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Abstract
The aim of the paper is to investigate the entrepreneurial intentions of 252 Italian business graduate students from University of Rome Tor Vergata, Italy. Based on the Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behaviour (TBP), we used the Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (EIQ) to collect the data which were analysed through Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), by using PLS (Partial Least Squares) approach. Consistently with previous studies the main results suggest that entrepreneurial intentions are directly influenced by personal attitudes and perceived behavioural control, while the effect produced by subjective norms is mediated. Differences in working experiences and the presence of a family business also contribute to explain student’s propensity toward entrepreneurship. Furthermore, either gender diversity or the positive valuation about the role of university education seem to contribute significantly to the genesis of entrepreneurial intentions. Based on these results, we propose some considerations about the need to intensify entrepreneurial education efforts at Tor Vergata University. Finally, the paper constitutes a seminal study about entrepreneurial intentions of Italian university students, adding new evidence to a consolidated scientific conversation from a different university context.
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1. Introduction

In entrepreneurial literature, the recognition that entrepreneurship is a complex phenomenon that occurs over time has implied an evolution of scientific inquiry towards more sophisticated approaches, explaining the process of starting a new venture through multiple perspectives and level of analysis (Bygrave, 2003; Gartner, 2004; Davidsson and Wiklund, 2001; Zahra and Wright, 2011).

At a micro-level, in the past few years a growing stream of research has been interested in investigating cognitive models of entrepreneurial behaviour (Krueger, 2007).

With the use of cognitive theory scholars have been involved in studying the situations that lead to entrepreneurial behaviour which is the result of processes of individual cognitions about entrepreneurship. These latter have been defined by Mitchell et al. (2002) as “the knowledge structures through which individuals express assessments and judgments or make decisions about taking entrepreneurial opportunities”. Thus, it is believed that individuals will only activate their entrepreneurial potential if they perceived to possess a specific abilities, environmental chances and social support as well. As pointed out by Kirby (2002) only if all three prerequisites are fulfilled then entrepreneurship will be likely to occur.

Economic literature offers different cognitive models, which have been proposed and tested to explain entrepreneurial behaviour. Results have led to consistent findings in most of cases, while variations have generally been ascribed to personal characteristics (for instance, age, gender, work experience, education) or even environmental factors (for instance, cultural and institutional influences). Furthermore, critical studies have considered variations due to methodological heterogeneity both in constructs, measurements and instruments used.

In this sense, this paper aims to investigate entrepreneurship at a micro level by considering the relationships about individual beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behaviour as well as their link with some personal and environmental factors.
Accordingly, we tried to test the *Theory of Planned Behaviour* (Ajzen, 1991, 2001) by using a standardized questionnaire recently developed by Liñán and Chen (2009), and then refined by and Liñán et al. (2011a).

Actually, our contribution adds new evidence in entrepreneurial cognitive literature from the Italian context, which seldom has received attention by researchers (Battistelli, 2001; Bettinelli et al., 2010; Dossena and Cafferata, in press).

Interviewed individuals are represented by business graduated students in an Italian university. The decision to choose this kind of respondents is mainly due to the conviction that education can play a fundamental role in entrepreneurial awareness and competencies (Gorman et al., 1997; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003; Young, 1997).

Actually, this conviction has been at the top of the issues in EU governments’ agenda during the last decades, recognizing the need for fostering entrepreneurship through programmes and measures enacting entrepreneurial potential in people, in order to raise start-up rates, and favour job creation and hopefully innovation (Harrison and Lieich, 2010).

Consequently, understanding the main drivers of entrepreneurial intentions in university students can provide evidence in order to stimulate educational actions in a more focused way, and this could result in useful insight either for educators or for policy-makers.

After the present introduction, the paper is organized as follows, providing with:

1. A literature background;
2. The research methodology;
3. Results; and
4. Discussion and conclusions.

### 2. Literature background

Studies about the role of entrepreneurial cognitions commonly starts from the assumption that the process of venture creation evolves over time and the
entrepreneurial behaviour is the result of a complex mechanism of interdependence between factors affecting the way that decision is taken (Davidsson, 1995; Gartner et al., 1994; Kyrö and Carrier, 2005).

In this sense, the intention to start an entrepreneurial career may be considered the most important predictor of the actual (future) behaviour.

Different models of entrepreneurial intentions have been developed by scholars during the last decades. Starting from the construct initially proposed by Bird (1988) and later developed by Shapero and Sokol (1982) and Boyd and Vozikis (1994), some researches conclude that entrepreneurial intent is affected by perceived desiderability, perceived feasibility and propensity to act.

This model (also known as SEE, Shapero’s Entrepreneurial Event) was tested by Krueger and Brazeal (1994) who have suggested that in many cases the latent entrepreneurial potential is not activated until there is a precipitating (or triggering) event, such as unemployment. Other empirical adoptions of Shapero’s model were developed by Krueger et al. (2000) and by Peterman and Kennedy (2003) among the others.

Another well-known competitor model for entrepreneurial behaviour is Ajzen’s (1991, 2001) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). According to this, entrepreneurial behaviour is supposed to be explained by intention, which is affected by three perceptual variables, called antecedents:

- **Personal Attitude (PA)**, which refers to an individual’s perception to have an opinion favourable to the behaviour of starting a business;
- **Subjective Norm (SN)**, which is a perception about the social approval of being entrepreneur by parents, friends and colleagues;
- **Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC)**, which is the perceived degree of difficulty involved in performing the entrepreneurial behaviour.

Also, the TPB model has received lots of empirical support in the field of entrepreneurship (Engle et al., 2010; Guerrero et al., 2008; Kolvereid, 1996; Krueger et al., 2000; Liñán and Chen, 2009; Shook et al., 2003; Veciana et al., 2005).

Comparing the two models, evidence suggests that they are consistent with each other and some elements are partially overlapped (such as the concept of
perceived desiderability and personal behaviour; or perceived feasibility and is close to perceived behavioural control; although, some contradictions have sometimes arisen because of measurement issues.

Nevertheless, SEE and TPB have been widely used in entrepreneurship research (Autio et al., 2001; Erikson, 1999; Henry et al., 2003; Kolvereid, 1996; Lee and Wong, 2004; Liñán, 2004; Liñán and Chen, 2009; Liñán et al., 2011a, 2011b; Pejvak et al., 2009; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003; Segal et al., 2005; Souitaris et al., 2007; Tkachev and Kolvereid, 1999; Veciana et al., 2005).

However, in both cases, many findings have been discovered about intentions, even though there are still few empirical studies verifying if these latters are stable in the long term (Liñán et al., 2011b), or even whether they have then turned in actual behaviours.

In our study, we will try to empirically test the TPB model, on the basis of the major findings in literature which would suggest that:

- PA is per se unable to predict whether a person will start a business;
- PBC is the strongest predictor; it refers to people’s perception about their possess of knowledge and ability to start a business;
- SN has even less predictive power, since it mainly exerts an indirect effect on intentions which is mediated through the other two mentioned variables.

Accordingly, in our study we will try either to confirm or to reject the validity of TPB model in explaining the entrepreneurial intentions of Italian graduate students. Hence, we propose the following hypotheses:

**H1:** Personal attitude towards entrepreneurship is positively related to Italian university students’ entrepreneurial intentions.

**H2:** Perceived behavioural control is positively related to Italian university students’ entrepreneurial intentions.

**H3a:** Subjective norm is positively related to Italian university students’ personal attitude.
Moreover, we also decided to investigate the impact of university education on the TPB model. Accordingly, the role education in fostering entrepreneurial spirit at university level has been considered in recent years one of the most promising instruments to enhance the entrepreneurial attitudes of young people, since education creates a wider awareness, interest and feeling in entrepreneurship (Lee et al., 2006; Peter and Kennedy, 2003; Potter, 2008). However, even if it is recognised that entrepreneurial education is very important either to build or to maintain entrepreneurship in people’s mind, only few studies have come up with the idea to analyse whether education influences entrepreneurial perceptions and intentions (Collins et al. 2004; Sizong and Lingfei, 2008). Thus, we decided to test for the effectiveness of entrepreneurial educational efforts as perceived by respondents, in order to understand if it does exist or not – and to what extent - a significant relationship with their propensity to start a business.

Hence, a further hypothesis to be tested is the following:

\textbf{H4: Perceptions about University Education are positively related to the three antecedents of Italian university students’ entrepreneurial intentions.}

At last, we decided to control for the effects of other explanatory factors on the perceptions about entrepreneurship. Among these:

- \textit{Age}: recent studies (European Commission, 2009, 2010) show that perceptions of the feasibility of self-employment drop-off with age. This suggests that younger people (ages 15 to 24, and 25 to 39) may offer the most potential for entrepreneurship since they appear to have the highest level of interest in entrepreneurial activities. As consequence, in our model we expect that age is positively correlated to the TPB model;

- \textit{Gender}: the effects of gender in entrepreneurship research has received wide attention by scientific community, in most cases establishing that there are significant differences between male and female regardinguptaking of self-
employment (de Bruin et al., 2007; Minniti and Nardone, 2007). As matter of fact, OECD statistics (2011) report the persistence of a gender gap over time also in the Italian context and we therefore expect variations in entrepreneurial intention in male and female respondents;

- *Working Experiences*: the importance of labour experiences has been broadly underlined, particularly because they provide individuals with experiential knowledge about organizations’ functioning (Cooper, 1993; Krueger et al., 2000). In this sense, in our analysis we expect that working experiences can exert a positive influence on entrepreneurial intention and its antecedents;

- *Family Business*: the parental role is considered a major influencing factor in the career making-choice process of students, especially when a close relative (typically the father) is self-employed (Carr and Sequeira, 2007; Matthews and Moser, 1995, 1996; Nabi et al., 2006) as in the case of familial businesses, which are quite common and widespread in Italy (Zocchi, 2012).

3. Methodology

We carried out an empirical analysis on a convenience sample of graduate students (majors: business and economics, finance, and social sciences) belonging to the Italian University of Rome Tor Vergata.

Empirical data were obtained from a population of over 800 graduate students. We sent out above 350 questionnaires during the period January 2010–December 2011. An initial version of the questionnaire was administered in paper to a test-sample of 50 students. Then the survey was extended via web to a larger sample of targeted students. The respondents took about 15 minutes to complete the questionnaires. At the end of survey, we received 268 questionnaires. Observations with missing values more than 10% were excluded through list-wise deletion. Where possible, we tried to recontact respondents to complete the unanswered questions; in other cases we decided to treat some observations by using the mean value criterion. At the end of the process we collected a total of 252 valid questionnaires.
We measured TBP and socio-demographic variables through the *Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire* (EIQ) developed by Liñán and Chen (2009) and translated into Italian language (see Appendix).

This questionnaire has been used in a series of replication studies and can be considered a standardized instrument useful to make comparisons, since it has been built upon the basis of the existent theoretical and empirical literature about the application of the TPB to entrepreneurship, and whose psychometric properties have been truly verified.

In order to measure *Entrepreneurial Intention* (hereinafter EI), PBC, PA and SN, respondents were asked to evaluate their degree of agreement on a 7-point Likert scale; multiple items were used – sometimes reverse-coded – to catch the perceptions about different components of the TPB model. University education was measured through multiple items on Likert-scale as well.

Measurements of restant socio-demographic variables were obtained through numerical values (age in years, working experiences in months) or dichotomical scales (gender: 1 = male; 0 = female; family business: 1 = yes; 0 = no).

In the analysis, we decided to test also for possible moderation effects between all the considered variables.

We performed the statistical analysis by using statistical packages IBM SPSS version 20 and WarpPLS 3.

In the first part of our analysis, we used descriptive statistics to unveil the characteristic of the sample (Table 1) and the distribution of frequencies (Table 2).

Average age was 24,35 years and 48,4% of respondents was female against the majority of males. On average students have been employed for about 15 months, while the share of students having a relative entrepreneur is surprisingly of 46,4%.

In the second half of the statistical elaboration, Structural Equation Model (SEM) was used to define causal relationships between entrepreneurial intention and its antecedents as well as with university education alongside with the other above-mentioned socio-demographic variables.

In the structural equation model, we decided to use a variance-based approach, called PLS (*Partial Least Square*) path modelling, which is a soft-
modelling-technique with less rigid distributional assumptions on the data, especially suited for situations when these are not normally distributed (Wold, 1966, 1982, 1985; Lohmöller, 1989) as in our case. In this regard it is worth mentioning that PLS path modelling has been stimulated by the increasing interest of researchers in theoretical modelling, especially in management, marketing and organizational fields (Higgins et al., 1992; Hulland, 1999; Reinartz et al., 2004).

4. Results

In this section we present the results of our analysis.

Preliminarily, we performed a reliability analysis of the questionnaire in order to evaluate the correspondence between constructs and items for the four latent variables to be tested (PA, PBC, SN, EI, UNI_EDU).

Results (Table 3) show that the Cronbach’s alpha for each of the constructs exceeds the 0.6 cut-off value for internal consistency.

Also, validity and convergence are assured by acceptable values of either Average Variance Extracted (which should be greater than 0.5) and Composite Reliability (the rule of thumb considers a threshold of 0.7).

In the table we also have indicated the scores of R-squared which express the proportion of variability in a dataset that is accounted for by the statistical model. It also indicates the goodness of fit between the regression curve and the scatter-plot.

Furthermore, multi-collinearity in the model should not be a problem as indicated by the full collinearity VIFs, which enable the identification of not only vertical but also lateral collinearity, and allow for a test involving all latent variables. A rule of thumb rooted in the empirical literature suggests that full collinearity VIFs of 3.3 or lower indicate no problematic multi-collinearity in the model, as in our case.

Finally, in the last column of the matrix we provide the Q-squared coefficients which reflect the predictive validity associated with each latent variables. The threshold of acceptability of Q-squared coefficients considers a value greater than 0. As such, in our analysis Q-squared results show sufficient
predictive values for each of the latent variables (except from SN, whose value is weak), very closer to the correspondent R-squared ones.

Table 4 shows the correlations among latent variables and their significance, which can be easily interpreted.

PLS path analysis has then been performed through the software WarpPLS 3 (Kock, 2012, 2011a, 2011b, 2010; Kock & Lynn, 2012), which has enabled us to execute a non-linear analysis algorithm together with a bootstrapping resampling procedure (n=300) in order to gain more accurate and stable estimates.

The path coefficients of the structural model (along with their significance) are reported either in Table 5 or the Figure 1, with the latter showing the path diagram.

Results suggest that both personal attitude and perceived behavioural control have a significant and positive impact on entrepreneurial intentions (p<0.001), even if the first antecedent (PA) has a greater effect when compared to the second (PBC). Thus, we can accept H1 and H2.

Subjective norms do not have a positive impact on entrepreneurial intention, whilst they exert an indirect effect through the mediation of PA and PBC. Hence, H3a and H3b are verified too.

Moreover, cognitive perceptions about the role of University Education in fostering entrepreneurship (UNI_EDU) have a positive and significant effect on both PA, PBC and SN, thus confirming the H4.

With respect to the hypothesized control variables (AGE, GENDER, WORK_EX, FB) the path analysis suggests that age has a positive and significant effect on Personal Attitude and on Working Experience as well. If the first result is somewhat supported by several studies, the second one could be reasonably interpreted by considering that elderly students have worked for longer periods of time.

Differences in gender are significant and operate indirectly on intentions through PBC, with males being probably more inclined to become entrepreneurs. Again, gender also moderates the effect of PBC on EI.

Working experiences produce a significant and positive impact on PBC, since they enhance individuals’ perceptions about the possess of capacity to achieve.
At last, we controlled for the presence of a relative who is entrepreneur, and results show that the existence of familial entrepreneurship directly and positively exerts its influence (even though the intensity is low) on entrepreneurial intentions. Beside that, the data also suggest there could be also a significant moderation effects of FB on the casual relationship between SN and PA.

Looking for a general estimation of the model fit, we proceeded to calculate the Average Path Index, the Average R-Squared Index and the Average VIF, all showing significant scores (Table 6).

5. Discussion and conclusions

The overall results presented here have proved that personal attitude and perceived behavioural control are able to determine the entrepreneurial intention of Italian students. Actually these do not seem to give importance to the approval of reference people, through subjective norm. This finding is consistent with the importance attributed to entrepreneurial parental role, whose contribution to explain the intentionality, despite significant, is quite modest and not correlated to the subjective norm.

In our case, it seems that the perceived social pressure to start a firm does not play a relevant role in explaining entrepreneurial intention, and this could be due to cultural issues related to specificities of the Italian context.

Also considering the effects sorted by university education, as well as the other socio-demographic variables (age, gender), the contribution to better understand the robustness of the TPB model receive a strong support from the present study.

Compared with previous findings, our study suggests that in the case of Italian students the main important predictor of the TPB model is personal attitude, and this is coherent with the results achieved, for example, by Liñán and Chen (2009) in Spain, and with those of Sizong and Lingfei (2008) in China. On the contrary, other researches in different countries tend to converge in considering a major impact of perceived behavioural control (see for example: Kruger, Reilly and Carsud (2000) for the American students, and
Liñán and Chen (2009) for the Taiwanese sample. More recently, Moriano et al. (2012) have explored the extent to which both the strength of relationships of TPB predictors with entrepreneurial intentions and the TPB predictors themselves vary across cultures of six different countries (Germany, India, Iran, Poland, Spain, and the Netherlands). Their results support cultural effects of PA and PBC on EI but cultural variation in the effects of SN are present.

The originality of this articles consists of having tested the TPB model on the Italian sample, and, at the same time, of having introduced the role of university education which seems to play indeed a great influence in shaping students’ intention to start-up.

Above all, a strong perception about the educational efforts at university level could be considered as a signal of a culture potentially supportive of entrepreneurship, as our studies has attempted to prove accordingly to relevant evidences in literature. Therefore, we could reasonably argue that stimulating entrepreneurship at University of Rome Tor Vergata should consider our results in order to increase the probability that students will attempt firm creation in the future (Honig, 2004).

However, even though there is a growing interest and participation in entrepreneurial education at University of Rome Tor Vergata, our considerations should be accepted carefully, especially if we consider the young age of respondents, and, more importantly, that environmental opportunities to successfully start-up and survive are quite negative during the present phase of economic recession. Thus, it could be reasonably happen that students’ positive intentions and expectations towards entrepreneurship will be postponed or even dismissed if not adequately fed and supported.

As consequence, this opens an opportunity-window for further investigation about the temporal progression in entrepreneurial intention which is demanded to future research. As well, scientific opportunities arise from the scarcity of longitudinal studies about the relationship between entrepreneurial intentions and actual behaviour, even considering once more the potential contribution of entrepreneurial education at university level also in the start-up and post-creation stages.
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Tables and figures

Table 1: – Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>2.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (male=1; female = 0)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.5010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Experiences (months)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>22.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Business (yes=1; no=0)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.4990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: – Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables and classes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20-23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 24-29</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &gt; 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Male (1)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Female (0)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Experiences (months)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-12</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 13-24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 24-36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &gt; 36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Business</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes (1)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No (0)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3: – Latent variable coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>R-squared</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Full collinearity VIF</th>
<th>Q-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA (5 items)</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN (4 items)</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC (6 items)</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI (6 items)</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI_EDU (5 items)</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_EX (1 item)</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE (1 item)</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB (1 item)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER (1 item)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB*SN</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER*PBC</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: – Correlations among latent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variable correlations</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>UNI_EDU</th>
<th>WORK_EX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FBSN</th>
<th>GENDER*PBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI_EDU</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_EX</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBSN</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER*PBC</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Square roots of average variances extracted (AVE’s) shown on diagonal.
(continued) Table 4: – Correlations among latent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>UNI_EDU</th>
<th>WORK_EX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FB*SN</th>
<th>GENDER*PBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI_EDU</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_EX</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB*SN</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER*PBC</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: – Path coefficients and p-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>UNI_EDU</th>
<th>WORK_EX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FB*SN</th>
<th>GENDER*PBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td></td>
<td>.295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI_EDU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB*SN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER*PBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Role and Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intention at University Level

(continued) Table 5: – Path coefficients and p-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>UNI_EDU</th>
<th>WORK_EX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FB*SN</th>
<th>GENDER* PBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI_EDU</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>WORK_EX</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>AGE</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>FB</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>GENDER</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>FB*SN</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>GENDER* PBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: – Model fit indices and p-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Path Index</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average R-squared</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average VIF</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>Good if &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Estimation of the entrepreneurial intentions model for the Italian university students
Appendix

**Questionnaire** (original in Italian)

**Education and experience**
1. What degree are you studying? ____________________________
2. When do you expect to finish it?
   - □ This year
   - □ Next year
   - □ Later
3. Have you got labour experience (have worked or are working presently)?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
   If yes, how much labour experience do you have? (total number of months) __________

**Personal attitude**
4. Indicate your level of agreement with the following sentences from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Being an entrepreneur implies more advantages than disadvantages to me
- A career as entrepreneur is attractive for me
- If I had the opportunity and resources, I’d like to start a firm
- Being an entrepreneur would entail great satisfactions for me
- Among various options, I’d rather be an entrepreneur

**Subjective norm**
5. Indicate your level of agreement with the following sentences from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- My immediate family would approve of my decision to start a business
- My colleagues would approve of my decision to start a business
- My friends would approve of my decision to start a business
- My immediate family would economically support my decision to start a business

**Perceived behavioural control**
6. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding your entrepreneurial capacity?

Value them from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Start a firm and keep it working would be easy for me
- I’m prepared to start a viable firm
- I can control the creation process of a new firm
- I know the necessary practical details to start a firm
- I know how to develop an entrepreneurial project
- If I tried to start a firm, I would have a high probability of succeeding
(continued) Questionnaire (original in Italian)

Entreprenurial intention
7. Have you ever seriously considered becoming an entrepreneur? □ Yes □ No
8. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement)

- I’m ready to make anything to be an entrepreneur
- My professional goal is becoming an entrepreneur
- I will make every effort to start and run my own firm
- I’m determined to create a firm in the future
- I have very seriously thought in starting a firm
- I’ve got the firm intention to start a firm some day

Entrepreneurship education
9. Have you taken any course or module that could be considered as entrepreneurship education? □ Yes □ No
   If yes:
   a. Indicate which one(s): ______________________________________________________
   b. To what extent has it helped you develop any of those aspects? Indicate from 1 (to no extent) to 7 (to a great extent)

- Knowledge about the entrepreneurial environment
- Greater recognition of the entrepreneur’s figure
- The preference to be an entrepreneur
- The necessary abilities to be an entrepreneur
- The intention to be an entrepreneur

Personal data
10. Age: __________
11. Gender: □ Male □ Female
12. Place of birth: _____________________, Place of residence: _____________________
13. What are your parents’ present occupations?
   Private sector employee □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Public sector employee □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Self-employed or entrepreneur □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Retired □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Unemployed □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Other □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Father □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   Mother □ □ □ □ □ □ □
14. In your immediate family is there any relative who owns and/or manages a firm? □ Yes □ No
   If yes:
   a. Is that firm a family business? □ Yes □ No
   (A family business is a firm where one or more family members have a significant ownership interest and significant commitments toward the business’ overall well-being, even through their own work)
   b. How many entrepreneurial generations have been committed in that family business?
      □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ More than 3
(continued) Questionnaire (original in Italian)

Contact data
Filling in the following data will allow to subsequently follow-up your evolutions. Any information provided will be considered as strictly confidential, and will only be used for the aims of this research project.

Name:____________________________________________________________________________
Postal address: _____________________________________________________________________
City/town: ___________________________________________________ Post Code: ___________
e-mail: ________________________________ Telephone: ____________ Mobile: ______________

Source: Adapted from EIQ, v2.05 and v3.2 (Liñán and Chen, 2009; Liñán et al. 2011)