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ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurial activity is essential to ensure the economic stability of any country. The rate of entrepreneurial activity is high in developed countries, yet remains lower in developing nations. This research was conducted to examine the factors affecting the entrepreneurial behaviors of individuals in the developing country of Pakistan.

Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter that presents an overview of this study, discusses the background of the research problem, and develops the research questions. Moreover, it highlights the ways in which this study enriches the existing literature. This study aimed to evaluate the direct effects of social capital on entrepreneurial attitude (EA) and the mediating effects of self-efficacy and social norms in this relationship. Moreover, this study examined the moderating effect of gender on entrepreneurial intention (EI) via self-efficacy and social norms.

Chapter 2 reviews the existing literature, while highlighting the gap in the research. This study is unique in the way it analyzes the multi-mediation effect on EI, which further leads to entrepreneurial behavior. The literature affirms that EI followed by EA further leads toward entrepreneurial behavior. However, this study evaluates the direct and indirect effects of social capital on building both EA and EI. Moreover, the literature asserts that social norms are more associated with women, while self-efficacy is more associated with men. This study observes the effect of these associations on EI with the mediating role of EA. Further, this study is conducted in Pakistan, which represents the South Asian context. The hypothetical model presented in this study is tested in this developing country, which differentiates the results of this study from those found in developed country contexts.

Moreover, this study exhibits the research model based on the hypotheses presented in this study. The theoretical model of this study is based on the theory of planned behavior with incorporation of gender schema theory. Moreover, it caters the existing literature on the behavioral determinants. This study posits that social capital affects the EA of individuals on the basis of role modeling and motivation, which causes individuals to believe in themselves and increases their self-efficacy. Thus, this study examines the moderation and mediation effects together.

Chapter 3 presents the research methodology followed in this study. As a descriptive study, the data were collected through a questionnaire with graduate and undergraduate students of...
management and business studies from different universities in Pakistan. In this longitudinal study, a positivism paradigm was applied. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used for the model testing. We used the test of moderation by applying the process (Bolin, 2014) to test the moderation effect of gender.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis. To validate the measurement tool in the South Asian context, we used confirmatory factor analysis in AMOS. The results depicted that all the variables were reliable, and established convergent and discriminant validity. Following this, to test the theoretical model of the study, the direct and indirect effects were examined through SEM. The findings of the study revealed that social capital affects EA and EI via the mediation of self-efficacy and social norms. EI leads toward entrepreneurial behavior. In addition, the findings indicate that gender moderates the effects of social norms and self-efficacy on both EA and EI.

Chapter 5 presents the conclusion and recommendations, which comprises the discussion, research implications, research limitations, and conclusion. The results demonstrate that social capital more significantly affects EA when it is linked with the social norms and self-efficacy of individuals. In addition, social norms are more associated with female individuals, while self-efficacy affects both genders equally. Moreover, EA moderates the effect of social capital on EI in such a way that it is higher among male individuals. These findings offer practical implications to policymakers.
### ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>The Average Variance Extracted is used to determine the convergent validity of the construct (Fornell &amp; Lacker, 1981).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis is used to test the measurement model (Kline, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>The Comparative Fit Index describes that the proposed model is better than the independent model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>Cronbach Alpha value is used to measure the reliability or internal consistency of a variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Degree of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>The variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEM</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Event Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>The effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable via the mediator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBIR</td>
<td>Small Business Innovation Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td>Shapero and Sokol model of the entrepreneurial event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Structural Equation Modeling is an analysis technique that runs the multiple regression equations simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEDA</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprises Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Social Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>Tucker Lewis Index based on the degree of freedom a variance among variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPB</td>
<td>Theory of Planned Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Background

There is extensive research supporting the link between entrepreneurship and economic development, and stressing the positive relationship between these two factors. An entrepreneur is an individual who eagerly takes initiative and assumes the full responsibility for that initiative, with the ability to create unique products or processes, and openness to the risk associated with this effort. Entrepreneurs are also persistent in their goals, even if they face many challenges while pursuing their initiative (Iversen, Jørgensen, & Malchow-Møller, 2007). Entrepreneurial activity is a key driver of economic development (do Paço, Ferreira, Raposo, Rodrigues, & Dinis, 2011; Sanyang & Huang, 2010). The correlation between the entrepreneurial activity of the local population, small business, and the economic development of the state has been confirmed in numerous studies (Acs, Desai, & Hessels, 2008; Naudé, 2010; Wennekers, Van Stel, Carree, & Thurik, 2010).

Entrepreneurship is a catalyst that can boost a stagnant economy and lead it to grow and develop (Zaman, 2013). Thus, in the progress of any country, entrepreneurship must be promoted and its contribution should not be ignored all across the boundaries. Particularly in developing countries, such as Pakistan, small businesses can play a vital role in development (S. Hyder & Lussier, 2016). However, despite its potential benefits for economic stability, entrepreneurship is very limited in Pakistan, as government policies do not support this phenomenon, but rather focus on the manufacturing industry (Chemin, 2008, 2010). International goals for world development support and promote entrepreneurship. The Millennium Development Goals assert that poverty cannot be eliminated until all people can access employment and have their basic needs met (Littlefield, Morduch, & Hashemi, 2003). Thus, the government can stress upon it by coordinating with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and Trade Association to promote business-related training and the formal education of individuals who own small and medium enterprises (S. Hyder & Lussier, 2016).

For many years, unemployment has been a crucial issue in Pakistan, and it is increasing substantially. After graduating students start seeking the good jobs in both public and private sector and unable to found the appropriate ones for them. The government alone cannot meet the requirements for jobs, and the private sector also does not provide sufficient
job opportunities. Formal education and training are lacking among entrepreneurs; thus, entrepreneurs are less educated and prefer to work in informal environments, without legal boundaries and codes of conduct (Williams & Shahid, 2016). To address these problems, the country’s higher education system needs to be reexamined to enhance entrepreneurial activities and economic growth, as this is the only way to eradicate unemployment issues and economic deterioration (Zaman, 2013).

Pakistan is one of the developing countries that are in a race to shift from a low-income to high-income country. Thus, this is the right time for Pakistan to introduce policies to promote entrepreneurship (Saleem, 2008), given that small businesses are essential to the economic development of the country, and successful entrepreneurs must be promoted. In this manner, valuable resources can be saved and best used. To develop policies regarding entrepreneurship, Pakistan has established the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Authority (SMEDA) (Qureshi & Herani, 2011). The SMEDA is working in Pakistan to introduce small and medium enterprise (SME) policies and provisions for loans and appropriate training. However, as a result of restricted resources, it can only cater to a small segment of SMEs. However, the understanding that real-time investment is required to promote SMEs because, if managed effectively, this will offer great returns to the country’s economy. SMEDA represents the only government policy to promote entrepreneurship; thus, its role must be enhanced by allocating increased resources to the authority, which will ignite the overall entrepreneurial environment in the country. The government must promote an environment that supports startups. However, for that purpose, it is crucial to raise awareness among the population regarding the benefits of self-employment. The social settings of individuals influence their understandings of the outcomes of entrepreneurial behavior and intention to empowerment (Azam Roomi & Harrison, 2010).

The production of human capital seems to be the most significant task of educators to create a knowledge-driven economy. Thus, educators should consider production of social capital a fundamental aspect of their work (Baudassé, 2014). Production is considered the third factor of knowledge, and social capital should be considered the fourth factor. Universities play a major role in creating social capital (Baudassé, 2014). Further, the foremost step in the process of entrepreneurship is entrepreneurial intention (EI) (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993), which indicates the readiness of an individual to initiate a new venture (Thompson, 2009), and can be defined as the “intention to start a business” (de Janasz & Behson, 2007). Various researchers have defined entrepreneurship differently as asserted by Krueger, Reilly, and Carsrud (2000). While Kolvereid (1996) perceived EI to be
individuals’ intent to be self-employed, Krueger and Brazeal (1994) viewed EI as the intent of an individual to launch a new venture. The current study examines the role of social capital in EI and behaviors, with the mediating effect of social norms and self-efficacy, and moderation of gender.

1.2. Significance of the Topic

Both factors are associated with country-level social capital and entrepreneurial activity (Kwon & Arenius, 2010; Smallbone & Welter, 2001). Country-level social capital in the form of trust provides more favorable conditions for entrepreneurship, and the successful development of entrepreneurship increases the welfare of the nation as a whole (Kwon & Arenius, 2010). Both prior entrepreneurship research (particularly research pertaining to the increased likelihood of individuals with entrepreneurs in the family starting businesses) and research on the effect of the development of social capital provide a theoretical basis for EI.

1.3. Problem Statement of the Study

There is limited literature seeking to understand the effect of EI in formulating entrepreneurial behavior, and more work needs to be undertaken in this field. According to the theory of planned behavior, in predicting human behavior, values and past experiences play a vital role, and individuals build their perceptions on these factors, which drive their attitudes and lead to behavior (Fayolle, 2005).

At the end of university education, business students are usually highly concerned about their career selection. They have two options—undertake entrepreneurship or seek a job in an existing organization. During this phase, the outcome of education is important, and this is conditioned by social interactions between students, teachers, and management (Plagens, 2011). Educational institutes are more than learning factories where the social environment generates academic outputs in the form of school performance (Plagens, 2011). Previous studies have found that social capital plays a vital role in the development of graduates’ entrepreneurial behavior. For example, Liñán and Santos (2007) examined the effect of social capital on graduates’ EI through the mediation of desirability and feasibility, while Campopiano, Minola, and Sainaghi (2016) studied the effect of social capital on students’ entrepreneurial behavior through the mediation of environment mental mission.

A university is able to build up the entire reasoning individual, to grow skylines and ingrain the adoration for learning in people and construct vote-based citizenship with
connected and educated natives who have the ability to make majority rules system work. According to Walstad and Kourilsky (1999), there is much greater potential for interest of entrepreneurship in every country than is being realized. While many students are interested in starting their own businesses, not many are taking educational strides to do so, which, according to Walstad and Kourilsky (1999), represents lost opportunity. It is the request of the day that the nature of education at each stage be enhanced to establish a strong framework for the headway of concentrates in essential sciences, building disciplines, horticulture expansion, restorative, and some other vital regions that are required for the economic development and reproduction of Pakistan.

University is an important educational milestone that prepares students for the dramatic transition from one life stage to the next (Brewer, Hook, Welburn-Simmons, & Williams, 2004), making it a crucial time to introduce a variety of “futures.” However, according to Kourilsky and Walstad (2002), university students are taught by “job takers” and surrounded by stimuli paid for by large company recruiters; thus, they are being groomed through education to “take” jobs, rather than “make” jobs. An effective introduction to entrepreneurship at the university level is likely to influence individual consideration of alternative career paths. More specifically, such an introduction is likely to encourage exploration of a career in entrepreneurship. Researchers in the social sciences are devoting increasing attention to the non-economic factors that facilitate economic progress (Altman, 2001; Landes, Harrison, & Huntington, 2000), and social capital is one of the most significant non-economic facilitators of progress (Fukuyama, 2002; Helliwell & Putnam, 1995; Knack & Keefer, 1997; R. Putnam, 2001; Westlund & Adam, 2010; Woolcock, 1998).

Individual social capital directly and heavily affects people’s behavior (Van Der Gaag & Snijders, 2005; Verhaeghe & Tampubolon, 2012). However, we cannot say that macro-level social capital (trust, etc.) directly affects entrepreneurial behavior. Having social capital means that an individual will receive social sustenance. Even in virtual groups, social capital boosts a sense of community and enhances mutual social sustenance (Tsai, Harpaz-Rotem, Pietrzak, & Southwick, 2012). Therefore, individual social capital also plays the role of a moderator, providing a buffer of social support—that is, it affects the relationship between the intent to initiate a business and the implementation thereof. The saying “it’s not what you know, but who you know” depicts the general view of social capital. Based on our experience, gaining membership to exclusive clubs requires inside connections, the employment and contracts’ close competition are generally led by
individuals who have “friends in high places” (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). We agree with Portes (1998) that “the greatest theoretical promise of social capital lies at the individual level—as exemplified by the analyses of Bourdieu and Coleman”. Individual social capital is “the collection of resources owned by the members of an individual’s personal social network, which may become available to the individual as a result of the history of these relationships” (Van Der Gaag & Snijders, 2005).

Numerous studies have demonstrated that individuals’ social capital is linked with the success of their business (Read, Song, & Smit, 2009; Smallbone & Welter, 2001; Turner & An Nguyen, 2005; Venkataraman, 1997). However, an important aspect of the issue remains unexplored—whether or not individual social capital facilitates the initiation of a new business. We perceive that an individual’s social capital plays a dual role in initiating a business. The social capital of an individual acts as a facilitator to increase perceived behavioral control, which, in the theory of planned behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 2011), is one of the factors (alongside attitude and subjective norm) that influences behavioral intention. The TPB has appeared as a proficient tool and instrument to explore an individual’s intention toward entrepreneurship (e.g., Engle et al., 2010; Kautonen, Van Gelderen, & Tornikoski, 2013; Van Gelderen, Kautonen, & Fink, 2015). Thus, this study examined the effect of social capital on self-efficacy and social norms, and then its effect on attitude toward entrepreneurship, with the help of TPB. EI is always followed by entrepreneurial attitude (EA), and then these intentions further lead toward entrepreneurial behavior (Fayolle, 2005) and complete the process of entrepreneurial engagement.

Douglas and Shepherd (2002) asserted that there is a link between the individual’s attitude toward work, income, independence, and risk and the intention to become an entrepreneur. Thus, a positive attitude toward entrepreneurship helps develop EI, which leads to entrepreneurial behavior. In addition, self-efficacy affects whether an individual seeks entrepreneurship (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 2001; Bandura & Wessels, 1997; Walstad & Kourilsky, 1999; Wilson, Marlino, & Kickul, 2004; Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005). Attitudes and intentions are mediated through the effect of social norms, self-efficacy, and social capital. Self-efficacy is “characterized as a man’s confidence in his or her capacity to perform a work” (Gist, 1987) and a person’s conviction that he or she can viably use these abilities to accomplish a specific task (Bandura, 1989; Bandura & Wessels, 1997).

Gender differences are also becoming important in the Asian entrepreneurial context (Arshad, Farooq, Sultana, & Farooq, 2016). Therefore, we also incorporated the role of
gender and its moderation effect on social norms and self-efficacy in our study. With the help of gender schema theory, we proposed that social capital may induce the entrepreneurial behavior of male graduates through the double mediation of self-efficacy and attitude toward entrepreneurship, while social capital may influence the entrepreneurial behaviors of female graduates through the double mediation of subjective norms and attitude toward entrepreneurship. This study contributes to the existing literature on social capital through examining the effect of social capital on the entrepreneurial behavior of students.

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The world has rapidly moved into a knowledge-based economy (George, 2006) where education has taken the place of production. Duderstadt (2007) confirmed the need for universities to adjust rapidly. Thus, this study is vital to the field of entrepreneurship in higher education, as it provides important knowledge regarding the effect of brief preparing and exercises in different movement and new pursuit ideation on understudy receptiveness to ideation and entrepreneurial aim. The crest in fame of entrepreneurship is joining with societal and industry requests on higher education to deliver more versatile basic scholars (Solesvik, 2013; Welsh & Tullar, 2014). Researchers have recommended that individuals’ EA separates them in the marketplace (Higdon, 2005). Welsh and Tullar (2014) set that entrepreneurship shows these fundamental abilities the best of any scholarly control.

This highlights the need to give individuals chances to purposely hone (Ericsson, 2008) the key abilities and mindsets that promote fruitful entrepreneurial conduct (Dew, Read, Sarasvathy, & Wiltbank, 2009). Rather than concentrating only on executing another business, teachers should consider whether students would be better off with the chance to determine ways to think and act more entrepreneurially, thereby creating ideation (Basadur, Runco, & VEGAxy, 2000) and opportunity readiness aptitudes (Puhakka, 2011). This can be accomplished via preparing students in an imaginative critical thinking process (Basadur, Gelade, & Basadur, 2014). Such preparing will separate the entrepreneurial self-efficacy issues related with the intimidating idea of beginning another endeavor, thereby giving students an essential range of abilities and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, which will enable them to choose how to best use their recently framed entrepreneurial outlook and readiness. Inside this study, writing including experiential learning (Kolb, 2014), ponder rehearse (Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Römer, 1993), and arranged conduct (Ajzen, 1985) was displayed to assemble an aggregate strong hypothetical system that illuminates the study of inventiveness and ideation (e.g., Ames & Runco, 2005) and entrepreneurial purpose (e.g.,
Knowledge creation or the formation of social capital has been described as the ability of organizational leaders to tap into the knowledge of their most valuable resources—their people. Therefore, the objectives of the study are as follows:

- to study the effect of social capital on entrepreneurship
- to study the effect of social capital on social norms
- to identify the effect of social norms on attitudes toward entrepreneurship
- to study the effect of social capital on self-efficacy
- to identify the effect of entrepreneurial self-efficacy on attitudes toward entrepreneurship
- to analyze the effect of social norms on EI
- to analyze the effect of self-efficacy on EI
- to identify the effect of entrepreneurship on EI
- to identify the effect of EI on entrepreneurial behavior
- to study the different mediational mechanisms between social capital and entrepreneurship
- to study the different mediational mechanisms between social capital and EI
- to examine the moderation of gender while studying the effect of social capital on EI through different mediational mechanisms.

1.5. Contribution of the Study

The existing literature presents the role of social capital on entrepreneurship, yet provides theoretical analysis only. The novelty of this research is its study of the effect of social capital on EI with the mediating effect of social norms and self-efficacy through the TPB. In addition, this study not only explains the relationship between social capital and EI, but also extends the body of literature by explaining how EI leads to entrepreneurial behavior. Further, this study enriches the existing literature with a model of the mediating effect of social capital via social norms and self-efficacy, with the moderation of gender. This study offers valuable implications for educational institutes in the area of business and management, and for government policymakers.

1.6. Methodology

In this study, the quantitative research technique was followed by the research design of the positivism model. Quantitative research involves recognizing the qualities of an observed phenomenon or investigating conceivable connections among at least two
phenomena (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). There are various types of quantitative analysis, including correlational analysis, developmental design analysis, observation-based study analysis, and survey analysis (Creswell, 2009). This study presents a survey analysis of the data, which were collected from students at different universities. The face-to-face data were collected from a sample size of 1,000 students through a random sampling technique.

1.7. Analysis Strategy

To analyze the quantitative data in this study, we used missing value analysis, descriptive statistics correlation, confirmatory factor analysis, and structured regression model testing techniques. This study explored and determined the relationship between the independent variable of social capital and the dependent variable of EI. Further, it examined the mediating effect of social norms and self-efficacy.

1.8. Findings

The findings of this study indicate a positive and significant indirect influence of social capital on EI. This influence is mediated by the prevailing social norms and positively affected by self-efficacy. Moreover, individuals with self-efficacy are more inclined toward EI through the influence of their social capital. However, the direct effect of social capital was found to be insignificant. Moreover, EI followed by EA further leads toward entrepreneurial behavior.

1.9. Limitations and Research Directions

The limitations of this study are contextual, as the sample was taken from university graduates studying business at universities in Pakistan; thus, the generalizability is limited. To broaden its scope, the results can be validated by further research at the international level, given that the entrepreneurial phenomenon varies across cultures (Fernández-Serrano & Romero, 2014). In this study, the data were collected from business graduates; however, it is also necessary to collect data from engineering and information technology students because they are also involved in entrepreneurial activities (Berglund & Wennberg, 2006; Menzies & Paradi, 2003; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Al-Laham, 2007). Therefore, future researchers could test or replicate this study by collecting data from students in other disciplines. Moreover, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of EI, the perspective of business personnel could also be included, rather than only including students in the study sample.
1.10. Outline of the Project

This study is presented in five chapters. This initial chapter has introduced the topic and provided its context and background. Chapter 2 reviews the existing literature to emphasize the importance of social capital, with the mediating effect of social norms and self-efficacy. Moreover, it presents the theoretical framework based on the developed hypothesis. Chapter 3 presents the research methodology employed in this study and describes the research design and analysis techniques. Chapter 4 presents the study results, supported by a discussion that leads to useful recommendations. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes the study and highlights its limitations. At the end of the paper, the reference list is presented.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the existing literature to enhance the current knowledge. It discusses the findings of prior studies in the context of the major variables of the current study. It also highlights the gaps that exist in prior studies in relation to this study’s contributions. Moreover, this chapter develops the research hypotheses, based on the findings of the literature review and TPB. Following this, the theoretical framework is constructed, based on the study hypotheses.

2.2. Literature Review on Entrepreneurial Intention

The literature on entrepreneurship and EI presents numerous definitions (Krueger et al., 2000). For example, Kolvereid (1996) perceived EI as the intent of an individual to be self-employed, while Krueger and Brazeal (1994) considered EI the intent of an individual to initiate her or his own business. Intent is taken as a reasonable process to collect resources, obtain knowledge, and act in a specific manner (B. J. Bird, 1992). Thus, the definition considered for this research defines EI as a thoughtful process that encourages an individual to collect resources, acquire information, and concentrate behavior. Thus, EI can be defined as a cognitive process that motivates an individual to allocate resources, acquire knowledge, and concentrate behavior toward “initiating economic activities in the formal sector under a legal form of business” (Klapper & Love, 2011).

To understand the individuals as an entrepreneur, EI follows the trait approach. On the other hand, due to the boundaries of trait approach Davidsson (1995) got encouraged to present an economic psychological model of the factors that could provide an understanding of EI. The model comprises of six components; background of the individual, conviction, domain attitude, intention and situation (Davidsson, 1995).

Yli-Renko, Autio, and Sapienza (2001) asserted that to better comprehend the planned behavior and predictors of entrepreneurship, the literature of entrepreneurship contacts the psychological literature. Theories of intention had already been developed and intention considered as the major indicator for the planned behavior. Planned behavior was best indicated by intention especially when the behavior in question is difficult to perceive, exceptional or includes uncertain time lags (Krueger et al., 2000). The entrepreneurial activities based on consistent efforts over the time, B. Bird (1988) supports Katz and Gartner (1988) that entrepreneurship is basically a planned behavior related to intention building.
According to Krueger et al. (2000), the intention models developed to explain EI are useful because they elaborate those factors, exogenous in nature as cultural, social, financial. Due to the interconnection of these factors they cannot be evaluated isolated and provides descriptive results if evaluated together. In addition, Krueger et al. (2000) elaborated that planned behavior is affected by the exogenous factors via the person’s attitude which ultimately affects the individuals’ behavior. Krueger et al. (2000) explained that the intention to indulge in economic activities is the bases for the entrepreneurs to take initiative of the economic events. Katz and Gartner (1988) supported the same argument that the potential entrepreneurial activities were indicated by the entrepreneurial intention.

In the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor South Africa Report, Turton and Herrington (2012) acknowledges two most frequent used models to examine the EI. In the current literature these models ruled as it provides empirical evidence for significant interpreters of EI (Van Gelderen et al., 2015). These two models have dominated recent literature, as both models present empirical evidence regarding the strong predictors of EI (Van Gelderen et al., 2015). The first model is by Shapero and Sokol (1982), and is the Shapero and Sokol model of the entrepreneurial event (SEE). The second and updated model is TPB, which measures the individuals’ intention on bases of three factors; attitude of individual toward behavior, subjective norms, perceived control (Ajzen, 1991). Krueger et al. (2000) undertook a study comparing these two models, and recognized the common themes between them. They supported both the models and acknowledged their effectiveness in forecasting EI. However, Van Gelderen et al. (2015) asserted that the TPB is more consistent in specifications while SEE is unclear in perspective of the comprehensive research.

The existing literature is covered with the application of TPB in determining the EI of an individual. Similarly, this study also uses TPB in spite of SEE in support of Krueger and Carsrud (1993) who appreciated it as testable and hypothesis-driven strategy.

2.3. Gaps in Existing Literature and Contributions of This Study

The new industries and organizations created by entrepreneurial firms have fueled rebounds from economic slumps and enabled individuals from all backgrounds to pursue economic success (Kuratko, Ireland, Covin, & Hornsby, 2005; Schramm, 2006). With such a crucial role, it is important that the generative and self-renewing contribution of entrepreneurship to market economies be vigorously pursued and carefully developed in all
economies, especially in developing countries. Numerous studies have validated the positive effect of social capital on the success of business ventures (Read et al., 2009; Smallbone & Welter, 2001; Turner & An Nguyen, 2005; Venkataraman, 1997). However, other features still demand the attention of researchers to explore how social capital helps initiate business ventures or how it plays its role.

Social capital helps increase perceived behavioral control, which, according to TPB, is one of the factors influencing behavioral intention. This social capital can be built through relational networks and can be important in coping with the environment challenges faced by higher education (Dose, 2012). Moreover, higher education can promote bonding of the social groups while indorsing the unity in various societies, which has long appealed to educators and policymakers (Heyneman, Kraince, Lesko, & Bastedo, 2007). Research scholars are also seeking to understand the effect of social capital on students’ behaviors, including their learning orientation (J. B. Anderson, 2008; Morgan & Sørensen, 1999), academic performance, social network usage (Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009), and dropout intention. At university level, disciplinary climate, academic norms, and shared trust between home and school are all forms of social capital (Forsyth & Adams, 2004). Thus, in this study, the effect of social capital in the context of the TPB will be examined to determine how it affects the social norms and self-efficacy that influence EI, leading to the entrepreneurial behavior of university-level students.

2.4. Constructs of the Study

2.4.1. Social Capital

Individuals with the essential expertise who have a clear understanding of the roles of an organization and have sufficient support from their institutes are needed by organizations to be highly efficient. A clear and visible charge, focus, guiding principles, clarity among individuals about their roles, leadership, accountability, trust, and affective reward systems are required by organizations and higher educational institutes to be highly effective (Murtaugh, Burns, & Schuster, 1999). An individual’s willingness toward entrepreneurship is influenced by self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 2001; Walstad & Kourilsky, 1999; Wilson, Kickul, & Marlino, 2007; Wilson et al., 2004; Zhao et al., 2005). An individual’s capacity or capability to perform a task is known as self-efficacy (Gist, 1987). Self-efficacy can also be defined as the trust of a person in his or her skillset and ability to achieve certain goals. An individual’s perception of his or her abilities and capabilities has been revealed, which type of behavior he or she is engaged in, even he or she have to face bad experiences
A person with low self-efficacy may face problems in achieving tasks, feel challenged in achieving tasks or goals, have low motivations, focus on her or himself, and have weak commitment. These types of individuals give up quickly and take a much longer time to regain self-efficacy if they fail to achieve goals and tasks. Moreover, they are more susceptible to depression and stress (Bandura, 1986). People with high self-efficacy feel less discouraged in achieving tasks or goals, even if they face hurdles and obstacles. Such people regain their self-efficacy much more rapidly after failing to achieve a task or goal, and show low susceptibility to depression and stress (Bandura, 1986). An individual’s high self-efficacy plays an important role in his or her career decision making. An individual’s intentions toward entrepreneurial activities are influenced by self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 2001) and the effectiveness of a person, being consistent in challenging fields, and occupational interests are also predicted by reliability (Wilson et al., 2007).

It is important to review and appraise social capital’s socioeconomic concept. In the social capital model, social capital comprises an individual’s informal and formal relationship and interactions with other members of society to attain a perceived reward from the market. Social capital can be defined as the benefit or capital attained because of societal and social relationships (Lin & Erickson, 2010). Human relationship investment results in social capital, which requires time and resources (Lin & Erickson, 2010). In addition, access to information, reduction in transactional costs, and combine decision making facilitation become easier because of social capital (Grootaert & Bastelaer, 2001). Similarly, social capital is identical to physical capital, which can be appreciated or depreciated with use.

The weakness and strength of the relationship among an organization or an individual with other organization and individual is a significant factor that relates to social and societal capital (Granovetter, 1983). Both strong and weak internal ties in a community are significant to assure social capital self-efficacy (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). Closeness in social capital will be attained if there are strong internal ties in the community, while weak internal ties lead to gaps in social capital.

Social capital has different complex levels (Grootaert & Bastelaer, 2001). The first is the social or macro level, at which the potential advantages or benefits attained from an organization’s or individual’s society are focused, such as enhanced and upgraded level of income (Dakhli & De Clercq, 2004; Fukuyama, 1995; Knack & Keefer, 1997). The second level is the individual or micro level, at which the potential advantages or benefits from the
network relationships or linkages of an individual are focused, such as the success of the firm (Davidsson & Honig, 2003; Lin & Erickson, 2010). The final level is the organization or meso level, at which the potential advantages or benefits from the network relationships or linkages of an organization are focused, such as higher and greater efficiency and effectiveness (R. D. Putnam, 1993).

At all three levels, the advantage and benefit is attained from bridging and bonding social capital (Grootaert & Bastelaer, 2001; Uphoff, 2000). However, cognitive social capital is derived from a psychological process that results ideas and thoughts, reinforced by ideology and culture, generate shared values and norms, trust, belief, and attitude. Thus, the cognitive social capital has integral and subjective character, contributes to cooperative behavior and conduct, and encourages collective actions. However, structural social capital is linked with other types of social and societal organization—specifically, social networks, policies, and procedures—that also contribute to a combined action toward the attainment of joint benefits and social as well as societal contribution. However, structural social capital is a comparatively impartial and superficially noticeable concept.

As per the model stated by Ajzen, four different notions about social capital were derived to attain the objectives and goals of this research. The first is that this research is positioned at the individual level, not the macro or meso social levels of analysis. Thus, we aimed to determine social capital’s influence on individuals’ perceptions regarding EI. Second, we included rational, rather than structural, social capital in the models of EI, as intent proceeds to the execution or performance of certain behaviors and roles. Third, the derivation of cognitive social capital can emerge from bridging and bonding cognitive social capital. Finally, the exact position of social capital inside the model of EI must be sensibly reviewed.

Previous research (Aldrich & Martinez, 2003; Audretsch & Keilbach, 2004) has stated that, conceptually, in entrepreneurship, a vital role is played by social capital. Thus, it is insufficient to explain and clarify social capital’s positive influence on entrepreneurship. Further, in previous research, the term “entrepreneurial capital” at times gave the impression of signifying one or more types of capital, such as human or physical capital (Audretsch & Keilbach, 2004). The definition of entrepreneurship capital is usually taken in its broader sense. Social capital is included in the definition of entrepreneurship, even though entrepreneurship and social capital are dissimilar concepts.
The current research studies the mediating role between EI and social capital played by self-efficacy. It describes how self-efficacy is created by social capital and, as a result, how it affects and influences the process of entrepreneurship.

2.4.2. Self-efficacy

As per the research of Fishbein and Cappella (2006), the TPB was generated from the theory of self-efficacy, which further generated the theory of social construct by Bandura (1977a). As per previous research, there exists a complex relationship among locus of control, self-efficacy, and PBC, as they each measure the same thing—that is, an individual’s opinion and perception of his or capability to achieve a certain goal at a perceived level that is acceptable (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2002). As stated by previous research, self-efficacy and PBC combine to create TPB on the basis of external and internal factors, which later weaken self-efficacy (Fishbein & Cappella, 2006). They further assumed that all other high levels of perceived control must strengthen an individual’s intention and willingness to perform an action and increase his or efforts to achieve his or her goal and task. Ajzen (2002) studied obstacles and barriers in the development of PBC and TPB. PBC focuses on the apparent comfort of an individual in executing a certain task and goal assigned to him or her. TPB is commonly used when making decisions related to health, such as quitting smoking, following a healthy diet, taking medicine, or exercising (e.g., Ajzen, 2002; Ajzen & Sheikh, 2013; Fishbein & Cappella, 2006). In contrast, during the last 10 years, TPB has appeared as a proficient tool and instrument to explore individuals’ intention toward entrepreneurship (e.g., Engle et al., 2010; Kautonen et al., 2013; Van Gelderen et al., 2015).

There are four factors that influence self-efficacy (Bandura & Wessels, 1997). The first factor is the experiences of an individual, which increase or reduce self-efficacy. If an individual succeeds in achieving a task or goal, self-efficacy will increase. If he or she fails, his or her self-efficacy will decrease. The second factor is experience modeling, whereby individuals believe that they can achieve a certain task or goal because they have watched another achieve this. The third factor is the social norms and values influencing an individual’s intention toward TPB and the theory of reasoned action, whereby societal pressure encourages or discourages individuals in pursuing certain goals. The final factor is physiological, which has a strong influence on the self-efficacy of an individual. Individuals who can positively deal with their psychological reactions to depression and stress in a positive manner have increased self-efficacy.
Usually, generalized self-efficacy is considered to indicate how efficiently and effectively a person believes he or she can engage in different tasks, and how easily and comfortably certain tasks can be achieved by him or her (Judge et al., 2002). The psychological or spiritual way in which a person displays intent to achieve new goals or tasks to gain further learning or advancement, even if he or she has faced difficulties in previous tasks, differentiates generalized self-efficacy from the theory of self-efficacy.

2.4.3. Social Norms

Numerous studies have investigated entrepreneurs’ qualitative aspects, focusing on the personality traits and psychological attributes that differentiate successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs from other remaining people (Borland, 1975). Other studies have focused on different demographic factors, such as gender, age, ethnic group, family, religion, professional experience, and socioeconomic status (Reynolds, Storey, & Westhead, 1994). These studies made it possible to identify some important relationships between demographic factors and several traits on one side and the implementation of behavior of the entrepreneur conversely.

However, from a theoretical perspective, both approaches are criticized because of issues in their concepts and methodology, as well as the low capacity in explanations (Krueger et al., 2000). In reality, as per Chell (1986), if these theories and approaches are accepted, it will mean that no one can learn to become an entrepreneur. For example, the social learning theory established by Bandura (1977a) is a vital approach to explain the behavior of entrepreneurs, titled the entrepreneurial intent model. A major part of this approach is the individual’s intention to adopt a certain behavior (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993; Shapero & Sokol, 1982). Intention is defined as the motivational attributes and factors that affect an individual’s behavior and plan to adopt a certain behavior and attitude in practice, and indicate his or her efforts toward the adoption of a specific behavior. Therefore, if an individual adopts or displays a new behavior, there is a high chance that his or her performance will be important and significant repentance (Shapero & Sokol, 1982). This theory is known as “entrepreneurial event.” As per this theory, a person decides to develop a firm when an event or occurrence causes him or her to view entrepreneurship activity as more desirable or realistic than other options. Perceived feasibility can be stated as an individual’s perception of his or her ability and capacity to fulfill a specific or certain behavior to become an entrepreneur.

Likewise, in relatively greater explanation, “planned behavior” theory developed by Ajzen (1991). As per this theory, an individual’s intent to perform or execute a certain
behavior or role directly depends on three perceptions and observations. The first two of these are self-efficacy and personal attraction, which are relatively similar to those stated by Shapero and Sokol (1982) (perceived probability and perceived desirability). The third perception is “subjective norms,” which refers to societal pressure to perform a specific behavior or role. In respect to this, bonding cognitive social is grounded upon one’s strong and sturdy ties with his or her family members or friends may produce the cognitive dimension of different beliefs supporting his perception. Thus, through the values derived from the contact and conation of an individual with his or her friends or family, a highly favorable perception of the feasibility or desirability of firm creation will be generated by entrepreneurs.

2.4.4. Entrepreneurial Attitude

As stated by Chen, Greene, and Crick (1998), education programs on entrepreneurship focus on management, finances, and marketing control characteristics of self-efficacy, while ignoring risk taking and innovation. As stated by Chen et al. (1998), such deficiencies point back toward PBC and TPB, as these theories state that entrepreneurial efficacy refers to an individual’s thoughts or beliefs regarding his or her capabilities and self-control. As stated by other researchers, it is true that self-efficacy is lacking important and vital characters, such as risk taking and innovation, but one’s reactiveness toward one’s entrepreneurial opportunities (Costa, Ripoll, Sánchez, & Carvalho, 2013; Segal, Borgia, & Schoenfeld, 2005; Wood, McKinley, & Engstrom, 2013; J. Zhang, Cao, & Zeng, 2014), which indicates how an individual’s intention leads to his or her actual behavior in certain tasks. Cognitive biases and styles are also used by different researchers to learn about individuals’ self-efficacy and entrepreneurship. Stability in an individual’s entrepreneurial behavior and intent is influenced highly by cognitive style. Entrepreneurs with an analytic approach are usually more stable in making their decisions to pursue entrepreneurial opportunities because they heavily rely on skills to control financial risks and problems, marketing skills, and managerial skills, which are held by them and their team. In contrast, it is difficult to predict how entrepreneurs with holistic behavior will pursue entrepreneurial opportunities because they tolerate a higher level of risks, so a higher level of generalized self-efficacy lies between them (Dutta & Thornhill, 2008).

In addition, cognitive biases play a vital role in individuals’ intentions as entrepreneurs. Such cognitive biases comprise of overconfidence, illusion of control and belief in the law of small numbers. Overconfidence prevails in entrepreneurs with intent, specifically those entrepreneurs who are tangled back to their perception about risk and
improvement in their actual behavior (Forbes, 2005; Houghton, Simon, Aquino, & Goldberg, 2000). PBC is interlinked with the bias of illusion of control. Control and overconfidence are displayed by belief in the law of small numbers. As per the definition of Houghton et al. (2000), belief and confidence in limited and small numbers is an entrepreneur setting their decisions upon limited and small experiences. Finally, Houghton et al. (2000) noted that overconfidence is not a negative and destructive bias because it initially allows individuals the opportunity to be entrepreneurs by taking risks. Thus, new entrepreneurs gain valued experience and skills by passing through this process toward future opportunities.

Some researchers have also studied the boundaries and limits to EI. For example, Schlaegel and Koenig (2014) studied the barriers and limits to EI from the perspective of the entrepreneurial event model (EEM) and TPB (Shapero & Sokol, 1982) over a competing intention model sight. Competing models were integrated by Schlaegel and Koenig (2014), who also established the conditions for a contextual boundary model, which had a moderating effect on propensity and tendency to act, connection between self-efficacy and EEM with perceived feasibility, linkage and relation between PBT and TPB, self-efficacy, and perceived desirability. However, although they found barriers and limits to intent, they did not specify what these barriers were and how they acted. Other scholars have found government policies and economic constraints to be barriers and limits to EI (Engle et al., 2010; Van Gelderen et al., 2015). Intent limitations and constraints in teaching of entrepreneurship include low self-efficacy toward attaining the necessary skills required to engage in the activities of entrepreneurship, coaching, opportunity, and lack of a sporting environment (Chen et al., 1998).

2.4.5. Entrepreneurial Intent

Initiating a business is an example of planned behavior and it used to be intentional as the intentions to predict the individual’s behavior better than any other factor as demographics, beliefs, and personality traits. Although these intentions are built of an explicit attitude, the intentions are a strong mediator between attitude and behavior, even in cases where attitude appears to predict the behavior. Intentions ignite the cognition process, which make a base for perception and encourages an individual to act in a certain manner (Ajzen, 1991). In relation to the TPB, although there is very insignificant ratio for business startups, intentions play a crucial role in initiating this process. The literature supports the notion that intentions lead to initiatives, and such intention base models have revealed in
entrepreneurial research that activities are an output of planned behavior (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993).

The understanding of EI has gained importance in recent years, yet the literature remains limited. The meta-analysis of the literature asserted that entrepreneurial behavior is predicted by EI (Armitage & Conner, 2001). The most dominant part of literature is based on Ajzen’s TPB and Shapero’s model of EI. Ajzen (1991) clarified the intentions with the link of attitude, perceived behavioral control, and subjective norms, while Shapero and Sokol’s (1982) explanation of EI was based on perceived desirability, perceived feasibility, and propensity to act. Intention is a representation of an individual’s drive to invest effort and act accordingly based on a planned and conscious decision (Conner & Armitage, 1998).

2.4.6. Entrepreneurial Behavior

Exogenous factors drive individuals’ perceptions, which leads to a certain attitude. This attitude also leads to building intentions for a specific action that leads a certain behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Thus, intentions are a mediator for actions and behaviors that can be predicted by the existing attitude regarding that certain behavior. An enormous part of entrepreneurial research covers the influence of external factors on entrepreneurial actions, and usually there is a weak link found between the two (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). There is no significant empirical evidence for behavioral prediction based on attitude, yet external factors change attitude and indirectly influence intentions and entrepreneurial behavior (Ajzen, 1985; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Sheppard, Hartwick, and Warshaw (1988) supported this concept by reviewing empirical tests, and explained that intentions are predicted by attitudes and behaviors. Even role models only influence entrepreneurial behavior when they can affect the attitude of individuals through personality traits, such as self-efficacy (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993; Scherer, Adams, Carley, & Wiebe, 1989).

2.4.7. Gender in Entrepreneurship

In 1992, Brush reported that men are highly motivated for the entrepreneurial business than are women with the practically identical establishment. A huge measure of examines showed that women defy more inconveniences in meandering methodology when diverged from their male accomplices. In particular, businesswomen face greater inconvenience in coordinating cash-flow to start or encourage their business (Fay & Williams, 1993) or to attain detachment financing (Becker-Blease & Sohl, 2007). They also have a lower level of human- and money-related capital (i.e., education and work association) contributed to start a new business (Boden & Nucci, 2000). Thus, studies in
different countries have found that the objective accomplishment rate for businesswomen is less than that of men, and they experience slower rates of improvement, low advantages, and low arrangements (B. Brush; De Bruin, Brush, & Welter, 2006).

A possible cause of these barriers faced by businesswomen is the stereotyping all things happens against the women takes part in such activities (Marlow & Patton, 2005). The investigation in like manner supports the all things considered held observation that to be a business visionary is a completely masculine typical for the people from society (Ahl, 2006; Lewis, 2006). Different studies have found that these types of generalizations regarding gender affect the decisions of individuals to pursue entrepreneurial activities as their occupation (Gupta, Turban, & Bhawe, 2008). Thus, the current study proposed that gender creates a distorted effect of social capital on the entrepreneurial points and the method.

2.5. Context of the Study

Globally higher studies are an interactive environment that is at the same time international, countrywide, and native (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Välimaa, 2004). There has always been a strong clash and conflict between the missions and tasks of universities (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumley, 2009). Institutes of higher educations must act as profit-creating organizations and prioritize creation of revenue. In contrast, they must also act as organizations that are non-profit, prioritize the good of the public and societal welfare, and provide knowledge and pathways for the development of education (Union, 2014). Higher educational institutes and universities are central players in improving the reputations and positions by innovation nurturing in their respective countries (de Boer et al., 2002).

Pakistan’s Higher Education Commission has its main emphasis on higher education quality and ensuring its impartial and reasonable access. As such, it is vigorously struggling to uphold and promote higher education in Pakistan. According to the global competitiveness report of the World Economic Forum for 2015 to 2016, Pakistan is ranked and graded 124 out of 140 countries. There has been no improvement in this position since 2013; rather, Pakistan’s position has decreased to 148 from 147 during the last few years. From 2001 to 2002, Pakistan’s higher education sector grew rapidly. Pakistan’s number of higher educational institutes and universities increased by 78% from 2010 to 2015. In the same period, the number of enrolled students increased by 174%, including a large number of female students. The region’s socioeconomic needs in the area of higher educational institutes and universities have also been supported by the establishment and development
of BICs. Small Business Innovation Research was also introduced by the Higher Education Commission, with the partnership of relevant universities to grant research in universities. Research is an influential, dominant, and powerful tool for competitive advantage. It is understood by them that research can support them to create competitive advantage over other market players and competitors if it is managed strategically by increasing social capital (Mohamad, Bakar, & Rahman, 2009). As a result, to gain strategic expansion and growth, a number of higher education institutes have initiated programs of strategic development (Baker & Balmer, 1997).

A great quantity of data and literature is already available on this topic, yet this research is limited in terms of some important, interesting, and relevant issues. The entrepreneurial climate is characterized by variables that differ among individuals, as identified by B. Bird (1988). The values are also highlighted by the literature, to set up entrepreneurial environment, trails, and behaviors are very significant determinants (Jesselyn Co & Mitchell, 2006). The current study compared two theories—planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and entrepreneurial event (Shapero & Sokol, 1982)—and found that paid job preference adversely affects entrepreneurial purpose and aim, though some sociodemographic variables (mainly gender) have a substantial influence on intent. Similar work on EI has been undertaken by Liñán and Santos (2007). A casual and unplanned model was examined in the research undertaken in Malaysia by Nasurdin, Ahmad, and Lin (2009), who examined factors such as social identification, societal norms, and role models, and observed the effect of desirability on EI.

There are three basic objectives of the current research. First, a comparison is undertaken between the EEM (Shapero & Sokol, 1982) and TPB (Ajzen, 1991)—the two most extensive and broadly tested opposing theories used to explain EI (Shook, Priem, & McGee, 2003; Solesvik, Westhead, Kolvereid, & Matlay, 2012). Through a combination of social capital and the processes of entrepreneurship, the current research examines the mediating role of subjective norms and self-efficacy in EI and social capital.

2.6. Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis Development

In 1993, Krueger and Krueger enriched the literature with the help of the TPB, and explained that EI is the key factor to trigger entrepreneurial behavior—more so than any other factors, such as attitude, personality traits, or demographics. This phenomenon was first presented by Ajzen (1991, 2002), who also emphasized the leading role of intention in understanding human behaviors. There have been numerous studies to understand the
relationship between intention and behavior in general; however, the current study also considers the TPB.

2.6.1. Theory of Planned Behavior

Most analysts wandered into the entrepreneurial goal space and discovered TPB very clarifies entrepreneurial aims (e.g., Engle et al., 2010; Fretschner & Weber, 2013; Kautonen, van Gelderen, & Fink, 2015; Yang, 2013). In any case, most entrepreneurship scholars agree that social capital’s effect on entrepreneurial expectations is still largely untested (Brazeal et al., 2014). A few researchers have found state of mind in the TPB structure to be the best indicator of entrepreneurial expectation (Yang, 2013), while others revealed blended surveys because of demeanor in entrepreneurial aims (P. Zhang, Wang, & Owen, 2015). It is positioned that social values and PBC decidedly affect entrepreneurial expectations (Yang, 2013; P. Zhang et al., 2015). A few analysts concentrated on social weights and standards, and discovered that social standards (including family weights and the apparent fabulousness of owning a business interestingly with the conceivable difficulties of settling on the choice to begin a business) to be the most notable TPB build in anticipating entrepreneurial goal (Engle et al., 2010; Fretschner & Weber, 2013). Further, the connection between entrepreneurial aims and earlier family business experience (Carr & Sequeira, 2007) in number strain to stay in the family firm, and impactful want to keep family organizations alive through selecting the correct family successor is especially exceptional.

The behavioral expectation is firmly identified with its indicators (ATT, SN, and PBC), which are related to the conviction builds (behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs). The conviction forerunners express the person’s idea, perception, and capacity to perform certain conduct, and the criticalness of the given result, before taking part in the conduct. Hence, to decide people’s states of mind, abstract standards, and saw behavioral control, it is vital to set up the precursors of these develops. As indicated by the theory of arranged conduct, objective decisions oversee individuals’ decisions and practices (Ajzen, 1985, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005). In this manner, when an individual can survey his or her beliefs about the conduct, she or he will probably decide on a specific result. Every result is assessed to choose whether the conduct will create the result being sought. As indicated by Cheng, Lam, and Hsu (2006), before an individual chooses whether to engage in particular conduct, she or he will probably assess the advantages and costs that are the outcomes of the conduct. Warshaw and Davis (1985) characterized behavioral aims as “how much a man [or woman] has figured cognizant plans to perform or not play out some particular future conduct.” In this study, managers’ aims to offer entry-level positions could
be affected by their mentalities, emotional standards, and behavioral control in light of their beliefs.

**2.6.2. Social Capital and Entrepreneurial Attitude**

There has been limited research undertaken on social capital, and the available work is descriptive in nature, based on subjective evidence. Thus, the empirical and theoretical field is required to be covered (Mair & Noboa, 2006; Paldam, 2000). Even from the social capital the persons belong from business network are more beneficial and put significantly positive impact on the emerging entrepreneurs (Davidsson & Honig, 2003). This terminology choice can create a problem, as it can overlap with social capital, which is usually defined as one’s assumption for productive and creative purpose about group membership, norm, network, and his trust. However, entrepreneurship is stated as “a process, activity or an action that is involved to start-up of an enterprise as well as for the growth of that newly started enterprise.” Social capital commonly discusses the capability of a person to attain benefits by means of his or her distinct position in the structure of an organization, mainly including the person’s friends, fellows, relatives, classmates, or other relationships. The greater benefits of assistance an individual can gain from these relations, the greater social capital he or she holds. In short, social capital refers to the resources stemming from an individual’s position in a social network structure. Although the concept of social capital is interesting and has attracted the attention of researchers, it is thus far in an emerging stage and is associated with various research perspectives (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Paldam, 2000). Social capital can be defined as “goodwill available to individuals or groups” that is gained through networks and helps promote new business ventures (Adler & Kwon, 2002). Further, Woolcock (1998) defined social capital as the actions of individuals that affect the attitude of their members toward economic goals, even though the expectations are not focused on economic scope. Social capital also helps gain trust and deals through the collaboration of groups or through the linkages of people within groups. On the bases of the above information, we posit this hypothesis:

H1: Social capital positively affects EA.

**2.6.3. Social Capital and Social Norms**

Social capital has numerous forms, and social norms are one of the three most important of these (Coleman, 1988). Neo-Weberian theorists have constructed social capital as the group of norms that individuals hold as the basic element in any organization. In the nineteenth century, the role of social norms was ignored in the economic context; however, by the mid-1990s, researchers had identified the role of social relationships as a separate
form of social capital, and started working in the field of ethnic entrepreneurship. However, although the effect of social relations on economic development has been realized and influential theorists view it as epiphenomenal, developing countries have rarely been studied from this perspective of social relations (Woolcock, 1998).

Based on prior empirical and theoretical research, Thornton and Flynn (2003) argued that entrepreneurship is influenced by social capital at three distinctive levels: connections between industries and firms, connections between groups and teams, and networking ties among individuals. They concluded that social capital positively influences entrepreneurship because:

those networks in which unity is high and information flow has low investment risk in innovation. Provided that networks interlink or connect groups, firms or individual with each other, or tie them up with each other. They are the contexts which provide the human, financial and social capital that foster entrepreneurship. (Thornton & Flynn, 2003)

As a result of these networks’ importance, many organizations and individuals are seeking to gain benefits from entrepreneurial opportunities and chances, and to develop and create social networks with other performers in the economy. With strong social capital, individuals have a greater chance to interact with resourceful people in society (Acs et al., 2008), which enhances their probability of success. Therefore, this phenomenon can be strengthened with the strong tie of social norms, as it eliminates problem behaviors in society and helps promote networking of individuals (Schultz, Nolan, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Griskevicius, 2007). On the bases of the above information, we may draw the following hypothesis:

H2: Social capital is positively linked with social norms.

2.6.4. Social Norms and Entrepreneurial Attitude

As per the presumption of social capital view, network ties provide organizations or individuals with access to information, knowledge, and other valuable resources (Batjargal, 2007; Davidsson & Honig, 2003; Elfring & Hulsink, 2003; Hazleton & Kennan, 2000; Lechner & Dowling, 2003). Thus, social capital creates networking between individuals or between organizations and individuals, along with some other valuable resources (Acs et al., 2008). Further, networks generate new chances and opportunities through adopting other skills of actors (Hamel, 1991; Kogut & Singh, 1988). For example, if firms with venture capital are part of a network, their contribution and input is a signal of reduced risk for investors (Hansen, Podolny, & Pfeffer, 2001). Private firms’ market valuation can also be
provided by these networks (Stuart, Hoang, & Hybels, 1999). The reviewed literature illustrates that entrepreneurs know that the principles of social networks can be applied and offer a convenient way to start new firms or expand existing businesses (Kim & Aldrich, 2005). Thus, entrepreneurship is influenced by social capital, as greater social capital can reduce transactional costs, information costs, search costs, decision-making costs, and bargain costs (Landry, Amara, & Lamari, 2002; Maskell, 2001). Over the decades, the role of social norms has been controversial, especially in predicting the behavior of individuals. However, the literature has recognized that social norms ignite and boost individuals’ course of action (Schultz et al., 2007). The TPB also explains different measures of attitude, one of which is perceived social norms. The TPB argues that the behavior of individuals depends on the social pressures that either support or oppose certain actions. Based on the above information, we posit the following hypothesis:

H3: Positive social norms develop attitudes toward entrepreneurship.

2.6.5. Social Capital and Entrepreneurial Attitude mediated by Social Norms

De Carolis and Saparito (2006) argued that, although social capital helps create opportunities, it does not always lead to opportunities. Although the concept is vague thus far, the chances of new opportunities are high as a result of networking (De Carolis & Saparito, 2006). Entrepreneurial behavior of networking groups inclines individuals to hold a positive attitude toward entrepreneurship. Networking with people plays an important role in stimulating new ideas for emerging trends. Individuals with a good known circle and by social networking with others creates a positive reputation that is an actual or potential resource named as social capital. Many studies have proven that social skills can influence business successes via many means, as better communication and more chances to it enhance the chances of success. In addition, teams can better produce new ideas and start businesses, in comparison with individual efforts (R. A. Baron & Markman, 2000).

According to the TPB, if an individual believes that other members of his or her social group will also undertake a certain behavior or role, this will contribute to a more positive intent toward his or her performance of that role or behavior. Thus, there was a need to state a better theory, which was named the intention model by Ajzen. In development of individuals’ cognitive abilities human resource capital plays an important role (Becker, 1964), societal and social are more relevant factors involved in the human capital development. Thus, integrating the different theories representing individuals’ social relationships seems to be a more applicable technique to advance the descriptive ability of models that are intention based.
Thus, we may hypothesize:

H4: Social capital positively influences attitudes toward entrepreneurship through the mediation of social norms.

2.6.6. Social Capital and Self-efficacy

Social capital can be defined as “goodwill available to individuals or groups” that is gained through networks and helps promote a new business venture (Adler & Kwon, 2002). Different networks or communities help people promote their common objectives (De Carolis & Saparito, 2006; Ellison, Heino, & Gibbs, 2006). Social capital enhances the probability of success by enabling connections and networks with others (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Prabhu, McGuire, Drost, & Kwong, 2012). Markman, Balkin, and Baron (2002) recognized that individuals’ subjective perception of their ability is more important than their objective assessment. They asserted that individuals’ derived by their perceived self-efficacy to perform in a certain domain. Thus, entrepreneurial self-efficacy refers to one’s belief in one’s abilities to effectively perform the role of an entrepreneur (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994; Prabhu et al., 2012; Scherer et al., 1989). The notion of self-efficacy is related to perceived behavioral control, which indicates the career orientation attitudes or intentions of individuals (Ajzen, 1991; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993).

Social capital helps graduate build confidence in their entrepreneurial skills through role models and success story inspirations. Wu, Wang, Liu, Hu, and Hwang (2012) reported the positive connection between individuals’ self-efficacy and social capital. The trust of the individuals to deal with others and positive intra-community interactions enhance social efficacy and social capital. Thus, entrepreneurial self-efficacy or belief is also built through close friends or family members who support the individual emotionally and intellectually. Therefore, social capital helps improve individuals’ entrepreneurial self-efficacy by giving them a positive attitude and approaches on their selves (Wu et al., 2012). In addition, social capital presents different examples or role models to synergize individuals’ self-belief. Based on these arguments we may posit:

H5: Social capital is positively linked with individuals’ entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

2.6.7. Self-efficacy and Entrepreneurial Attitude

Self-efficacy is “characterized as a man’s confidence in his or her capacity to perform a work” (Gist, 1987) and an individual’s conviction that he or she can viably use his or her abilities to accomplish a specific task (Bandura, 1989; Bandura & Wessels, 1997). As indicated by Bandura et al. (2001), there are four different ways to develop a solid feeling of self-efficacy:
1. Dominance of experience: The most effective occurs when an individual makes progress in achieving tasks or defeating boundaries through perseverance.

2. Social demonstrating: When individuals view people like them accomplishing comparable objectives, it gives them trust that they have the capacity to achieve these objectives. However, when individuals view people like them fail in certain tasks, it can cause them to question their capacity to accomplish comparative tasks.

3. Social influence: When an individual is socially influenced to believe that he or she has the capacity to accomplish certain tasks, this individual might be more inclined to continue when issues arise.

4. Physical and emotional states: These states affect individuals’ view of their abilities. For example, when individuals feel on edge or strained around achieving a specific assignment, they can view these emotions as indications of individual inadequacy.

Individuals’ impression of their capacities seems to determine the type of conduct in which they take part, the level of effort they invest in certain practices, and the extent to which they take part in those practices, notwithstanding when looked with aversive experiences (Bandura, 1977a). People with low self-efficacy are prevented from seeking after testing tasks, have low aspiration, powerless promise to their goals, focus on their perceived insufficiencies, give up rapidly, are slow to recapture feelings of self-efficacy after failing, ascribe disappointments to individual incompetence, and are more susceptible to stress and sadness (Bandura, 1986). People with high self-efficacy are less deterred from their goals when faced with obstacles; set testing objectives; approach troublesome tasks as difficulties, as opposed to dangers; increase their effort when faced with challenges; rapidly recoup their feeling of efficacy after failing; and are less susceptible to stress and sadness (Bandura, 1986). The level of an individual’s self-efficacy plays an essential role in decision making, such as in professional decisions. Self-efficacy additionally affects entrepreneurial goals (Bandura et al., 2001) and dependably predicts word-related intrigue, tirelessness in testing fields, and individual adequacy (Wilson et al., 2007). Therefore, perceived self-efficacy encourages people (Markman et al., 2002), especially during entrepreneurial ventures, through promoting their attitude of entrepreneurship (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994; Zhao et al., 2005). Therefore, EI develops through self-efficacy as “a person’s belief in their ability to successfully launch an entrepreneurial venture” (McGee, Peterson, Mueller, & Sequeira, 2009).
This study examined the mediating effect of self-efficacy on EA. This notion explains the effect of self-efficacy on EA in the sense that, when individuals start believing in their abilities to manage a business, they start valuing themselves and eventually are more open to entrepreneurial ventures (Ajzen, 1991; Kolvereid, 1996). In 1991, Ajzen stated that the belief of individuals promotes their positive attitude as it is the subjective value which individual have for the attitude object about the object of the attitude. In addition, according to the theory of reasoned action, individuals’ beliefs dictate their attitudes toward behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Thus, we developed the following hypothesis:

H6: Individuals’ entrepreneurial self-efficacy determines their attitude toward entrepreneurship.

2.6.8. Social Capital and Entrepreneurial Attitude mediated by Self-efficacy

Social capital is an individual’s resource for being familiar and connected with people in society, and by maintaining a positive reputation among other individuals in society. The greater the social circle, the greater the chance to gain information and awareness, which may enhance the trust of others in an individual (Pajares, 1996). There is more than one dimension of social capital; the relationship dimension, cognitive dimension, and structural dimension are three dimensions proposed by W. Tsai and Ghoshal (1998). The TPB developed by Ajzen (1991) states that one’s intent to perform a certain behavior or role directly depends on three perceptions and observations. The first two of these are self-efficacy and personal attraction, which are similar to those stated by Shapero and Sokol (1982) (perceived feasibility and perceived desirability). The third perception is “subjective norms,” which refers to societal pressure to undertake a certain behavior or role. This theory states that an individual’s belief about other individuals’ societal role influences their behavior toward certain responsibilities. With greater social capital, the chances of an individual increase for a positive reputation and personal linkages with other members of the society, which helps the individual to access other benefits, such as access to capital, access to supply chains, and even approaching or expanding customer markets. Thus, different people from social capital can assist entrepreneurs in different ways (R. A. Baron & Markman, 2000).

Therefore, the social capital that affects EA is also affected by the mediating role of self-efficacy. Social capital or interaction with others and positive experiences with people help individuals trust others and their own abilities. Moreover, the more that individuals believe in their own abilities, the more they will be inclined toward entrepreneurship.
Thus, based on the above information, we may posit the following hypothesis:

H7: Social capital positively influences EA via the mediation of entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

2.6.9. Social Norms and Entrepreneurial Intention

Over recent decades, the role of norms in predicting human behavior has been explored, and it has been recognized that social norms directly lead to action (Schultz et al., 2007). It is a phenomenon of society that communication spreads among groups of people, which builds their perception about norms. Particularly at a collective level, norms are the perceived behavior or code of conduct that is expected from members of society (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005). Diverse cultures have different social norms, depending on the prevailing values, customs, and conventions (Sherif, 1936). The expectations of an individual’s family or closely connected people influence the individual’s perceptions about certain tasks. This perception leads to the intentions of that individual (Krueger et al., 2000).

The literature reveals that social norms have been found to control behavioral problems via the perceptions of people in society (Schultz et al., 2007). Thus, social norms have a prominent effect on individuals’ personality or preferences. Therefore, if entrepreneurs were promoted in society, we could assume that the intention to become an entrepreneur would increase. Intentions are influenced by perceptions and the desire for action, so the perceptions produced by social norms ultimately move toward intention building (Davidsson, 1995). Intention can be predicted by the perception of personal attractiveness, feasibility, and social norms (Ajzen, 1985; Krueger et al., 2000). These social norms are based on the emotional and behavioral tendencies of the individuals in a society (Elster, 1989). Reitan (1997) affirmed the effect of social norms on intention building. Thus, we may posit:

H8: Social norms positively influence EI.

2.6.10. Social Capital and Entrepreneurship Intention mediated by Social Norms

Social capital is constructed by various aspects most commonly by social circle which can be support for different actions. It is the existence of norms at a social level and it is productive and crucial for certain achievements that cannot be attained without it. Social capital refers to actions that are followed by the rules, regulations, and norms of that society. Thus, it can predict the actions, its shape, construct, and social context. Social capital usually has a positive influence, yet its effect varies with the situation, so that it can be beneficial or negative (Coleman, 1988; Lapinski & Rimal, 2005). Unlike other capitals—such as physical, financial, and human capital—social capital depends on relationship
building and embraces all contacts, from childhood neighbors to high school friends to professional associates. Social capital affects individuals’ perceptions regarding quality of life, and thus affects action to a great extent (Coleman, 1988). However, the influence of people in society depends on the degree to which the individual is connected and affiliated with them. Perceptions lead to the behavior of the individual (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005).

A significant part of the literature has examined the effect of individuals’ personal and psychological traits on entrepreneurship, while less work has analyzed the demographic and socioeconomic factors. In addition, the relationship between the social context and EI has not been well considered, although it is recognized as important for economic development by the scientific community (Liñán & Santos, 2007). The intentions caused by an individual’s motivation influence his or her behavior and lead to certain actions that ensure performance of that task. Thus, the ultimate behaviors are predicted by the individual’s intentions (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993; Liñán & Santos, 2007; Shapero & Sokol, 1982). Social capital refers to the social network in which an individual is embedded. It is interlinked with social norms because norms generate values that help people hold perceptions and mold behavior. Thus, based on the above arguments, we may assume:

H9: Social capital positively influences EI via the mediation of social norms.

2.6.11. Self-efficacy and Entrepreneurial Intention

Self-efficacy relates to individuals’ belief in their abilities. Bandura defined it as individuals’ view of their ability to influence the events that affect their live (Ajzen, 2002; Bandura et al., 2001). Ajzen (1991) also included perceived self-efficacy in his TPB, as it builds the perception of individuals, which leads to intentions and behaviors. Bandura affirmed that self-efficacy influences the thought patterns of individuals, which inspires their actions. Thus, self-efficacy predicts how much effort will be invested by the individual, and the sustainability of this effort in the face of hurdles (Bandura, 1977b, 1982). With higher self-efficacy, individuals are more inclined to invest increased effort and perform better, which supports EI (Ajzen, 2002; Boyd & Vozikis, 1994).

Thus, with reference to the TPB, self-efficacy builds the success or failure understanding of the individual for an EA, which leads to EI (Ajzen, 1985). The greater self-efficacy held by individuals, the more likely they will agree to take the initiative and risk in starting an entrepreneurial venture, with belief in their abilities and perceptions of success. Self-efficacy is of huge importance in the entrepreneurial literature, as it psychologically explains venture creation (Fayolle, 2005; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Individuals are more inclined toward activities that they perceive as controllable and
accomplishable. Thus, the entrepreneurial situation also influences perceived self-efficacy and EI (Bandura, 1986; Fayolle, 2005).

Hence, self-efficacy affects the actions and performance of individuals, and, with higher self-efficacy, individuals will be more inclined toward EI (Ajzen, 2002; Boyd & Vozikis, 1994). Thus, with reference to TPB, self-efficacy builds the success or failure perceptions of individual for an EA, which leads toward EI (Ajzen, 1985). Zhao et al. (2005) also affirmed that EI is influenced by self-efficacy, and women with lower self-efficacy demonstrate a low level of EI. Thus, the greater self-efficacy held by individuals, they more likely they are to take the initiative and risk of an entrepreneurial venture, with belief in their abilities and the perception of success. Based on the above information, we present the following hypothesis:

H10: Individuals’ entrepreneurial self-efficacy positively influences EI.

2.6.12. Social capital and Entrepreneurial Intention mediated by Self-efficacy

The literature affirms the role of social capital in EI, as social capital refers to the formal and informal relationships that individuals build through interactions with others by investing the resource of time in them (Lin, 2002; Liñán & Santos, 2007). The more a person interacts with other people in society, the more people they are linked with, and the greater their chances of having role models to follow. The opportunities will be vast with higher social capital, as it extends opportunities such as accessibility to finances, loans, ideas, and human and marketing resources. In addition, information seeking will become easier and even in a collective way or in social groups decision will be collective. The more opportunities will increase the self-efficacy of individuals and promote their positive perceptions of entrepreneurial ventures. Thus, social capital is an intangible capital that is imparted to the whole group of individuals (Liñán & Santos, 2007).

Although social groups have a positive influence on individual perceptions, people also act based on their past experiences. If they are accomplished in certain tasks, they will set more determined goals. Perceived belief, attitude, and preferences will influence intentions (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994). Fay also asserted that past conditions affect self-efficacy, which leads to EI. Hence, based on productive experiences, positive perception arouses desire to act and achieve goals, which builds attitude and leads to intention. Thus, social capital influences EI, while the self-efficacy of the individual mediates its effect. Therefore, based on the above arguments, we may posit:

H11: Social capital positively influences EI via the mediation of self-efficacy.
2.6.13. Entrepreneurial Attitude and Entrepreneurial Intention

Perceptions about certain activities build individuals’ attitude toward that activity. This attitude further leads to intention building, as attitude and exogenous factors usually affect intention (Ajzen, 1991; Krueger et al., 2000). Krueger et al. (2000) stated that certain attitudes predict EI. Souitaris et al. (2007) defined EI as “a state of mind directing a person’s attention and action toward self-employment as opposed to organizational employment.” Situational variables also affect individuals’ intentions; however, at times, the intention might not lead to the initiation process, as entrepreneurial ventures are not so frequently observed.

Krueger and Carsrud (1993) asserted that understanding EI for business startups is crucial to benefit researchers, teachers, and students. Self-efficacy leads to the behavioral sets of individuals that lead to intention (Ajzen, 1985). Similarly, social norms are external forces that influence the individual’s attitude. Moreover, according to the study of J. Zhang et al. (2014), entrepreneurial intent formation is directly influenced by social capital. According to the TPB, self-efficacy, social norms, and EA positively affect EI (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Davidsson (1995) affirmed that attitude positively influences individuals’ EI. Consequently, all these factors positively support EA, which leads to EI. Thus, we may hypothesize:

H12: EA positively influences EI.

2.6.14. Social Capital and Entrepreneurial Intention mediated by Entrepreneurial Attitude

The entrepreneurial phenomenon is examined from different perspectives in the literature to determine why some people are more entrepreneurial, why advantage of opportunities is taken by some, different psychological and demographic factors, and the effects of entrepreneurs’ personal characteristics. The factors that lead to entrepreneurial behaviors in some individuals are of keen interest to researchers (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Similarly, the effect of social capital is of keen interest to researchers; however, its direct effect on entrepreneurial behavior is less evident in the literature (Davidsson & Honig, 2003; De Carolis & Saparito, 2006). Most researchers hold the view that it helps to identify opportunities to some individuals than the others based on their social networking (Burt, 1998). EI enables EA and leads to the final decision to become an entrepreneur, which is influenced by other factors, such as locus of control, self-efficacy, and need for achievement (Kristiansen & Indarti, 2004).
Thus, in light of the prevailing literature, we understand that networking as social capital allows individuals to enhance their information, ideas, opportunities, and financing, and eliminates risk factors. It also benefits individuals through information and influence (De Carolis & Saporito, 2006; Kristiansen & Indarti, 2004). Thus, social capital directly influences EA. This attitude encourages individuals to take action and predicts their intention toward entrepreneurial behavior. Similarly, a positive attitude toward other entrepreneurial factors, such as risk taking and independence, also leads toward EI (Douglas & Shepherd, 2002). This previous research indicated the positive link between attitude and EI, so we may assume that individuals’ social capital indirectly influences EI through building EA. Therefore, we posit:

H13: Social capital positively influences EI indirectly via the mediation of EA.

2.6.15. Double Mediational Mechanism

2.6.15.1. Effect of Social Capital on Entrepreneurial Intention via double mediation of Social Norms and Attitude toward Entrepreneurship

In relatively greater explanation, the TPB developed by Ajzen (1991) declares that one’s intent to perform or execute a certain behavior or role directly depends on three perceptions and observations. The first two of those are self-efficacy and personal attraction, which are similar to those stated by Shapero and Sokol (1982) (perceived feasibility and perceived desirability). The third perception is “subjective norms,” which refers to societal pressure to undertake a certain behavior or role. According to this perception, if an individual believes that other members of society will also undertake a certain behavior or role, this will contribute a more positive intent toward his or her performance or undertaking of that role or behavior.

There was a need to state a better theory, which was named the intention model by Ajzen. In the development of individuals’ cognitive abilities human resource capital plays an important role (Becker, 1964), societal and social are more relevant factors involved in the human capital development. Thus, integrating the different theories representing individuals’ social relationships seems to be a more applicable technique to advance the descriptive ability of models that are intention based. Thus, individuals’ social capital helps build their intentions toward a certain phenomenon. Meanwhile, the effect of social norms should not be neglected, as the perceptions of friends, family, and society play an important role. Their societal views on any action influence individuals’ perceptions toward it (Fayolle, 2005). Ajzen (2002) claimed that external factors are highly influential, especially for people with a weak internal locus of control. Social norms and attitudes are one of the
predictors of entrepreneurial behavior (Fayolle, 2005), which is the final product of EI. Thus, we may hypothesize:

H14: Social capital positively influences EI indirectly via the double mediation of social norms and EA.

2.6.15.2. Effect of Social Capital on Entrepreneurial Intention via double mediation of Self-efficacy and Attitude toward Entrepreneurship

The theory that previous experience increases an individual’s intention toward entrepreneurship is not only restricted to family-owned businesses. Corporate intention toward entrepreneurship between firms who are emerging is derived through the self-efficacy and skills of individual team members, as well as the collective experiences of teams, which later encourages them to behave like entrepreneurs (Fini, Grimaldi, Marzocchi, & Sobrero, 2010). In reality, individual intention develops and strengthens as a result of experiences because of entrepreneurial and generalized self-efficacy (Gird & Bagraim, 2008). Reason behind this increase is entrepreneurial intent is ascribed to noticeable increase and growth in self-efficacy of entrepreneurship (Hmieleski & Corbett, 2008). The research by Hmieleski and Corbett (2008) improved the concept that unexpected behavior leads to increased EI. As per their research, unexpected behavior does not occur because of increased entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

Previous research has also examined founders’ experience, and found founders to differ from managers who are non-founders, as founders have higher self-efficacy (Chen et al., 1998). Opportunity, chances for growth, and growth build good experiences that lead to greater self-efficacy, aspiration for growth in the future, and enhanced entrepreneurial intent (Kraaijenbrink & Groen, 2012). Further, the feelings and decisions of entrepreneurs about different increased or decreased opportunity based upon the attributed and recognized self-efficacy in expertise capacity of those provided opportunities and chances (Schleuning et al., 2012). Similarly, EI is derived from the EA of an individual (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). The locus of control is one of the predictors of attitude toward entrepreneurial behavior (Fayolle, 2005). Thus, the social capital that affects EI is mediated by other factors, such as self-efficacy and EA. Thus, we may hypothesize:

H15: Social capital positively influences EI indirectly via the double mediation of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and EA.

2.6.16. Entrepreneurial Intention and Entrepreneurial Behavior

Plenty of literature supports the connection between EI and entrepreneurial behavior. Researchers agree that behaviors are the final shape of intention, which is based on different
factors. Ajzen (1991) asserted that behaviors are predicted by intentions, but this phenomenon is more observed in people with higher volitional control. In contrast, Kautonen et al. (2013) argued for the importance of other factors, such as opportunity and resources. Further, Kruger and Carsrud (1993) stated that, as much as opportunity is required for certain behavior, intention is equally mandatory. It has also been revealed with empirical testing that attitude leads toward certain intentions that predict behavior (Sheppard et al., 1988). Individuals’ intentions encourage them to take action to achieve their desires, which are assembled in their goals. As the goals can be achieved by assisting plans and the intentions are cognitive structure consisted on both goals and plans (Ajzen, 1991).

Perceptions create intentions, which lead toward attitudes regarding certain behaviors, and then individuals decide to begin the entrepreneurial process (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Although Allinson, Chell, and Hayes (2000) argued that intentions may not always lead to entrepreneurial outcomes, the major distinction between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs is the notion of intention. Intention plays an integral role by shaping behaviors, which are based on individual desires, irrespective of the uncontrollable external factors (Fayolle, 2005). Although the entrepreneurial relevance is complex, research agrees that intentions have more influence on behavior than do sociological or psychological factors (Fayolle, 2005; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993). Thus, with reference to the existing literature, we may assume that intentions are direct predictors of individual behavior, regardless of the cultural factors or environmental barriers existing in a country. Based on the above discussion, we may posit:

H16: EI positively affects entrepreneurial behavior.

2.6.17. Moderated Mediation with the perspective of Gender

2.6.17.1. Moderation of Gender on direct effect of Social Capital on Attitude toward Entrepreneurship

In this research, we drawn on the perspective of J. Zhang et al. (2014) and consider social capital alongside willingness toward entrepreneurship. We are supposing that constitution of social capital is on the surrounding factors of an individual’s willingness toward entrepreneurship and workings on EI over social networks. In these social networks, people depend on one another by building connections and trust, which obliges them to exchange support or cooperation with each other (Burt, 1998). This social capital aids them in different ways. People who cannot maintain this social capital and are without a social structure are unable to attain its benefits. Westermann, Ashby, and Pretty (2005) argued that gender affects the creation of social groups, and, with female individuals, more conflict
arises, which weakens the power of the social network and lessens the benefits of the social capital. Similarly, Burt (1998) supported the phenomenon that female individuals are more comfortable in small social circles, and the comfort of individuals affects their performance in taking any action. However, some researchers hold the view that social capital is more influential for women than men (Wells, Seifert, Padgett, Park, & Umbach, 2011). Molyneux (2002) also supported the fact that social capital is remarkably different between genders. Although Molyneux’s initial research only considered social capital with male individuals, without specifying gender, female concerns regarding social capital were later highlighted, including their importance for policy making. Thus, the literature indicates that gender somehow moderates the effect of social capital on any phenomenon, which we are assuming in this study to be EA. Thus, we may posit:

H17: Gender moderates the indirect effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of EA in such a way that this effect will be stronger for male individuals.

2.6.17.2. Moderation of Gender on indirect effect of Social Capital on Attitude toward Entrepreneurship via Social Norms

Rommi (2005) and A. Hyder, Azhar, Javaid, and Rehman (2011) investigated women business visionaries in Pakistan by building up a more prominent comprehension of ladies has a place with various cultural foundation, showing sexual orientation–related difficulties and openings. Both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards motivate and stimulate those who wish to be entrepreneurs. In contrast, capital, investment, confidence, complaint, cost, and skills are the hurdles, barriers, and obstacles to entrepreneurship (Choo & Wong, 2006). Similarly, Schoof (2006) explored the same issue based on similar thoughts, and determined that a cultural/social approach in the direction of early life and youth entrepreneurship, education regarding entrepreneurship, finance access to start a business, the regulatory/administrative context, and support/assistance for business are the most important barriers to starting a new business.

The literature supports the influence of cultural framework on EA. Specific roles are associated with women, including taking care of families and other household tasks, according to gender schemas (Bem, 1981). Females face discrimination when they engage in entrepreneurial activities, as a result of restrictive social and cultural barriers (Rubio-Banon & Esteban-Lloret, 2016). However, women still play an important role in economic development, especially in developed countries (Aramand, 2012). In Pakistan, female entrepreneurs were examined by Rommi (2005) (A. Hyder et al., 2011) by developing and creating a greater and better understanding of women belonging to diverse cultural and
societal background, offering gender-associated opportunities and challenges. Vital research was undertaken by Haque (2007) in Pakistan, who determined that, to increase the base of entrepreneurship in the state and country, bound rent-seeking, encouraging innovation, and raising enterprise are important and planned the strategy and approach for an innovative and new growth and authorization of towns and cities can be fundamental and crucial steps in changes and reforms by government. Thus, we may hypothesize: H18: Gender moderates the indirect effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of social norms in such a way that the effect will be stronger for women.

2.6.17.3. Moderation of Gender on indirect effect of Social Capital on Attitude toward Entrepreneurship via Self-efficacy

Specific roles are traditionally associated with different genders, with females associated with family caretaking activities, and males associated with financially supporting the family (Rubio-Banon & Esteban-Llort, 2016). Thus, entrepreneurial activities tend to be considered more as “male” activities (Winn, 2005), which leads to men having a higher level of self-efficacy regarding entrepreneurship (Wilson et al., 2007). Self-efficacy is linked with entrepreneurship, with individuals with more self-efficacy having a positive attitude about taking risks and starting new ventures. These individuals are more confident in their abilities, despite external pressures (Bandura, 1977a; Walstad & Kourilsky, 1999; Wilson et al., 2004; Zhao et al., 2005). Thus, due to the entrepreneurial characteristics as risk taking, encounters, supremacy, and aggressiveness which are more associated to the male members of the society (Ahl, 2006; Gupta et al., 2008) and self-efficacy relevancy with males.

Moreover, social capital builds a good reputation based on positive interactions and past experiences in direct contact (R. A. Baron & Markman, 2000), which can aid entrepreneurs in accessing capital and even potential customers, and can boost their confidence in their venture’s success. As stated by R. A. Baron and Markman (2000), social skills and networks contribute to the development of social capital, and such skills can be imparted through training to entrepreneurs. Thus, social capital positively affects EA, especially among individuals with a higher locus of control and self-efficacy (Fayolle, 2005). Previous research supports the notion that male members of society have higher self-efficacy; thus, we may assume that gender plays a moderating role in this phenomenon. Based on this argument, we may hypothesize: H19: Gender moderates the indirect effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of self-efficacy in such a way that the effect will be stronger for male individuals.
Figure 1. Hypothesized model.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction
The last chapters discussed the connection between organizational learning and execution. In addition, it has summarized the research problem alongside the research objectives and research questions. The current chapter will present the research outline and research methodology, and discourse the research paradigm and its features in the context of an organization.

3.2. Types of Business Research
There are two main types of business research: applied research and basic or fundamental research. Applied research is undertaken to solve a particular phenomenon or problem prevailing in an organization, and its results are applied in the organization. In contrast, basic research is undertaken to enhance the existing body of knowledge of a particular topic or area. It not only reveals unknown realities, but is also helpful in generating new theories. This knowledge can also later be used in applied research. This study is a basic research type, which generates knowledge about EI, leading to entrepreneurial behavior of individuals.

3.3. Review of the Hypothetico-Deductive Method
The hypothetico-deductive method consists of seven steps, starting with identification of the problem and ending with the final results. Logical research nature is control through the nature of the issue definition (Johnston, 2014). The other phases include generating the problem statement, creating the hypotheses, defining the measures, collecting data, and interpreting data. In this study, we followed all seven steps.

3.4. Research Paradigm
According to Sobh and Perry (2006), there are four paradigms for research that are acknowledged in the organizational sciences: constructivism, positivism, critical theory, and realism. In the paradigm of positivism, knowledge is generalized in a statistical manner by the statistical analysis of the observed facts as a population. In the paradigm of constructivism, the research results are linked to singular opinions and their various created certainties. In the paradigm of critical theory, knowledge is taken based on its suitability to the individual agreements of society. In the paradigm of realism, knowledge is considered by logically displaying the empirical results nested within the related theories.
Positivism paradigm is the most prominent paradigm for experimental authoritative research. In their audit of hierarchical research methods, Aguinis, Pierce, Bosco, and Muslin (2009) identified that positivist paradigms were applied for almost all exact authoritative investigations. Hierarchical wonders were estimated as free actualities about a solitary understandable reality (Healy & Perry, 2000). At the end of the day, phenomena of organizations were observed and described with target perspective and without meddling with the phenomena of organizations being studied. This contains repeated control of reality with varieties in a free factor or a couple of autonomous factors to recognize regularities in, and to shape connections between, some organizations’ angles (Babbie, 2011; Couper, Traugott, & Lamias, 2001). Forecasts can be made based on matters that have already been observed and clarified, and their relations with one another (Zikmund, 2003).

3.4.1. Justification of the Paradigm applied in this Research

Based on the above research paradigms, the chosen paradigm for this research was positivism. This paradigm was advocated for two fundamental reasons—the freedom of the researcher and the rationality of examining the phenomena of organizations. As aforementioned, large organizational research tends to apply the positivist paradigm (Sampe, 2012).

3.5. Scientific Research Elements

Scientific research can be studied through different approaches, such as ontology, epistemology, and methodology (Sobh & Perry, 2006). Ontology identifies the presence of reality with regard to the examination, and concerns the assurance whether a few classes of being are major and asks in what sense the things in those classifications can be said to exist. Epistemology is the connection among the real world and the specialist, and considers the nature, sources, and breaking points of information. Methodology covers the systems used by the scientist to determine reality (Sobh & Perry, 2006). Briefly, through ontology answers can be define as what is in frame and real world nature, further through epistemology is about what is the idea of the connection between the scientist and the researcher to be looked into, although methodology is the subject of how an analyst discover and anything can have in the form of results after the whole study (Babbie, 2011).

The present study explored the practices of organizational learning and the antecedents in the relationship with the performance of organizations. We evaluated the presence of organizational phenomena on an objective without have basis of interfering and
measured the practices of organizational learning. The quantitative analysis of the current study results was undertaken with the help of software AMOS 20.

3.5.1. Positivistic Research Method

Table 3.1 demonstrates that the fundamental research strategy is quantitative. Quantitative strategies guarantee that learning is gained by applying measurable thinking to a small segment of the population to reach conclusions about the broader population (Babbie, 2011). Clark and Creswell (2008) recommended using quantitative strategies when the exploration issue recognizes factors that impact the result of the top indicators of the result. Quantitative research involves identifying the qualities of a watched phenomenon or examining feasible connections among at least two phenomena (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). There are various types of quantitative analysis, including correlational analysis, developmental design analysis, observation-based study analysis, and survey analysis (Creswell, 2009). Further, quantitative research methodology creates a deductive approach, beginning with a hypothesis that is tested with the use of standardized tools (Creswell, 2009; Leedy & Ormrod, 2010).

Creswell (2009) depicted quantitative information strategies as information condensers empowering the specialist to see the comprehensive view. This was a key goal at this phase of the exploration. Given that the end goal of the current research was to create and test appropriate proportions of organizational learning and its relationship with organizational execution, a quantitative strategy was necessary. In addition, this study focused on testing a model that identified connections among numerous factors and their relationship with organizational learning factors.

Although the positivism worldview is generally focused on a quantitative strategy, the role of a subjective technique is essential to support quantitative outcomes. Subjective research enquires about whose discoveries are not subject to evaluation or quantitative examination (Clark & Creswell, 2008) can distinguish imperceptibly heterogeneity in quantitative information and beforehand obscure clarifying factors (Kelle, 2006). The researcher gathers open-ended information, from which rising information themes are developed (Creswell, 2009), and examines the discoveries to answer the research questions. In such a methodology, the researcher uses an inductive structure to direct the study and its subjects (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010).

The qualitative methodology of data collection includes following different types of methods, such as naturalism, ethnography, ethnomethodology, methods of grounded theory, case study method, phenomenological study, and description study method (Babbie, 2011;
Clark & Creswell, 2008; Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Naturalism accepts that a protest of social reality exists and can be watched and revealed precisely, while ethnography centers around point-by-point and exact reports of social life. Ethnomethodology focuses on the disclosure of certain, normally implicit suppositions and claims, as does grounded hypothesis (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010).

Many researchers use a mixed mode while studying organizational-related studies, such as applying both qualitative and quantitative methods (Aguinis et al., 2009). A mixed-method approach joins quantitative and qualitative methodologies. However, mixed-method approaches can be time consuming, as both quantitative and qualitative strategies must be audited and clarified. The results from qualitative meetings can recognize imperceptible heterogeneity in quantitative information and also already obscure logical factors and indefinite models (Kelle, 2006). The results from the qualitative part of a mixed-methods approach can see beforehand limitless quantitative discoveries or affirm late quantitative discoveries (Aguinis et al., 2009).

3.5.2. Research Approach

In this study, the deductive approach was chosen and the general theory was narrowed to the specified hypotheses, which were further analyzed through testing the positivist experiment. Positivism the cause-and-effect relationship was tested through manipulating and observing the different measures of variables.

3.6. Research Design

The research design plans the different steps of conducting research, and selection of a particular design depends on the research objective. The research design is an explanation of the arrangement of the analysis of a study (Babbie, 2011), describing the chief strategy and identifying the approaches and processes to collect the data and analyze the required information (Babin, Carr, Griffin, & Zikmund, 2012). The design states the research type and explains the sampling approaches, foundations of data, processes to collect data, data evaluation problems, and analysis strategies (Babbie, 2011). It is vital to implement a good research design to produce quality research (Babin et al., 2012; McDaniel & Gates, 2007).

The scientific research configuration has seven stages (Babin et al., 2012; Ezzy, 2006). The research begins with appraisal of the significant existing information related to a topic. This is followed by definition of the ideas and recommendations, articulation of the hypotheses, developing a plan of research to test the theories, obtaining important
information, examining and assessing the information, and finally proposing clarification of the topic and announcing any new issues raised by the research.

The current study adopted the descriptive research design in describing the characteristics of respondents, variables, and constructs under examination (Rowlinson, Hassard, & Decker, 2014). For descriptive analysis, we used means, standard deviations, and variances to enable clear description of all the required characteristics. Further details of this study research design are provided below.

3.6.1. Justification for Quantitative Research Design

In this exploratory study, a quantitative technique approach was applied, with the goal that the examination would use existing instrument to collect data which is significantly assessed (Creswell, 2009). Similarly the use of this methodology was believed to be appropriate because the examination was intended to investigate the use of descriptive statistics to investigate the relationships between factors for each develops and between builds and also the impact of one develop on another build utilizing structural equation modeling (SEM) (Hair, 2010).

3.6.2. Research Strategy

Data collection is one of the most common strategies used in both qualitative and quantitative research, as it allows the researcher to collect data from different types of open- or close-ended questions. Usually, these questions are self-administered and respondents can respond to them on their own. A survey is a widespread method to collect data in the paradigm of positivism (Babbie, 2011; Babin et al., 2012; Rowlinson et al., 2014). The survey method is referred to as a group of approaches that allows the usage of quantitative investigation, where information for countless individuals is collected through different strategies, such as mail surveys, telephone interviews, or distributed measurements, and this information can be broken down by using factual procedures (Babbie, 2011; Babin et al., 2012). By concentrate an agent test of organizations, the study approach seeks to find connections that are normal crosswise over organizations, and thus provide explanations regarding the research question (Babbie, 2011).

Reviews empower the researcher to acquire data through questionnaire about practices, circumstances, or perspectives at single point in time (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Data contains the statistics (certainties, conclusions, inspirations, mindfulness, and states of mind) that are accumulated by speaking with an agent test of individuals (Babin et al., 2012; N. K. Malhotra, Hall, Shaw, & Oppenheim, 2006). Studies are generally used because they offer rapid, cheap, and precise methods for evaluating data about a populace (Babin et al.,
The use of overviews allows researchers to consider a larger number of factors at one time than is commonly conceivable in research centers or field tests, while data can be gathered about certifiable conditions.

Two fundamental media can be used for review look into be specific human intelligent media and electronic intuitive media (Babin et al., 2012; Ibeh, Brock, & Zhou, 2004; Rowlinson et al., 2014). Human intelligent media are close to home types of correspondence, in which a message is coordinated at an individual level (or during a small gathering), who at that point has a chance to associate with the communicator (Couper et al., 2001; Ibeh et al., 2004). A portion of the human intelligent review composes are entryway to door individual meetings, shopping center catch meetings, and telephone interviews. The use of electronic intuitive media is a technique for correspondence between the researcher and respondent through using computerized innovation (Babin et al., 2012; N. K. Malhotra et al., 2006). Advancements in innovation have enabled leading electronic overviews, such as email studies, internet/web reviews, changed over computer-assisted telephone interviewing studies, bulletin boards, downloadable studies, and intelligent booths (Babin et al., 2012; Ibeh et al., 2004).

The adaptability of information accumulation is resolved essentially by the degree to which respondents can communicate with the questioner and the overview survey (N. K. Malhotra, 1999; N. K. Malhotra et al., 2006). Both phone and web study strategies offer direct to high adaptability of information gathering (Couper et al., 2001; N. K. Malhotra et al., 2006). For example, when using the internet study technique, a survey can be controlled in an intelligent mode (Couper et al., 2001). Therefore, analysts can use different enquiry groups, customize the questions, and handle complex skip designs (McCabe, Couper, Cranford, & Boyd, 2006). Mail and email reviews have low adaptability because these study modes do not consider associations between the questioners and respondents (Babin et al., 2012; McCabe et al., 2006).

3.6.3. Study Setting

In this study, we used a non-contrived setting and the research was undertaken in a natural environment. Such studies are called field studies, as the cause-and-effect relationship is observed at the same time that the event occurs.

3.6.4. Unit of Analysis

In this study, the unit of analysis was the individual, as the data were gathered from individual respondents. On the base research questions, the unit of analysis was determined which led toward determining the sample size and data collection techniques.
3.6.5. Time Horizon

This was a longitudinal study, as data were gathered from respondents twice. The data were collected in two waves—the first wave collected variables such as social capital, social norms, self-efficacy, and EA. To avoid common method bias, 10 days after the first wave, the second wave collected data for EI and entrepreneurial behavior. In this manner, the collected data sufficiently answered the research question. Thus, a longitudinal method was most appropriate for this study.

3.7. Research Questionnaire

In this study, the adopted questionnaire was used. It was based on two parts—demographics and content. The content part had three to seven questions for all six variables of the study. It was a set of close-ended questions against which respondents could register their opinions.

3.7.1. Personally Administered Questionnaire

In this study, a survey design was employed, and the best way to collect data in this design is to use a personally administered questionnaire, as it can be completed over a short period and the researcher has the chance to introduce the research idea and problem area for the respondents’ improved understanding. In addition, the ambiguities of respondents can be clarified, and this can motivate them to provide appropriate and complete responses, which leads to the required response rate. Moreover, the respondents have complete freedom to respond to the questionnaire at their convenience, taking as much time as they require.

3.7.2. Guidelines for Questionnaire Design

In designing the questionnaire, the researchers focused on the wording of the questions; the categorization, scaling, and coding of the variables; and the overall appearance of the questionnaire. A properly designed questionnaire not only enhances the response rate, but also reduces bias issues.

3.8. Measurements

In this study, the adopted questionnaire was used, in which the preferences of the respondents for different variables were ranked with an ordinal scale. For this purpose, the Likert scale was used, scaling from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” EA was measured through five items adopted from Liñán and Chen (2009), while EI was measured with the same questionnaire containing seven items. Social norms were measured with eight items adopted from Liñán and Chen’s (2006) questionnaire, and self-efficacy was measured with six items adopted from Wilson et al.’s (2007) questionnaire. The independent variable
of social capital was measured with six items, and the dependent variable of entrepreneurial behavior was measured with three items.

3.8.1. Pretesting of Structured Questions

To ensure the usability of the questionnaire, we pre-tested the questionnaire to ensure the wording was sufficiently clear and easily understandable by the respondents. Although we used a questionnaire, to lessen the inadequacies and control bias, a pilot survey was mandatory. For this purpose, the questionnaire was filled by 300 respondents who were MBA students at a local university. Before administering the questionnaire to the whole sample, the pilot survey can indicate changes required to the language, wording of questions, or number of questions. However, the adopted questionnaire was easily understood by all respondents to the pilot survey, so we did not make any changes to the questionnaire.

3.9. Research Methodology

3.9.1. Population

The initial phase to develop the sampling strategy is the identification of the objective population. The targeted population for this study encompassed management sciences students at 46 private-sector universities in Lahore and Islamabad. To ensure the anonymity of the universities, the names of the institutes are not labeled. Students from all programs at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels were considered the targeted population.

3.9.2. Sampling Frame

When undertaking a survey, studying the entire population can be impossible; thus, scholars use samples taken from the population (Babbie, 2011; Rowlinson et al., 2014). In this research, the study population comprised 46 private-sector universities recognized by the Higher Education Commission as offering business studies. Thus, for this population, we applied a purposive sampling technique. The number of enrolled students in the management sciences program was unavailable on the university websites and not shared by the university administration, in consideration of the universities’ privacy. Thus, the population of the study was unknown and we opted for an unknown sampling frame.

3.9.3. Sample Size

The required sample size relies on certain elements, as the homogeneity of the population, the proposed information examination procedures, and the accessibility of time and funds for the investigation. The sample used in this study was university students
studying management sciences, and the questionnaires were self-administered by them. To ensure the respondents’ anonymity, the students were required to share their registration numbers, rather than their names.

According to R. B. Kline (2011), it is recommended that, for each observed variable, five cases should be available. The current study had a total of six latent variables, which had 36 observed variables or question items. Given that various reactions might be gotten and should be disposed of, we chose to employ a team of three individuals to perform the data collection. After gaining permission from management and the concerned teachers, the data collection team personally visited the classrooms and approached students. In most cases, they distributed the questionnaire at the start of the lecture, and retrieved it at the end of the lecture. In total, 650 questionnaires were distributed among students, and 557 questionnaires were retrieved in the first wave, while 52 questionnaires were retrieved in the second wave. After cross-matching the data, 474 questionnaires were completed; however, we later found that many of these had missing values. Thus, cases with more missing values were eliminated, and a final sample size of 459 questionnaires was selected for the data analysis.

3.9.4. Sampling Technique

Sampling is a procedure of using a small number of items to reach conclusions about the overall population (Babin et al., 2012). Fundamentally, sampling design involves a few stages generally used in professional studies. The current research used a non-probability sampling method (Tansey, 2007). The purposive sampling technique was selected, as the respondents were chosen based on their education program. This deliberate selection of respondents for a common phenomenon of interest is purposive sampling (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016).

3.10. Data Analysis Techniques

The data were analyzed in three steps. At first, the validity was measured, with two factors: discriminant and convergent validity. The validity of the questionnaire was measured using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (J. C. Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In addition, to determine the model’s convergent and discriminant reliability, we used the re-specification technique (J. C. Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In the second step, the hypothesized model was tested using the SEM technique (R. B. Kline, 2011) and direct and indirect effects were calculated. In the third step, the moderation effects were calculated by using the Bolin (2014) PROCESS macro.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the quantitative data to determine the relationship between the independent variables of social capital and gender, and the dependent variables of attitude, intention, and behavior toward entrepreneurship, with the mediating role of self-efficacy and social norms. Moreover, to examine the hypothetical relationship among the variables, in this chapter, we examine the validity of all the measuring instruments in the Pakistani context. We identify the determinants of social capital and its effect on entrepreneurial behavior. In addition, we establish the mediation of subjective norms and self-efficacy in the relationship between social capital and EI, with the moderation effect of gender in our proposed theoretical model. We also check the validity and reliability of the measuring instruments in the South Asian context.

We use SEM with the help of AMOS to test the hypothesized model. However, before testing the hypothesized model, we apply descriptive statistics and missing values analysis. Moreover, to determine the demographic characteristics of the sample, we perform demographic analysis of the respondents using data collected from 459 respondents. We use SPSS to perform these initial analyses. The complete analysis and its results are reported below.

4.2. Demographics Characteristics of the Sample

This study included 459 questionnaires. As displayed in Table 1, of the respondents, 255 (55.5%) were male, while 204 (44.4%) were female. Ninety-three respondents (20.3%) were aged 15 to 20 years, while 228 respondents (49.7%) were aged 21 to 25 years, 102 respondents (22.2%) were aged 26 to 30 years, and 23 respondents (5%) were aged 31 to 35 years. Only six respondents (1.3%) were aged 36 to 40 years, and seven respondents (1.5%) were above 40 years of age.

Similarly, the majority of respondents (183; 39.9%) were studying at bachelor level, while 89 respondents (19.4%) were studying at a master’s level, 169 respondents (36.8%) were studying at MS or MPhil level, and only 18 respondents (3.9%) were studying at PhD level. The majority of respondents (239; 52%) were not operating their own business, while the remainder of respondents (220; 48%) were linked with either their own or a family business.
Table 1: Demographics of the Study Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15–20 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21–25 years</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26–30 years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31–35 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–40 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS/MPhil</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/own business</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial course</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of training sessions attended</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents (240; 52.3%) had studied entrepreneurial courses, while the remaining respondents (219; 47.7%) had not studied any entrepreneurial course during
their academic career. Moreover, 186 respondents (40.5%) stated that they did not have any role model, while the majority (273; 59.5%) stated that they did have a role model. In addition, the respondents had attended varying numbers of sessions on entrepreneurial training, with 273 respondents (59.5%) attending only one session, 184 respondents (40.1%) attending two sessions, and one respondent (0.2%) attending three or four sessions.

4.3. Variable Description

The dataset comprised responses measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale for all variables. All items on these scales were measured on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree”). The measuring instrument was adapted and pilot tested for use in a South Asian context. It comprised two parts that considered the demographics and variable information. The second part included 34 items that enquired about the six variables studied in this research.

4.4. Analysis Techniques

For the analysis section, to ensure reliability and validity (both convergent and discriminant), we applied CFA (Gerbing & Anderson, 1992). To establish the convergent and discriminant validity, we incorporated the model re-specification technique. Moreover, to test the hypothesized model, we used SEM (R. B. Kline, 2011), and calculated direct and indirect effect. In addition, to calculate the moderation effects, we used the PROCESS macro.

4.5. Reliability and Composite Reliability

We examined two types of reliability in this study. The first type was Cronbach’s alpha through SPSS 16.0. The reliability was confirmed to be above 0.60—an acceptable value according to Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) and Sekaran (2003). The second type was composite reliability (CR). Although Cronbach’s alpha is commonly used as a reliable indicator, it has been reported to underestimate (Bollen, 1989; Chin, 1998; Raykov, 1997). This issue arises on the bases of the assumption of Cronbach’s alpha which supposes that all measured items are weighted equally, or the path coefficients from the latent factor to the measured items are equal. If the value fails to meet this assumption, Cronbach’s alpha underestimates the reliability. For alternate options, Werts, Linn, and Jöreskog (1974) created CR to assess the reliability of a set of indicators. CR relaxes the rationale behind the assessment of Cronbach’s alpha and is a nearer approximation under the assumption that the parameter estimates are accurate (Chin, 1998). It has since been viewed as a superior measurement to Cronbach’s alpha (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). CR is
calculated by almost all SEM software. Based on Bagozzi, Yi, and Phillips (1991) and Zafar, Hashim, and Halim (2017), the CR value should be over 0.60. CR is the most commonly used index for the estimation of reliability in SEM analysis.

4.6. Factor Analysis

Generally, factor analysis can be used as a modeling approach to study hypothetical constructs through indicators or observable proxies that can be directly measured (Byrne & Van de Vijver, 2010; Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2010; Raykov & Marcoulides, 2006). Factor analysis is referred to as exploratory factor analysis (EFA) if the issue of interest involves determining the number of latent constructs or factors required to efficiently clarify the relationships existing among a set of observed measures (Hair et al., 2010; Hu, Bentler, & Hoyle, 1995). CFA is an alternative to EFA, where the pre-existing structures of the relations existing among the measures are quantified and examined. However, unlike EFA, the main concern of CFA is not the examination and confirmation of available details of the assumed factor structures. Moreover, researchers should have an idea of the structure composition prior to confirming any specific factor structures.

4.6.1. Confirmatory factor analysis

This analysis is a modeling approach that was created to examine any hypothesized relationship regarding a factor structure, and when the factor numbers and their interpretations, in light of indicators, are provided prior to the analysis. The present research followed the three recommended CFA phases: reviewing related theories, providing a conceptualization of the hypothesized relationships in a model, and finally testing the model for internal and external consistency alongside the observed explanatory data. However, construct validity should be examined in terms of convergent and discriminate validity to validate the measurement model through CFA. Based on some studies (Hair et al., 2010; Newkirk & Lederer, 2006), a minimum value of 0.50 is predicted to be the standardized factor loading of the items consisting of constructs. Nevertheless, a factor loading of 0.30 is still considered acceptable with a number of respondents over 350 (Hair et al., 2006). Additionally, the goodness-of-fit indices should be satisfactory in other methods (Gerbing & Anderson, 1992). The goodness-of-fit indices (absolute, incremental, and parsimonious) are the chi-square–degree-of-freedom ratio ($\chi^2$/DF), comparative fit index (CFI), incremental fit index (IFI), Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normed fit index (NFI),
and goodness-of-fit index (GFI). Individual constructs were examined through AMOS 16.0 to examine the measurement model for exogenous and endogenous variables.

Table 2: Model Fit of CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>( x^2 )</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>( \chi^2/DF )</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Single-factor CFA</td>
<td>5,842.92</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>11.087</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Six-factor CFA</td>
<td>1,916.43</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>3.743</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that the adapted questionnaire was used in this study to check the reliability and validity of the instrument in a particular area, the CFA test was performed. The moment structure technique (AMOS 22) was used. The six-factor CFA exhibited a good fit with the data (\( \chi^2 = 1,916.43; \) DF = 512; \( \chi^2/DF = 3.743; \) RMSEA = 0.077; GFI = 0.787; TLI = 0.869; CFI = 0.881). However, the model with all factors loaded in a single factor exhibited a poor fit with the data (\( \chi^2 = 5,842.921; \) DF = 527; \( \chi^2/DF = 11.087; \) RMSEA = 0.148; GFI = 0.485; TLI = 0.52; CFI = 0.549). Moreover, the \( \chi^2 \) difference test also recognized that the six-factor model was better than the single-factor CFA model (\( p < 0.05 \)), as the standardized loadings of all items were rationally higher than the recommended values of 0.50 (0.60 to 0.94) (R. B. Kline, 2011) for their respective factors in the six-factor model. Thus, these instruments were preferable to use in the South Asian context.

4.7. Validity Test

An instrument used for research is required to be reliable, if it is not valid; though it can only be valid when it is reliable. Validity is the ability to describe a concept through measurement, however reliability presents the consistency of the measurement (Hair et al., 2006). There are two types of validity: content and construct validity, which further subdivided two types: convergent and discriminate validity.

4.7.1. Construct validity

Construct validity refers to the level to which a set of measured variables represents the theoretical latent construct that it has been designed to measure. It presents the effectiveness of the process to achieve results through using a measure fit related to the theories for which the test was initially created (M. K. Malhotra & Grover, 1998). It is important for researchers to verify the construct validity of research and link it to the theorized concept, the validity is more constructed when more construct validity is used (V. Malhotra & Stanton, 2004).
Table 3: Reliability, Convergent Validity, and Test of Discriminant Validity for All Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial behavior</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the two types of validity—convergent and discriminant validity—the six-factor convergent validity was examined by computing the average variance extracted (AVE) of each factor. All the estimate findings were above the recommended value of 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Similarly, for the discriminant validity analysis, the AVE of all factors was compared with the squared correlation of all factors. This method is also recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981), and the table shows that the AVE values were higher than the squared correlation value of the respective variables. Further, the Cronbach’s α values were observed in the table to examine the internal consistency of all the variables (Nunally & Bernstein, 1978).

**4.8. Assumptions Underlying Structural Equation Modeling**

Current statistical analyses depend on assumptions concerning the actual variable used in data analysis. Researchers and statisticians confirm the need to meet these criteria for the research outcomes to be trustworthy (Byrne & Van de Vijver, 2010; Hair et al., 2006) because a trustworthy outcome veers away from the appearance of Type I or Type II errors. Type I errors have a p-value lower than 0.05; thus, for the hypothesis to be significant, the p-value should be less than 0.05. For a Type II error has more than p-value (0.05) is used. These errors lead to the over- or underestimation of the research significance. According to Hau and Marsh (2004), knowledge and understanding of the above basic assumptions leads to the determination of serious bias in study findings. The basic assumptions are normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity (Hair et al., 2010).
4.8.1. Structural Equation Modeling

SEM consists of a statistical model that examines the relationships between several latent constructs (Hair et al., 2010). The present study uses SEM as the main analysis method because of the presence of a mediator in the study. In addition, SEM may also lay down the paths in the final model (revised model). SEM is often used to analyze causal relationships between latent variables, which explain the relationships of dynamism variables (exogenous constructs) and their effects on other variables (endogenous constructs).

SEM is commonly used in various fields and disciplines. The extended literature reveals that SEM is an effective second-generation multivariate method that is suitable to analyze results that involve several variables, and allows the assessment of measurement properties and theoretical relations with multiple relations at the same time, in the same analysis (Byrne & Van de Vijver, 2010; Hair et al., 2010; Hau & Marsh, 2004). SEM involves both factor and path analysis for simultaneous estimate of a measure, and determines the relationships between several related constructs, known as latent variables (Byrne & Van de Vijver, 2010; Hair et al., 2010). Additionally, it has become one of the criteria to consider when selecting research methodologies, especially in studies concerning issues linked to the social and behavioral sciences. It comprises two main functions: the measurement, i.e., the things that require measurement, the measurement method, and how to meet the reliability and validity conditions, and casual relationships among variables and explanations underlying complex and unobserved variables (Hair et al., 2010).

4.8.2. Justifications for using Structural Equation Modeling

SEM is described as a statistical methodology using a confirmatory method to investigate a structural theory, bringing attention to the presence of a specific phenomenon. Generally, the theory comprises causal processes that provide observations on multiple variables (Bentler, 1988). It serves the same purpose as multiple regressions, but has a more powerful analysis, and modeling of interactions is considered. A confirmatory method for data analysis is called for, as opposed to using EFA, which uses a multivariate procedure. Through using multivariate procedures, it is challenging to perform hypothesis testing (Byrne, 2001). To evaluate the composite nature of the interrelationships between several variables, SEM is suitable to use for the following reasons: it enables the use of multiple indicators to measure constructs and to minimize measurement errors through multiple indicators for individual latent variables, and it is capable of evaluating causal relations between multiple constructs simultaneously (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1982).
SEM is also capable of offering insight into the directions of the effect between research constructs, and examining the way test variables affect each other and the level of effect (Judge & Ferris, 1993). It can provide a complete assessment of the proposed model fit, and examines individual propositions, as opposed to coefficients, which is the scenario in multiple regression. Moreover, it is capable of modeling mediating variables (indirect effects) and features a unique graphical modeling interface. Finally, SEM is capable of incorporating unobserved and observed variables in data analysis, as opposed to using only observed measurements with multivariate procedures (Byrne, 2001). The SEM analysis includes LISREL and AMOS. The latter was developed by Arbuckle in 1977, and possesses many advantages over other programs of its caliber. The package’s graphical interface and approach to specifying structural models are user-friendly (R. Kline, 2005). It is convenient and easy to use to present the hypothesized relations between variables. AMOS is also commonly used in various disciplines, including marketing in terms of purchasing local brands. We used SEM in the present study.

4.8.3. Structural Equation Modeling Procedure

SEM is a commonly used multivariate approach. The first step is model conceptualization, which tackles the constructed hypothesis based on the theory in terms of the main aspect of the relationships with latent variables and other relevant indicators. The model’s development occurs in this step, based on theory and empirical findings. With the help of measured indicators, it depicts the latent variables. This step is followed by the path diagram development stage, which is deployed to achieve uncomplicated hypothesis visualization from model conceptualization. The third step is the model specification, which handles the structural design and measurement development for the research problem. Causal relationships obtained from the variables should be discussed during this stage. The fourth step is model identification, where the data are tested to guarantee that the gathered information has quality. This step also determines the operative parameters for the model. The aim is to validate the specification model and ensure that it is not under-identified, just identified, or over-identified. This is followed by the fifth step, which is the estimation of parameters, which involves the process of evaluating every parameter in the specified model to achieve a model-based covariance matrix that matches the targeted covariance matrix. To determine the significance of the final parameter, which significantly varies from zero, the researcher uses a significance test. Among the existing estimation models, based on the literature review, the maximum likelihood by weighted lasted is the most commonly used model for this purpose.
The sixth step is testing the model fit. The aim of this step is to examine the appropriateness of goodness-of-fit between the data gathered and the model. The criterion involves whether or not the model-based covariance matrix is the same as the observed covariance matrix. The goodness-of-fit, as a specific type of construct validity, is an important component of the SEM procedure, as it verifies the validity of the measurement model (Hair et al., 2006). The seventh phase is model modification, where the objective is to achieve better goodness-of-fit. Re-specification primarily depends on the given modeling strategy, owing to the fact that, in these outstanding features, SEM is considered to check the research model against the gathered data to better assist in developing the model in the current research. There are three major strategic frameworks for testing SEM (Joreskog & Sorborn, 1993): hypothesis model, alternative model, and generating model.

The rationale behind the present study was based on the revised model. Of the above three scenarios, the generating model is the most commonly used. In this study, it was suitable, as we proposed and rejected a theoretically derived model on the basis of poorness of fit to the chosen data sample, which may be preceded in an exploratory mode to change and re-estimate the model. We also proposed a single model on the basis of theory and appropriate data collected, and then verified the fit of the hypothesized model to the sample data for the development of a confirmatory method. In contrast, a competing model (DTPB) is comparatively uncommon in practice. We selected a model that best fit the data after considering several alternatives, all based on theory. SPSS 16.0 was used to test the preliminary analysis of data using an SEM software package, AMOS 16.

4.9. Goodness-of-Fit Index

The functions comprise examination of the loading factors in each dimension in forming a variance, confirmation of the instruments linked to the latent variables, estimation of the measurement error in the framework, and validation and generation of the framework. Hence, CFA is frequently used to verify whether the set of factors and loading of construct items validate the expected requirements needed to measure what actually measures the scale. Based on the study by Bollen (1989), the $x^2$ test, DF, RMSR, GFE, IFI, TLI, NFI, AGFI, and RMSEA are the most frequently achieved measures; hence, this study used them as goodness-of-fit to measure all variables, as listed in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC6</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN5</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN6</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN7</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN8</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Se1</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se2</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se4</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se5</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se6</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI6</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entrepreneurial behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EA1</th>
<th>0.793</th>
<th>EA2</th>
<th>0.825</th>
<th>EA3</th>
<th>0.81</th>
<th>EA4</th>
<th>0.737</th>
<th>EA5</th>
<th>0.741</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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>

Entrepreneurial behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>0.833</th>
<th>EB2</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>EB3</th>
<th>0.807</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10. Descriptive Statistics

Table 5 illustrates the means, standard deviations, and correlations between all variables studied. Moreover, this table offers insight into the relationships between the variables used in this study.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics: Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Role</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIs</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation significant at 0.01 level (two-tailed).
* Correlation significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed).

The hypothesized model was tested using SEM, and the results indicated that the fit of the six hypothesized model was accepted and better than any alternative hypothesis. To assess the mediation, either full or partial, we drew direct paths from the independent variables to the dependent variables.
4.11. Direct Effect

Hair et al. (2010) described a directive as the relationship between two constructs with one path. It is the effect that variables have on each another that constitutes the direct relationship. The present study comprised 13 direct effects, and, to guarantee that all paths in the model were reinforced, the recommended values of critical ratio (CR) and p-value must be confirmed, which is the approximate CR parameter divided by its approximate standard error. CR reinforces the path if it is over 1.96, and does not support the path when it is less than 1.96, which results in rejection of the hypothesis. The probability level (p-value) offers a cut-off point, which asserts that the findings are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Moreover, if $p < 0.01$, it is considered highly significant, as it indicates that the observed difference occurs less than a single time in 100 times if there was really no actual difference (Davies & Crombie, 2009, p. 4).

4.12. Indirect/Mediating Effect

The variables that encompass the relationship arrangement with as minimum one intervening construct are related to indirect effect (R. M. Baron & Kenny, 1986). In the present study, the mediating effect for EI was examined. Brown and Leigh (1996) indicated few important steps for the indirect path, as given below:

1. The effect of all possible paths from one variable to another, mediated by any other variable, comprises the total indirect effect.
2. The total of all direct and indirect effects in the model is the total effect.
3. The breakdown of all indirect effect into uniform indirect paths comprises the standardized indirect effect.

The indirect and direct effect comparison is confirmed by the mediation of the path, as either full or partial mediation. For this purpose, the values of both the direct and indirect effects are considered, while, for the mediating effect, there must exist another variable to create a total of three: independent variable (patriotism), mediator variable (purchase intention), and dependent variable (actual purchase). The result of the mediating effect can be calculated during the estimation of each variable from the output of the analysis. Therefore, if the indirect effect ($P \rightarrow PI \rightarrow AP$) is greater than the direct effect ($P \rightarrow AP$), and all paths are significant, then it is considered a full mediator. In contrast, if the indirect effect is less than the direct effect, it is not considered a mediator. Hair (2010) stated that, to examine the testing of mediating, some steps must be followed because, usually, the
relationships are unclear. According to Hair et al. (2010), this applies the approaches of SEM and general linear model or multiple regression analysis.

4.13. Direct and Indirect Effects

Our results indicated that Hypothesis 1—that social capital positively affects EA—was not supported. The direct effect of social capital on EA was found to be weak and insignificant. The results gave a negative value (-0.01, po0.001); thus, the magnitude of the indirect effect of EA was very insignificant, as shown in Table 6. However, the results supported H2—that social capital is positively linked with social norms. The hypothesis indicating that social capital directly influences social norms was significant, as shown in Table 6 (.40, po0.001). The magnitude of the direct effect was very positive.

In addition, the results supported H3—that positive social norms develop attitudes toward entrepreneurship. This result affirmed the effect of social norms on EA with a significant and positive result (.52, po0.001). Moreover, the results affirmed H4, which indicated a positive influence of social capital on EA with the mediation of social norms. The indirect effect of (0.39, po0.001) in Table 6 indicated a full mediation effect, while the direct effect was insignificant. Similarly, the results affirmed H5, which positively linked social capital with the entrepreneurial self-efficacy of the individual (.39, po0.001). The results also supported H6—that the entrepreneurial self-efficacy of an individual develops attitudes toward entrepreneurship. As Table 6 shows, the results indicated a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and EA (.451, po0.001).

In addition, the results illustrated a full mediation effect of entrepreneurial self-efficacy on EA, with a magnitude of 0.39 (po0.001) for social capital, which supported H7. Further, the results supported H8—that social norms positively influence EI, as the relationship was found to be significant and positive, as shown in Table 6 (0.26, po0.001). Correspondingly, in accordance with H9, social capital was found to affect EI, with the mediation of social norms, as shown in Table 6 (0.10, po0.001). The results also indicated that social norms mediate the effect of social capital on EA. Likewise, the results demonstrated a similar effect of self-efficacy, and supported the proposed H10, which stated that entrepreneurial self-efficacy positively influences EI. Table 6 illustrates the positive and significant direct effect (.18, po0.001) of self-efficacy on EI. In addition, the results indicated that social capital positively influences EI via the mediation of self-efficacy. In accordance with H11, Table 6 shows a full mediation effect of self-efficacy on the indirect relationship between social capital and EA (0.07, po0.001). Further, the results supported
H12 regarding a positive influence of EA on EI, with a significant and positive result (0.44, po0.001) in Table 6. However, the indirect effect of social capital on EI with the mediation of EA was found to be insignificant, as illustrated in Table 6 (0, po0.001); thus, the results did not support H13.

Table 6: Direct and Indirect Effects of Independent Variables on Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via social norms</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via self-efficacy</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via EA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via social norms and EA</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via self-efficacy and EA</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via EA</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via EA</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, the results confirmed H14, as the proposed indirect double mediation effect of social capital on EI via the mediation of social norms and EA was found to be significant, with a magnitude of .09 (po0.001). Correspondingly, social capital also positively influenced EI indirectly via the double mediation of entrepreneurial self-efficacy.
and EA, with the magnitude 0.08 (po0.001), which affirmed H15. In addition, the results supported H16 by indicating a positive effect of EI on entrepreneurial behavior, as shown in Table 6 (0.44, po.001).

4.14. Moderation of Gender

To examine the moderated mediation of gender in the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables, the PROCESS macro was used. This analysis was established by Bolin (2014) and applied with 5,000 bootstrap samples. We performed the comparison analysis between males and females to test the hypotheses.

Table 7: Moderated Mediation Effect of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis supported H17—that gender moderates the indirect effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of EA in such a way that this effect is stronger for male individuals, as illustrated in Table 7 (male: 0.16*, p < 0.001; female: 0.09, p < 0.001). Correspondingly, H18 was also supported by the results, indicating that gender moderates the indirect effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of social norms in such a way that the effect is stronger for female individuals (male: 0.07, p < 0.001; female: 0.09*, p < 0.001). Likewise, the proposition of H19 that gender moderates the indirect effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of self-efficacy in such a way that the effect is stronger for male individuals was partially significant in the results. The magnitude of the indirect effect of social capital on EI via self-efficacy and EA was the same for males and females (male: 0.05*, p < 0.001; female: 0.05*, p < 0.001).
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Discussion

Entrepreneurship is an important contributor to economic development that generates business openings and reduces unemployment. EI is the key to generating entrepreneurship and is helpful for creating entrepreneurial activity. Various entrepreneurial studies have concentrated on presentation to entrepreneurial good examples, disposal of scholarly capital, and past entrepreneurial experience and knowledge, yet have rarely considered the incorporated effects of inventiveness and social capital, which are especially pivotal in the present unique condition and for more youthful ages. The motivation behind the current research was to determine the connections between social capital and EI, leading to entrepreneurial behavior in light of the TPB. The findings demonstrate that social capital is essentially and significantly connected with entrepreneurial intent and its precursors (self-efficacy and subjective norms). These findings were supported by the results of SEM, which indicated that social capital is identified with EI.

These results suggest that people are more likely to plan to start their own business, feel inspired to engage in entrepreneurship, and feel capable of starting their own business when they believe their choice will be endorsed by their close family members, companions and partners; when entrepreneurial activity is esteemed by those near them and the general public; when they know other individuals who are successful entrepreneurs; and when they trust that the general population will bolster them in starting a business. Moreover, the results indicated that social capital has a weak logical power over the dependent variables, and a stronger direct effect on EI. These findings differ from the findings of Malebana (2014), who revealed a weak direct connection among social capital and the factors of EI among 355 final-year business students from a university in the Eastern Cape and a university of innovation in the Limpopo region of South Africa.

For generating constructive entrepreneurial demeanors and improving individuals’ perceived ability to begin a business, the results highlight the significance of people in the individual’s immediate environment regarding their endorsement of the individual’s choice to start a business, the esteem appended to the entrepreneurial activity in the nearby environment and by the general public, the individual witnessing entrepreneurial experience, and perceived social assistance in the development of entrepreneurial intent and behavior. The results bolster the findings of past studies regarding the esteem connected to
entrepreneurial activities (Byabashaija & Katono, 2011; Kibler, Kautonen, & Fink, 2014; Light & Dana, 2013). Perceived behavior, EI (Liñán & Santos, 2007; Liñán, Urbano, & Guerrero, 2011; Malebana, 2014; Sahinidis, Giovanis, & Sdrolias, 2012), and state of mind toward starting a business (Liñán & Santos, 2007) are positively affected by social norms.

The findings agree with those of past research on the importance of witnessing entrepreneurial good examples (Klyver & Schøtt, 2008; Uygun & Kasimoglu, 2013) and receiving social help from weak and strong ties (Davidsson & Honig, 2003; Malebana, 2014; Tatarko & Schmidt, 2013) to invigorate entrepreneurial intent. In this manner, an environment that is socially supportive, supports entrepreneurial activities, acknowledges and celebrates entrepreneurial roles in society, and offers different types of social support. The role of social capital in the development of EI is imperative in supporting entrepreneurial behavior. Additionally, this sort of condition could improve the probability of starting a business (Zanakis, Renko, & Bullough, 2012) by affecting perceived social control and self-efficacy (Tatarko & Schmidt, 2013) and could likewise positively affect activities of entrepreneurship (Stephan & Uhlaner, 2010).

The study results likewise agree with the findings of Buttar (2015), who found a positive connection between social capital, perceived appeal of the entrepreneurial profession, and perceived capacity to start a business. Self-efficacy is enhanced by social capital by decreasing the effect of individual insufficiencies and outer deterrents that can hinder entrepreneurial behavior. It additionally helps produce states of mind those are positively entrepreneurial. EI and social capital are essential for entrepreneurship improvement. Those who make policies regarding entrepreneurship improvement should not only direct their efforts at providing material and immaterial help, but should also emphasize the significance of entrepreneurship to the general public. These endeavors should involve publicizing the accomplishments of role model entrepreneurs, creating ideal societal demeanors in the direction of entrepreneurship, offering help to entrepreneurial activities, and empowering entrepreneurship as a reasonable option for careers. Expanded social help and entrepreneurship would emphaticallyvaluation impact the arrangement of entrepreneurial capacities. Because of the significance ascribed these days toward the entrepreneurial limit as a cause of economic improvement and competitive advantage in the realm of globalization, the current study concentrated on the examination of the start-up process is getting up increasingly fundamental.

In the current study, entrepreneurial intent models created by Shapero and Sokol (1982) and Ajzen (1991) were our starting point. These models helped clarify the
intellectual factors affecting intent to start a business, leading to entrepreneurial behavior. However, we added social capital as a unique factor in those models. Social capital is the complete arrangement of an individual’s social connections; it offers access to other generation assets. In the proposed theoretical model, subjective social capital has been mainly deliberated, as it transmits qualities, convictions, and states of mind through individuals’ connections, deciding recognitions, and subsequently expectations to begin a business.

The cause of this psychological social capital measured has been, particularly, double: got from the person’s strong ties (holding social capital) and got from the person’s feeble ties (crossing over social capital). In the current analysis of a sample of potential entrepreneurs, we began to investigate the effect of certain psychological social capital determinants and recognitions on the intent to begin a business. Estimating cognitive social capital constructs apply their impact first on discernments and these, thusly, on intent. The proposed auxiliary model clarified 57% of the difference in EI. We also tested the model for the presence of direct and indirect social capital–intent relations, and the results affirmed the presence of indirect effects of the constructs characterizing social capital on EI by means of self-efficacy, while emotional standards and subjective norms did not influence the social capital–intent relationship. From the connections stated in the given hypothetical model, only one relationship was rejected, and one was partially affirmed. Thus, in the current second case, the results indicated a weak connection between social capital and perceived achievability.

Knowing other entrepreneurs in one’s family may invigorate an interest in entrepreneurship, but not necessarily trust in one’s own entrepreneurial abilities. It is intriguing to note that role models who are non-family have the most elevated effect on achievability. Likewise, it is intriguing to recognize the effect applied on discernments by the other two holding intellectual constructs of social capital: (i) valuation of the entrepreneurial choice in the immediate environment and (ii) endorsement of the decision to start a business. If people in an individual’s immediate environment positively value entrepreneurship, the longing to become a businessperson is higher; however, the achievability recognitions are not. In the meantime, if people feel the plan to begin business is endorsed in, does social capital influence entrepreneurial goals? That closer condition, they will likewise feel more able. Hence, endorsement arouses the feeling that individuals can rely on that help.
Regarding the constructs used to measure social capital (such as contacts with entrepreneurial systems and bodies to assist with starting a business), they influence plausibility, yet do not influence desirability with regard to entrepreneurship. This may occur because of the type of social capital, which generates trust in individuals regarding entrepreneurial activity and believe to tackle possible problems. The results support the effect of desirability and feasibility constructs on EI, as in previous studies (Kolvereid & Isaksen, 2006). The originality of this study resides in testing the social capital–intention model with the addition of entrepreneurial behavior. Overall, the results of this study are satisfying, as the most of hypotheses were accepted. Self-efficacy and social norms affect EA and EI; thus, suggestions to improve these areas can bring positive change in both the private and public sectors by enhancing productivity and profit, which will help reduce unemployment and boost economic stability. These outcomes will support the economic, political, and social issues of the country.

5.2. Academic Contributions

The academic contributions of this study include the following. This study has evaluated the effects of social capital on entrepreneurial behavior, followed by EI. Although the entrepreneurial literature has expanded over time (Naudé, 2010; Wennekers et al., 2010), the link with social capital has remained unexplored (Liñán & Santos, 2007). Thus, this study tested the direct relationships between the independent variables and dependent variables regarding how social capital affects EA, which further leads to EI and behavior. In addition, this study examined the direct effect of social norms and self-efficacy on EA and their indirect effect on EI. This study has enriched the literature by analyzing the indirect effect of social capital on entrepreneurial behavior via the multiple mediation of social norms, self-efficacy, and EA. Correspondingly, we also investigated the moderation effect of gender in the relationship between social norms, self-efficacy, and EI.

The findings of this study indicated that the direct relationship between social capital and EI is weak (Van Der Gaag & Snijders, 2005); however, the effect of social capital on EI through the mediation of social norms (Meek, Pacheco, & York, 2010) and self-efficacy (Krueger et al., 2000; Zhao et al., 2005) is strongly significant and positive. These results affirm the indirect relationship between social capital and EI (Liñán & Santos, 2007). Similarly, the indirect effect of social norms on EI was found to be higher among women, while the indirect effect of EA on EI was higher among men. These results align with the
gender-comparative study of Arshad et al. (2016). In addition, we found the effect on EA of self-efficacy among men and women to be equal.

5.3. Implications of the Study

Although developed countries have undertaken a variety of research in the entrepreneurial context, this study offers public policy implications for developing countries. Self-efficacy was derived as the main force for individuals to be inclined toward EI. Self-efficacy not only directly affects EA and EI, but also mediates the effect of social capital. Thus, it is very important to enhance individuals’ self-efficacy by enhancing their opportunities. More specifically, the results are helpful for education policymakers to design curriculums according to the needs of students, and promote students’ self-efficacy by providing practical experience through introducing more incubation centers on university campuses. Moreover, through different workshops and training sessions, students can gain exposure to new ideas and interact with role models (BarNir, Watson, & Hutchins, 2011; Pajares & Schunk, 2001), which will boost their self-belief and encourage them toward EI. Similarly, given the large number of women in the population and dominant effect of social norms on women’s EI, women should be provided environments in which social norms can be promoted.

Moreover, the results indicated a significant effect of EI on entrepreneurial behavior, and these intentions were derived from the indirect effects of social capital via the mediation of self-efficacy and social norms. Thus, to promote EI, again, the educational sector and government should start encouraging activities to enhance positive social norms and an environment that supports high self-efficacy because, until these areas are strong, EI will not develop, even with robust social capital.

5.4. Recommendations for Future Research

At universities, students are not the only potential entrepreneurs; different reports have indicated that employees and academic staff may also be involved in entrepreneurial activities. Thus, future research may also investigate managerial and academic university staff. Moreover, this study only relied on the theoretical framework of the TPB and social capital to explain the role of social capital in the development of EI and entrepreneurial behavior. Thus, future research could study other theoretical frameworks, such as the theory of social learning, motivational theories, and expectancy theory, regarding EI and entrepreneurial behavior. In the university context, the current study only considered social capital, yet there are multiple university-related factors, such as research and development,
the availability of incubation centers, and entrepreneurial support. These factors could be studied by future research.

This study discovered gender differences while considering the effect of social capital and EI. Future research could also examine the moderating roles of age, education level, and field of study while identifying the effect of social capital and EI. Moreover, this study explored the multi-mediation effect on EI, while future research could consider the multidimensional constructs of the study model (Tsai et al., 2012). Likewise, the results indicated that the indirect effect of social capital on EA was strong, while the direct effect was weak. Future studies could explore the reasons for this phenomenon.

5.5. Conclusion

This study has demonstrated the effect of social capital on EI via multi-mediations in the context of a developing country. It has indicated a strong and significant indirect effect on EI through the mediation of self-efficacy and social norms. In addition, this study indicated that EI followed by EA leads to entrepreneurial behavior. Moreover, the mediation effects are moderated by gender in such a way that the effect of self-efficacy is similar for both genders, while the effect of EA is more inclined toward men than women. In contrast, social norms are more inductive for women than men. These results support the importance of promoting self-efficacy and social norms through different training approaches, and the need to enhance expertise in society to improve economic development through entrepreneurial ventures, especially in a developing country.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1

1. Gender: □ Male □ Female

2. Age: □ 15-20 Years □ 21-25 Years □ 26-30 Years
□ 31-35 years □ 36-40 Years □ More than 40 years

3. Current Educational Program: □ BS □ Masters □ MPhil/MS □ PHD □

4. Semester: ______________________

5. My Family (father, mother, brothers) Own business? Yes □ No □

6. Have you studied the Entrepreneurship Course? Yes □ No □

7. Do you have any role model in your family who is doing his own business?
Yes □ No □

8. Have you participated in any Entrepreneurship training/workshop?
Yes □ No □

Part-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am able to solve problems of business related matters.(SE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am able to make decisions in business related matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am able to manage money for business.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am creative in business related matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am able to make people agree with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am good being a leader.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My closest family thinks that I should start my own business.(SN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The expectations of my closest family are important to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. #</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My closest friends think that I should start my own business.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The expectations of my closest friends are important to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My fellow students think that I should start my own business.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The expectations of my fellow students are important to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other people who are close to me think that I should start my own business.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The expectations of other people who are close to me are important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Being an entrepreneur implies more advantages than disadvantages to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A career as entrepreneur is attractive for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>If I had the opportunity and resources, I’d like to start a firm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Being an entrepreneur would entail great satisfactions for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Among various options, I would rather be an entrepreneur.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My class fellows togetherness is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My class fellows feel very close to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>When we class fellows get together, everyone is present.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My class fellows ask each other for help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My university provides me with contacts with people that might help me with pursuing an entrepreneurial career.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>My university introduces me to business networks, providing contacts to potential business partners and/or customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My university provide me access to a distribution network for my intended company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am ready to do anything to be an entrepreneur.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My professional goal is to become an entrepreneur.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Questions</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>29</td>
<td>I will make every effort to start and run my own firm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am determined to create a firm in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have very seriously thought of starting a firm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I have the firm intention to start a firm someday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>How much effort have you given to activities aimed at starting a business in the last 12 months? (EB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>How much time have you used in activities aimed at starting a business in the last 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>How much money have you invested into activities aimed at starting a business in the last 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thanking You!**