  
2  
3 *Economic opportunity*<sup>b</sup>  
4

5 I would like a large share of my salary to be based on results  
6

7 I would like to be paid based on my achievements  
8

9  
10 *Avoidance of responsibility*<sup>b</sup>  
11

12 I do not want to take on many tasks with responsibility  
13

14 I want to avoid excessive commitment to my work  
15

16 I want to avoid responsibility  
17  
18

19  
20 *Security*<sup>b</sup>  
21

22 The stability of employment is very important to me  
23

24 The continuity of employment is very important to me  
25


---

26  
27 <sup>a</sup> The subjective norm scores were calculated by multiplying the item score for the belief statement  
28 (shown in the table) with the item score for the motivation to comply, which was measured by asking  
29 'How much do you care what the following people think if you strive to start your own business?' and  
30 providing a list of groups of people to match the belief statements.  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 <sup>b</sup> These items were measured as responses to the general question 'To what extent do you agree or  
36 disagree with the importance of the following items in terms of your working career?' (1 for definitely  
37 disagree; 7 for definitely agree).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Fig. 1. Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) and research hypotheses**



Review

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics**

	Range		(1) First wave (all, N=992)		(2) First wave (not in second wave, N=875)		(3) Second wave (N=117)		Difference (2) and (3)
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -statistic / chi-square
Behaviour									
(0) Not considered starting a business							50.8%		
(1) Thinking about it							33.3%		
(2) Taking steps							6.0%		
(3) Started in last 3 years							9.4%		
Intention	1	7	2.52	1.79	2.45	1.77	3.04	1.88	3.362**
Attitude	-11	51	24.66	10.26	24.19	10.27	28.19	9.52	3.990**
Subjective norm	3	147	43.30	26.98	42.27	26.51	50.96	29.26	3.286**
PBC	1	7	3.98	1.66	3.90	1.64	4.59	1.69	4.231**
Age	18	64	42.66	13.34	42.75	13.43	41.99	12.65	0.578
Female	0	1	61.0%		61.0%		60.7%		0.005

Notes: The difference column displays the *t*-statistic for continuous and the chi-square for indicator variables. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$

**Table 2. Results of the structural equation model estimation**

Exogenous variables	StdYX	Endogenous variables				
		Intention			Behaviour	
		Coef.	SE	StdYX	Coef.	SE
Intention				0.168**	0.167	0.059
Attitude	0.246**	0.330	0.124			
Subjective norm	0.210**	0.086	0.029			
PBC	0.249**	0.172	0.060	0.456**	0.314	0.068
Female	-0.184	-0.392	0.219	-0.168	-0.331	0.229
Age	-0.245	-0.020	0.050	-0.469	-0.024	0.053
Age squared	-0.028	-0.280	5.983	0.298	0.908	6.542
R-square		0.41			0.39	
$\chi^2$			13.66 (11 df), $p = 0.25$			
CFI / RMSEA / WRMR			0.975 / 0.045 / 0.576			

Notes: StdYX = fully standardized path coefficient. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$