

ISSN: 2357-1330

https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2019.12.03.26

ICLTIBM 2017 7th International Conference on Leadership, Technology, Innovation and Business Management

EFFECTS OF THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR ON ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTION OF STUDENTS

Ahu Tuğba Karabulut (a)* *Corresponding author

(a) Istanbul Commerce University, Istanbul, 34445, Turkey, email: tkarabulut@ticaret.edu.tr

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to compare the effects of the theory of planned behavior (TPB) on the entrepreneurial intention of Turkish and Danish undergraduate students. This study was conducted on 110 Turkish and 110 Danish undergraduate students. Frequency distribution analyses, factor analyses, reliability analyses, correlation analyses, multiple regression analyses and paired sample t-tests were conducted to the data. According to the results of multiple regression analyses, the planned entrepreneurial behavior positively affects entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate students in Turkey and Denmark. Personel Attitude has the highest increasing effect on entrepreneurial intention in Turkey and Denmark. Subjective norm and perceived behavioral control are higher but personal attitude is lower in Turkey than Denmark. According to the results of paired samples t tests, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control of Turkish students are higher than Danish students. On the other hand, entrepreneurial intention and personal attitude of Danish students are higher than Turkish students.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Theory of planned behavior, Entrepreneurial intention, Turkish undergraduate students, Danish undergraduate students.



1. Introduction

Being an entrepreneur is a popular career choice for undergraduate students in developed and developing countries. There are cross-cultural studies in the literature that compare the effects of the theory of planned behavior (TPB) on entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate students based on cultural classification of Hofstede. Hofstede (1980) classified cultures of the countries based on the levels of uncertainity avoidance, power distance, individualism and masculinity. The TPB has the following three dimensions: personal attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control. Personal attitude and perceived behavioral control can affect entrepreneurial intention of students in individualistic countries whereas subjective norm can affect entrepreneurial intention of them in collectivistic countries. The purpose of this study is to compare the effects of TPB on the entrepreneurial intention, culture and TPB will be summarized. Then, methodology and research findings will be presented. Finally, conclusion will be explained.

2. Literature Review

According to Crant (1996), entrepreneurial intention is judgement of a person about the likelihood of starting his own business. Entrepreneurial intention is a conscious state of mind that leads attention, experience and action toward a goal or its means. It is the main predictor of entrepreneurial behavior (Krueger Jr, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000; Schwarz et al., 2006; Finisterra do Paço Ferreira, Raposo, Rodrigues, & Dinis, 2011).

Researches about the effects of national culture on entrepreneurship are based Hofstede's (1980, 2011) framework. Literature shows that entrepreneurship is facilitated by cultures that has low uncertainty avoidance and power distance but high individualism and masculinity (Shane, 1993; Hayton, George, & Zahra, 2002). Most of the cross-cultural studies of entrepreneurial intentions reveal significant differences between countries (Nguyen et al., 2009; Pruett et al., 2009; Giacomin et al., 2011; Shneor, Camgöz, & Karapinar, 2013).

There is a difference between individualistic and collectivistic societies related to the roles of people and groups (Hofstede et al., 2010). People in collectivistic cultures like group membership, cohesion and group compliant behavior. Entrepreneurial role models are important for entrepreneurial intention (Hofstede, 1980; Malach-Pines & Kaspi-Baruch, 2008). On the other hand, people in individualistic cultures like freedom, autonomy and independence from groups and organizations (Hofstede et al., 2010). They rely on their entrepreneurial experiences for entrepreneurial intention (Mueller, Zapkau, & Schwens, 2014).

Hofstede and McCrae (2004) propose two perspectives for studies combining entrepreneurship and culture; aggregate psychological traits perspective and dissatisfaction perspective. They claim that cultures with low power distance and uncertainty avoidance and high masculinity and individualism lead more people have entrepreneurial values and become entrepreneurs based on aggregate psychological traits perspective (Davidsson & Wiklund, 1997). Dissatisfaction perspective proposes that cultures with high power distance and uncertainty avoidance and low masculinity and individualism lead entrepreneurial people choose entrepreneurship as their careers due to facing difficulties to do things in their ways in the companies they are employed (Shneor et al., 2013).

Busenitz and Lau (1996) believe that cultures that have high power distance and low uncertainity avoidance facilitate entrepreneurship and lead to a higher self-employment rate. Busenitz and Lau (1996) state that high power distance encourages entrepreneurial activity. Mitchell, Smith, Seawright and Morse (2000) reveal that power distance affect ability, arrangement, and willingness cognitions that influence start up decisions. Hofstede (1980) points out that collectivist cultures usually do not have high rates of entrepreneurship. Cultures that have high uncertainity avoidence socially discourage entrepreneurial career. Shane (1993) showed a negative relationship between uncertainity avoidence and innovation. Kreiser, Marino, Dickson, and Weaver (2010) highlighted that there was a negative relationship between uncertainity avoidence and risk taking. Essential qualities for business including entrepreneurship can be considered as masculine (Heilman, 2001; Gupta et al., 2009). Busenitz and Lau (1996) claim that cultures that have high masculinity and power distance facilitate entrepreneurial activity (Shinnar, Giacomin, & Janssen, 2012).

The results of Turkey and Denmark based on Hofstede's dimensions are as follows respectively: Power distance is 66 and 18; individualism is 37 and 74; masculinity is 45 and 16 and uncertainity avoidance is 85 and 23 (https://geert-hofstede.com/turkey.html). Turkey has higher power distance, masculinity and uncertainity avoidance levels but lower individualism level than Denmark.

Ajzen claims that a person's behavior can be predicted based on their attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and intentions in TPB. The TPB reveals that attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control affect intention directly (Pickett et al., 2012).

Beliefs about the consequences of the behavior (behavioral beliefs), beliefs about the normative expectations of other people (normative beliefs), and beliefs about the presence of factors that may increase behavior performance (control beliefs) guide a person's action in TPB. Behavioral beliefs cause a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the behavior, normative beliefs cause perceived social pressure (subjective norm), and control beliefs improve perceived behavior, subjective norm, and perception of behavioral control form the behavior. An attitude toward the behavior, subjective norm, and perception of behavioral control form the behavioral intention. When the attitude and subjective norm are more favorable, the perceived behavioral control is greater and the intention of a person to perform the behavior becomes stronger. At a sufficient degree of actual control over the behavior, when the opportunity occurs, people carry out their intentions (Hrubes, Ajzen, & Daigle, 2001, pp. 166-167).

Liñán and Chen (2009) developed Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (EIQ) to search TPB on entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate students in Spain and Taiwan. They (2009) found that EIQ properties were satisfactory and there was a strong support for the model.

Shneor et al. (2013) conducted a study to figure out the differences between effect of TPB on entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate business students in Norway and Turkey. Shneor et al. (2013) believed that Turkish people were expected to have higher levels of entrepreneurial intentions, perceived behavioral control and subjective norms but lower levels of personal attitude than Norwegian people. They (2013) found that Turkish students had higher levels of entrepreneurial intention and perceived behavioral control. They (2013) couldn't find significant difference between Turkish and Norwegian students in levels of subjective norms. They (2013) believed that they supported Hofstede et al.'s (2004) suggestion that a culture that had low individualism, low power distance, high uncertainty avoidance and high masculinity encouraged entrepreneurship. Norway and Denmark have same characteristics based on Hofstede's dimensions.

Bagheri and Pihie (2015) conducted a research to find out factors that affected entrepreneurial intentions of Malaysian undergraduate students by using TPB. They (2015) found that personal attraction and perceived control affected entrepreneurial intention. They (2015) added that subjective norms and valuation of entrepreneurship in the social and close environment affected personal entrepreneurship attraction. They (2015) revealed that subjective norms affected entrepreneurial intention through its influence on perceived control over the entrepreneurial tasks' performance and personal entrepreneurship attraction.

3. Methodology

The purpose of this study is to compare the effects of TPB on the entrepreneurial intention of Turkish and Danish undergraduate students. The author was inspired by the study conducted by Liñán and Chen (2009).

3.1. Sample and Data Collection Method

This study was conducted on 110 Turkish and 110 Danish undergraduate students. Turkish students attended a foundation university in Turkey whereas Danish students attended a public university in Denmark. EIQ developed by Liñán and Chen (2009) was filled by students during courses. Frequency distribution analyses, factor analyses, reliability analyses, correlation analyses, multiple regression analyses and paired sample t-tests were conducted to the collected data.

3.2. Research Model of the Study

The research model is as follows (see figure 1):



Figure 01. Research model

3.3. Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of this research are presented as follows:

H1: Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H1a: Personal Attitude Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H1b: Subjective Norm Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H1c: Perceived Behavioral Control Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H2: Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

H2a: Personal Attitude Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark
H2b: Subjective Norm Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark
H2c: Perceived Behavioral Control Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark
H3a: There is a Difference Between Entrepreneurial Intention Means of Turkish and Danish
Students

H3b: There is a Difference Between Personal Attitude Means of Turkish and Danish StudentsH3c: There is a Difference Between Subjective Norm Means of Turkish and Danish StudentsH3d: There is a Difference Between Perceived Behavioral Control Means of Turkish and Danish Students

3.4. Measures of the Study

EIQ developed by Liñán and Chen (2009) was used in this study. First of all, EIQ was translated to Turkish and then it was translated back to English by different academicians to give its Turkish version to Turkish students. The Turkish version of the questionnaire was reviewed by 3 academicians. The English version of EIQ was given to Danish students. The pilot study and factor analyses to its data were conducted before this actual study. Research questions are shown below in Table 01.

| Variable | Statement |
|--|--|
| | Being an entrepreneur implies more advantages than |
| | disadvantages to me |
| Personal Attitude | A career as entrepreneur is attractive for me |
| Indicate your level of agreement with the | If I had the opportunity and resources, I'd like to start a |
| following sentences from 1 (total | firm |
| disagreement) to 7 (total agreement). | Being an entrepreneur would entail great satisfactions for |
| | me |
| | Among various options, I would rather be an entrepreneur |
| Subjective Norm: If you decided to create a | Your close family |
| firm, would people in your close environment | Your friends |
| approve of that decision? Indicate from 1 (total disapproval) to 7 (total approval). | Your colleagues |
| | To start a firm and keep it working would be easy for me |
| Perceived Behavioral Control | I am prepared to start a viable firm |
| To what extent do you agree with the | I can control the creation process of a new firm |
| following statements regarding your | I know the necessary practical details to start a firm |
| entrepreneurial capacity? Value them from 1 | I know how to develop an entrepreneurial project |
| (total disagreement) to / (total agreement). | If I tried to start a firm, I would have a high probability of |
| | succeeding |
| | I am ready to do anything to be an entrepreneur |
| Entrepreneurial Intention | My professional goal is to become an entrepreneur |
| Indicate your level of agreement with the | I will make every effort to start and run my own firm |
| following statements from 1 (total | I am determined to create a firm in the future |
| disagreement) to 7 (total agreement) | I have very seriously thought of starting a firm |
| | I have the firm intention to start a firm some day |

 Table 01.
 Questions of the Research

3.5. Analysis

The cronbach alpha values of variables were calculated to find out reliability. Factor analyses revealed factor loadings of independent variables. Multiple regression analyses showed effects of independent variables (personal attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control) on the dependent variable (entrepreneurial intention).

3.6. Findings

| | | Ν | % | Mean | St. Deviation | |
|---|---------------------|-----|------|-------|---------------|--|
| Age | | 110 | 100 | 22.91 | 1.37 | |
| Gender | Female | 40 | 36.4 | 1.65 | 0.48 | |
| Gender | Male | 70 | 63.6 | 1.05 | 0.48 | |
| | Business | 59 | 53.6 | | | |
| Degree Studied | International Trade | 22 | 20.0 | 1.75 | 0.88 | |
| | Economics | 29 | 26.4 | | | |
| Work Experience | Yes | 90 | 81.8 | 1.25 | 0.10 | |
| work Experience | No | 20 | 18.2 | 1.23 | 0.19 | |
| Entrepreneurial Experience | Yes | 42 | 38.2 | 1.56 | 0.50 | |
| | No | 68 | 61.8 | 1.50 | 0.50 | |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Family Member) | Yes | 84 | 76.4 | 1 23 | 0.42 | |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Faining Member) | No | 26 | 23.6 | 1.23 | 0.42 | |
| Know Entropropour (As a Friend) | Yes | 77 | 70.0 | 1.24 | 0.47 | |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Friend) | No | 33 | 30.0 | 1.54 | 0.47 | |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Boss) | Yes | 46 | 41.8 | 1.54 | 0.50 | |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Boss) | No | 64 | 58.2 | 1.34 | 0.50 | |

 Table 02.
 Frequency Distribution Analyses (Turkey)

| Table 03. | Frequency Dis | tribution Analyses | (Denmark) |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|-----------|
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|-----------|

| | | Ν | % | Mean | St. Deviation |
|--|--------------------------|-----|------|-------|---------------|
| Age | | 110 | 100 | 22.73 | 2.37 |
| Candar | Female | 34 | 30.9 | 1.60 | 0.46 |
| Gender | Male | 76 | 69.1 | 1.09 | 0.40 |
| | Marketing | 40 | 36.7 | | |
| Degree Studied | Innovation | 29 | 26.4 | | |
| | Business | 21 | 19.1 | | |
| | Economics | 11 | 10.0 | 1.61 | 0.88 |
| | Aviation Technology | 4 | 3.64 | | |
| | Environmental Management | 2 | 1.81 | | |
| | Audiovisual Production | 2 | 1.81 | | |
| Work Experience | Yes | 97 | 88.2 | | |
| work Experience | No | 13 | 11.8 | | |
| Entropropourial Experience | Yes | 46 | 41.8 | 1 5 9 | 0.50 |
| Entrepreneuriar Experience | No | 64 | 58.2 | 1.30 | 0.30 |
| Vnow Entropropour (Ac a Eamily Momber) | Yes | 71 | 64.5 | 1.26 | 0.48 |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Family Member) | No | 39 | 35.5 | 1.50 | 0.48 |
| Know Entropropour (As a Friend) | Yes | 88 | 80.0 | 1.20 | 0.40 |
| Know Entrepreneur (As a Friend) | No | 22 | 20.0 | 1.20 | 0.40 |
| Vnow Entropropour (As a Pass) | Yes | 47 | 42.7 | 1.57 | 0.50 |
| Know Enuepreneur (As a Boss) | No | 63 | 57.3 | 1.37 | 0.30 |

Table 2 and Table 3 show that the findings of frequency distribution analyses for Turkish and Danish students are similar. Most of the students are males, have work experiences, know entrepreneurs as family members and friends. Table 4 shows the findings of KMO and Bartlett test result for independent variables for Turkey.

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy 0.877 | | | | | |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 2320.518 | | | |
| | df | 190 | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | | | |

Table 04. KMO and Bartlett Test Result for Independent Variables (Turkey)

A KMO value that is 0.877 points out that the data is appropriate to investigate and there is a perfect correlation among variables. Thus, the factor analysis can be conducted. The Bartlett's test result of 0.000 confirms the suitability of variables for factor analysis. The cronbach alpha values of independent variable are acceptable to test scale reliability. 65.531% of variance that is explained is good for validation. Table 5 shows the results of factor analysis of independent variables for Turkey.

| | Factor Loading | % Variance Explained | Cronbach a |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| Factor 1: Entrepreneurial Intention | | 23.411 | 0.901 |
| I will make every effort to start and run my own firm | 0.855 | | |
| I am determined to create a firm in the future | 0.836 | | |
| I have the firm intention to start a firm some day | 0.831 | | |
| I am ready to do anything to be an entrepreneur | 0.802 | | |
| My professional goal is to become an entrepreneur | 0.677 | | |
| I have very seriously thought of starting a firm | 0.674 | | |
| Factor 2: Personal Attitude | | 21.666 | 0.871 |
| If I had the opportunity and resources, I'd like to start a firm | 0.845 | | |
| Among various options, I would rather be an entrepreneur | 0.779 | | |
| Being an entrepreneur implies more advantages than disadvantages to me | 0.710 | | |
| A career as entrepreneur is attractive for me | 0.666 | | |
| Being an entrepreneur would entail great satisfactions for me | 0.656 | | |
| Factor 3: Subjective Norm | | 10.452 | 0.821 |
| Your friends | 0.726 | | |
| Your colleagues | 0.698 | | |
| Your close family | 0.649 | | |
| Factor 4: Perceived Behavioral Control | | 10.002 | 0.866 |
| I can control the creation process of a new firm | 0.864 | | |
| To start a firm and keep it working would be easy for me | 0.761 | | |
| I know the necessary practical details to start a firm | 0.756 | | |
| If I tried to start a firm, I would have a high probability of succeeding | 0.732 | | |
| I know how to develop an entrepreneurial project | 0.730 | | |
| I am prepared to start a viable firm | 0.712 | | |
| KMO = 0.877, P = 0.000 | | 65.531 | |

Table 05. Factor Analysis Results of Independent Variables (Turkey)

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 6 shows the findings of KMO and Bartlett test result for independent variables for Denmark.

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequa | 0.872 | | | | |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 1776.624 | | | |
| | df | 190 | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | | | |

Table 06. KMO and Bartlett Test Result for Independent Variables (Denmark)

A KMO value that is 0.872 points out that the data is appropriate to investigate and there is a perfect correlation among variables. Thus, the factor analysis can be conducted. The Bartlett's test result of 0.000 confirms the suitability of variables for factor analysis. The cronbach alpha values of independent variable are acceptable to test scale reliability. 71.919% of variance that is explained is good for validation.

Table 7 shows the results of factor analysis of independent variables for Denmark

Table 07. Factor Analysis Results of Independent Variables (Denmark)

| | Factor | % Variance | Cronbach a |
|---|---------|------------|------------|
| | Loading | Explained | |
| Factor 1: Entrepreneurial Intention | | 20.822 | 0.903 |
| My professional goal is to become an entrepreneur | 0,825 | | |
| I have very seriously thought of starting a firm | 0,775 | | |
| I will make every effort to start and run my own firm | 0,743 | | |
| I am determined to create a firm in the future | 0,734 | | |
| I have the firm intention to start a firm some day | 0.733 | | |
| I am ready to do anything to be an entrepreneur | 0.699 | | |
| Factor 2: Personal Attitude | | 19.981 | 0.890 |
| Being an entrepreneur implies more advantages than disadvantages to me | 0.805 | | |
| If I had the opportunity and resources, I'd like to start a firm | 0,801 | | |
| Among various options, I would rather be an entrepreneur | 0.799 | | |
| Being an entrepreneur would entail great satisfactions for me | 0.790 | | |
| A career as entrepreneur is attractive for me | 0.783 | | |
| Factor 3: Subjective Norm | | 18.714 | 0.790 |
| Your friends | 0.757 | | |
| Your colleagues | 0.730 | | |
| Your close family | 0.729 | | |
| Factor 4: Perceived Behavioral Control | | 12.402 | 0.783 |
| I know how to develop an entrepreneurial project | 0,819 | | |
| I am prepared to start a viable firm | 0,801 | | |
| I know the necessary practical details to start a firm | 0.786 | | |
| If I tried to start a firm, I would have a high probability of succeeding | 0.745 | | |
| I can control the creation process of a new firm | 0.715 | | |
| To start a firm and keep it working would be easy for me | 0.713 | | |
| KMO = 0.872 P= 0.000 | | 71.919 | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin Normalization with Kaiser.

The results of the correlation analyses between entrepreneurial intention and dimensions of planned

Entrepreneurial behavior for Turkey are shown below in Table 8.

| | Entrepreneurial Intention | Personal Attitude | Subjective Norm | Perceived Behavioral Comtrol | Total | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Entrepreneurial Intention | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Personal Attitude | 0.202** | 1 | | | | | | |
| Subjective Norm | 0.200* | 0.213 | 1 | | | | | |
| Perceived Behavioral Control | 0.107** | 0.185** | 0.204 | 1 | | | | |
| Total | 0.376** | 0.304 | 0.167 | 0.178 | 1 | | | |

 Table 08.
 Correlation Analyses Between Entrepreneurial Intention and Dimensions of Planned

 Entrepreneurial Behavior (Turkey)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.10 level (2-tailed).

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

There is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial intention and personal attitude at the 0.05 level in Turkey. Also, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial intention and perceived behavioral control at the 0.05 level in Turkey. However, these relationships are quite low. Significant and the highest correlation is observed between entrepreneurial intention and personal attitude (0.202). On the other hand, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial intention and dimensions of planned entrepreneurial behavior at the 0.10 level in Turkey.

The results of the correlation analyses between entrepreneurial intention and dimensions of planned Entrepreneurial behavior for Turkey are shown below in Table 9.

| Entrepreneuriar D | Entrepreneurial Denavior (Denmark) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Entrepreneurial Intention | Personal Attitude | Subjective Norm | Perceived Behavioral Comtrol | Total | | | | | |
| Entrepreneurial Intention | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal Attitude | 0.152** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Subjective Norm | 0.131* | 0.075 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Perceived Behavioral Control | 0.190* | 0.070 | 0.042 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Total | 0.099** | 0.023* | 0.022* | 0.50 | 1 | | | | | |

 Table 09.
 Correlation Analyses Between Entrepreneurial Intention and Dimensions of Planned

 Entrepreneurial Rehavior (Denmark)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.10 level (2-tailed).

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

There is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial intention and personal attitude at the 0.05 level in Denmark. However, this relationship is quite low. On the other hand, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial intention and dimensions of planned entrepreneurial behavior at the 0.10 level in Denmark.

Multiple regression analysis model summary of planned entrepreneurial behavior and entrepreneurial intention for Turkey is shown below in Table 10.

 Table 10.
 Multiple Regression Analysis Model Summary of Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior and Entrepreneurial Intention (Turkey)

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | 0.601 | 0.361 | 0.360 | 0.696 | 1.001 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Personal Attitude, Subjective Norm, Perceived Behavioral Control b. Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

The dimensions of the planned entrepreneurial behavior explain 36% of entrepreneurial intention. Personel Attitude has the highest increasing effect on entrepreneurial intention. Multiple regression analysis coefficients of planned entrepreneurial behavior and entrepreneurial intention for Turkey is shown below in Table 11.

| | ······································ | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|----------------------------|-------|--|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | Т | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics | | |
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | | Tolerance | VIF | |
| | (Constant) | 1.296 | 0.048 | | 6.236 | 0.000 | | | |
| | Personal Attitude | 0.197 | 0.055 | 0.257* | 6.618 | 0.021 | 0.003 | 1.305 | |
| 1 | Subjective Norm | 0.206 | 0.395 | 0.181* | 3.114 | 0.040 | 0.298 | 2.321 | |
| | Perceived Behavioral Control | 0.128 | 0.066 | 0.170* | 3.536 | 0.022 | 0.258 | 2.021 | |
| | F: 60.215 (p: 0.000) | | | | | | | | |

 Table 11.
 Multiple Regression Analysis Coefficients of Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior and Entrepreneurial Intention (Turkey)

(p<0.05) Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

H0a: Personal Attitude Does Not Positively Affect Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H1a: Personal Attitude Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

p = 0.021 < 0.05 H0a is rejected.

H1a is accepted at 0.05 significance level. Personal Attitude Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey.

H0b: Subjective Norm Does Not Positively Affect Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H1b: Subjective Norm Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

p = 0.040 < 0.05 H0b is rejected.

H1b is accepted at 0.05 significance level. Subjective Norm Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey.

H0c: Perceived Behavioral Control Does Not Positively Affect Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

H1c: Perceived Behavioral Control Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey

p = 0.022 < 0.05 H0c is rejected.

H1c is accepted at 0.05 significance level. Perceived Behavioral Control Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey.

H1 is accepted. Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Turkey.

Multiple regression analysis model summary of planned entrepreneurial behavior and entrepreneurial intention for Denmark is shown below in Table 12.

 Table 12.
 Multiple Regression Analysis Model Summary of Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior and Entrepreneurial Intention (Denmark)

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | 0.579 | 0.335 | 0.330 | 0.705 | 1.007 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Personal Attitude, Subjective Norm, Perceived BehavioralControl b. Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

The dimensions of the planned entrepreneurial behavior explain 33% of entrepreneurial intention.

Personel Attitude has the highest increasing effect on entrepreneurial intention.

| | Entrepreneurur mention (Dennurk) | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|----------------------------|-------|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics | |
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | | Tolerance | VIF |
| | (Constant) | 0.811 | 0.004 | | 4.731 | 0.002 | | |
| | Personal Attitude | 0.097 | 0.188 | 0.262* | 3.648 | 0.032 | 0.126 | 1.105 |
| 1 | Subjective Norm | 0.308 | 0.235 | 0.114* | 3.444 | 0.006 | 0.201 | 2.115 |
| | Perceived Behavioral | | | | | | | |
| | Control | 0.288 | 0.105 | 0.158* | 3.506 | 0.011 | 0.178 | 1.431 |
| | F: 58,667 (p: 0.000) | | | | | | | |

 Table 13.
 Multiple Regression Analysis Coefficients of Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior and Entrepreneurial Intention (Denmark)

(p<0.05) Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

H0a: Personal Attitude Does Not Positively Affect Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

H2a: Personal Attitude Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

p = 0.032 < 0.05 H0a is rejected.

H2a is accepted at 0.05 significance level. Personal Attitude Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark.

H0b: Subjective Norm Does Not Positively Affect Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

H2b: Subjective Norm Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

p = 0.006 < 0.05 H0b is rejected.

H2b is accepted at 0.05 significance level. Subjective Norm Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark.

H0c: Perceived Behavioral Control Does Not Positively Affect Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

H2c: Perceived Behavioral Control Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

p = 0.011 < 0.05 H0c is rejected.

H2c is accepted at 0.05 significance level. Perceived Behavioral Control Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark

H2 is accepted. Planned Entrepreneurial Behavior Positively Affects Entrepreneurial Intention in Denmark according to the results shown in Table 13.

As it is observed, Personel Attitude has the highest increasing effect on entrepreneurial intention in Turkey and Denmark. On the other hand, Personel Attitude has higher increasing effect in Denmark than in Turkey. Subjective Norm and Perceived Behavioral Control have higher increasing effects in Turkey than in Denmark. According to Hofstede, Turkey has higher results for power distance, masculinity and uncertainity avoidance (https://geert-hofstede.com/turkey.html). It is expected that subjective norm and perceived behavioral control are higher but personal attitude is lower in Turkey than in Denmark. The findings of this study are parallel to these expectations. According to the findings shown in table 14 and table 15, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control are higher but personal attitude is lower in Turkey than in Denmark.

| | | I | Paired Differ | ences | | | | |
|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------------------|--|-------|---------|-----|-------|
| Pair | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | t | df | Sig. |
| Turkish Students | 0.006 | 1 410 | 0.800 | Lower | Upper | 4 2 1 2 | 100 | 0.001 |
| Danish Students | -0.096 | 1.410 | 0.800 | -1.640 | 0.552 | -4.212 | 109 | 0.001 |

| Table 14. | Paired Samples | T Test | (Entrepreneuria) | Intention) |
|-----------|----------------|--------|------------------|------------|
|-----------|----------------|--------|------------------|------------|

Variable: Entrepreneurial Intention

| Table 15. | Paired Sam | ples Test | Statistics (| (Entrepr | eneurial | Intention) |
|------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1 abic 10. | i uncu buin | | Statistics | (Linu opi | cilcultur | memony |

| Pair | Mean | Ν | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------------|-------|-----|----------------|-----------------|
| Turkish Students | 5.711 | 110 | 0.805 | 0.045 |
| Danish Students | 5.807 | 110 | 0.874 | 0.080 |

The mean of Turkish students is 5.711 whereas the mean of Danish students is 5.807 for Entrepreneurial Intention. Danish students have 0.096 higher mean value than Turkish students. There is a significant average difference between Entrepreneurial Intention values of Turkish and Danish students (t = -4.212, p < 0.05) as seen in Tale 16.

Table 16. Paired Samples Correlations (Entrepreneurial Intention)

| Pair | Ν | Correlation | Sig. |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------|
| Turkish Students-Danish Students | 110 | 0.502 | 0.001 |

Entrepreneurial Intention values of Turkish and Danish students are not strongly but significantly positively correlated (r = 0.502, p < 0.05).

H3a: There is a Difference Between Entrepreneurial Intention Means of Turkish and Danish Students

Sig value that is 0.001 is smaller than 0.05. It confirms that Entrepreneurial Intention means of Turkish and Danish students are significantly different. Thus, H3a is accepted. Entrepreneurial Intention of Danish students are higher than Entrepreneurial Intention of Turkish students.

 Table 17.
 Paired Samples T Test (Personel Attitude)

| | | Р | aired Differ | ences | | | | |
|------------------|--------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|-----|-------|
| Pair | Moon | Std. | Std. Error | 95% Confide | ence Interval | t | df | Sig. |
| | wream | Deviation | Mean | of the Difference | | | | |
| Turkish Students | 0.274 | 1.049 | 0.712 | Lower | Upper | 2 5 4 2 | 100 | 0.000 |
| Danish Students | -0.574 | 1.046 | 0.715 | -1.421 | 0.455 | -3.342 | 109 | 0.000 |

Variable: Personel attitude

Table 18. Paired Samples Test Statistics (Personel Attitude)

| Pair | Mean | Ν | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------------|-------|-----|----------------|-----------------|
| Turkish Students | 5.539 | 110 | 0.871 | 0.057 |
| Danish Students | 5.913 | 110 | 0.916 | 0.065 |

The mean of Turkish students is 5.539 whereas the mean of Danish students is 5.913 for Personal Attitude as seen in Table 17 and Table 18. Danish students have 0.374 higher mean value than Turkish students. There is a significant average difference between Personal Attitude values of Turkish and Danish students (t = -3.542, p < 0.05).

| Table 19. | Paired Samples Correlations | (Personel Attitude) |
|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| Pair | Ν | Correlation | Sig. |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------|
| Turkish Students-Danish Students | 110 | 0.521 | 0.000 |

Personal Attitude values of Turkish and Danish students are not strongly but significantly positively correlated (r = 0.521, p < 0.05) as seen in Table 19.

H3b: There is a Difference Between Personal Attitude Means of Turkish and Danish Students

Sig value that is 0.000 is smaller than 0.05. It confirms that Personal Attitude means of Turkish and Danish students are significantly different. Thus, H3b is accepted. Personal Attitude of Danish students are higher than Personal Attitude of Turkish students. Paired samples T Test results are shown in Table 20.

 Table 20.
 Paired Samples T Test (Subjective Norm)

| | | | Paired Differ | ences | | | | |
|------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------|-----|-------|
| Pair | Moon | Std. | Std. Error | 95% Confid | ence Interval | t | df | Sig. |
| | Mean | Deviation | Mean | of the Difference | | | | |
| Turkish Students | 0.102 | 1.004 | 0.519 | Lower | Upper | 2 508 | 100 | 0.000 |
| Danish Students | 0.102 | 1.004 | 0.318 | -1.205 | 0.677 | 2.398 | 109 | 0.000 |

Variable: Subjective Norm

 Table 21.
 Paired Samples Test Statistics (Subjective Norm)

| Pair | Mean | Ν | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------------|-------|-----|----------------|-----------------|
| Turkish Students | 5.493 | 110 | 0.987 | 0.105 |
| Danish Students | 5.391 | 110 | 0.890 | 0.086 |

The mean of Turkish students is 5.493 whereas the mean of Danish students is 5.391 for Subjective Norm as seen in Table 21. Turkish students have 0.102 higher mean value than Danish students. There is a significant average difference between Subjective Norm values of Turkish and Danish students (t = 2.598, p < 0.05).

Table 22. Paired Samples Correlations (Subjective Norm)

| Pair | Ν | Correlation | Sig. |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------|
| Turkish Students-Danish Students | 110 | 0.498 | 0.000 |

Subjective Norm values of Turkish and Danish students are weakly and significantly positively correlated (r = 0.498, p < 0.05) as seen in Table 22.

H3c: There is a Difference Between Subjective Norm Means of Turkish and Danish Students

Sig value that is 0.000 is smaller than 0.05. It confirms that Subjective Norm means of Turkish and Danish students are significantly different. Thus, H3c is accepted. Subjective Norm of Turkish students are higher than Subjective Norm of Danish students.

 Table 23.
 Paired Samples T Test (Perceived Behavioral Control)

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. |
|------------------|--|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|---------|-----|-------|
| Pair | Moon Std. Std. Error 95% Confidence Interval | | | | | | | |
| | wream | Deviation | Mean | of the Difference | | | | |
| Turkish Students | 0.086 | 1 1 5 5 | 0.519 | Lower | Upper | 2 6 9 1 | 100 | 0.001 |
| Danish Students | 0.080 | 1.133 | 0.318 | -1.002 | 0.423 | 5.081 | 109 | 0.001 |

Variable: Perceived Behavioral Control

| Pair | Mean | Ν | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------------|-------|-----|----------------|-----------------|
| Turkish Students | 5.893 | 110 | 0.510 | 0.069 |
| Danish Students | 5.807 | 110 | 0.609 | 0.076 |

| Table 24. | Paired Sample | Test Statistics (| Perceived | Behavioral Control) | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | , | |

The mean of Turkish students is 5.893 whereas the mean of Danish students is 5.807 for Perceived Behavioral Control. Turkish students have 0.086 higher mean value than Danish students. There is a significant average difference between Perceived Behavioral Control values of Turkish and Danish students (t = 3.681, p < 0.05) as seen in Table 23 and Table 24.

Table 25. Paired Sample Test Statistics (Perceived Behavioral Control)

| Pair | Ν | Correlation | Sig. |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------|
| Turkish Students-Danish Students | 110 | 0.432 | 0.001 |

Perceived Behavioral Control values of Turkish and Danish students are weakly and significantly positively correlated (r = 0.432, p < 0.05) as seen in Table 25.

H3d: There is a Difference Between Perceived Behavioral Control Means of Turkish and Danish Students

Sig value that is 0.001 is smaller than 0.05. It confirms that Perceived Behavioral Control means of Turkish and Danish students are significantly different. Thus, H3d is accepted. Perceived Behavioral Control of Turkish students are higher than Perceived Behavioral Control of Danish students.

4. Conclusion

According to the results of multiple regression analyses, personal attitute, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control positively affect entrepreneurial intention in Turkey and Denmark. Thus, the planned entrepreneurial behavior positively affects entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate students in Turkey and Denmark. Personel Attitude has the highest increasing effect on entrepreneurial intention in Turkey and Denmark. Subjective norm and perceived behavioral control are higher but personal attitude is lower in Turkey than in Denmark. According to the results of paired samples t tests, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control of Turkish students are higher than Danish students. On the other hand, entrepreneurial intention and personal attitude of Danish students are higher than Turkish students. Undergraduate students plan to be entrepreneurs and have entrepreneurial intentions in Turkey and Denmark. The findings of this research support TPB of Ajzen on entrepreneurial intention. Also, they support the findings of Liñán and Chen (2009). This research will make contributions to researches that will be conducted in this field in the future.

Acknowledgments

This paper is funded by Istanbul Commerce University.

References

- Bagheri, A., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (2015). Factors influencing students' entrepreneurial intentions: The critical roles of personal attraction and perceived control over behaviour. *The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology*, 16, 16-28.
- Busenitz, L. W., & Lau, C.-M. (1996). A Cross-Cultural Cognitive Model of New Venture Creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20(4), 25–40
- Crant, J. (1996). The Proactive Personality Scale as a Predictor of Entrepreneurial Intention. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34(3).
- Davidsson, P., & Wiklund, J. (1997). Values, beliefs and regional variations in new firm formation rates. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18, 179-199.
- Finisterra do Paço, A. M., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviours and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 9, 20-38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-010-0071-9
- Giacomin, O., Janssen, F., Guyot, J. L, & Lohest, O. (2011). Opportunity and/or necessity entrepreneurship? The impact of the socio-economic characteristics of entrepreneurs.
- Hayton, J. C., George, G., & Zahra, S. A. (2002) National Culture and Entrepreneurship: A Review of Behavioral Research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26, 33-52.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R.R. (2004). Culture and personality revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. Cross-cultural Research, 38(1), 52-88.
- Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010) Long-versus short-term orientation: new perspectives. Asia Pacific Business Review, 16(4), 493-504
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1).
- Hrubes, D., Ajzen, I., & Daigle, J. (2001), Predicting hunting intentions and behavior: An application of the theory of planned behaviour. *Leisure Sciences*, 23, 165-178.
- Krueger Jr, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing Models of Entrepreneurial Intention. Journal of Business Venturing, 15(5-6), 411-432.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y-W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593–617.
- Malach-Pines, A., & Kaspi Baruch, O. (2008). The role of culture and gender in the choice of a career in management. *Career Development International, 13*(4), 306-319. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810880808
- Mitchell, R., Smith, J., Seawright, K. W., & Morse, E. (2000). Cross-Cultural Cognitions and the Venture Creation Decision. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 974-993. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556422
- Mueller, J., Zapkau, F. B., & Schwens, C. (2014). Impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on entrepreneurial intention-cross-cultural evidence. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 22(3), 251-282. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218495814500113
- Nguyen, T. H., Alam, Q., Perry, M., & Prajogo, D. (2009). The Entrepreneurial Role of the State and SME Growth in Vietnam. *JOAAG*, *4*(1), 60-71.
- Pickett, L. L., Ginsburg, H. J., Mendez, R. V., Lim, D. E., Blankenship, K. R., Foster, L. E., Lewis, D. H., Ramon, S. W., Saltis, B. M., & Sheffield, S. B. (2012). Ajzen's theory of planned behavior as it relates to eating disorders and body satisfaction. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 14(2), 339-354.
- Pruett, M., Shinnar, R., Toney, B., Llopis, F., & Fox, J. (2009). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions of university students: a cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 15(6), 571-594.
- Schwarz, E. J., Wdowiak, M. A., Almer-Jarz, D. A., & Breitenecker, R. J. (2009). The Effects of Attitudes and Perceived Environment Conditions on Students' Entrepreneurial Intent. *Education + Training*, 51, 272-291.

- Shane, S. (1993). Cultural influences on national rates of innovation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8, 59-73.
- Shinnar, R. S., Giacomin, O., & Janssen, F. (2012). Entrepreneurial perceptions and intentions: The role of gender and culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 465-493. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00509.x
- Shneor, R., Camgöz, S. M., & Karapinar, P. B. (2013). The interaction between culture and sex in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25(9-10), 781-803. http://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2013.862973