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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to understand the factors and/or constructs that influence intent to pursue entrepreneurship. The study of entrepreneurship as a theoretical framework has increased significantly over the past two decades. Many undergraduate and graduate programs now have courses, majors, and minors dedicated to entrepreneurship education. Therefore, it is critical to understand what influences one to pursue entrepreneurship so that the most effective concepts can be taught. Eight major constructs were presented in this study to test their influence both directly and indirectly on intent: perceived desirability, perceived feasibility, subjective norm, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments, future unemployment, and creativity. Responses were collected via an online survey from 120 students with majors in textiles, apparel design, and merchandising. Of the responses received, 102 were deemed usable. Exploratory factory analysis was used to test the significance of the data. Perceived desirability and perceived feasibility were shown to have a direct influence on intent. All other factors were tested to see if they impacted desirability and/or feasibility. Only subjective norm was found to effect both perceived desirability and perceived feasibility. Significance was also found between perceived feasibility and entrepreneurial self-efficacy and future unemployment. No correlation was found between perceived desirability and/or perceived feasibility and prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments, or creativity. The results strengthen previous literature on the major factors that influence entrepreneurial intent. Future research should focus on surveying students mid and post degree to gage intent to pursue self-employment.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In 2007, the United States experienced an economic downturn of exponential proportion. It was the largest of such events since the Great Depression and ushered in a time of job loss and gross domestic product decline (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2011). From 2007-2009, 8.7 million jobs were eliminated (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014) and consumer spending declined drastically (Petev, Pistaferri, & Saporta, 2012). In succession with The Great Recession of 2007, the unemployment rate for college graduates increased considerably. A study conducted by the John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development in 2011 found that only 53% of the college graduates studied were employed full time (Godofsky, Zukin, & Horn, 2011). Today, that number has increased significantly. According to 2015 data from the National Center for Education Statistics, the employment percent of young adults, those between the ages of 20-24, with a college degree reached a peak of 89%. However, this number is marked with fallacies in that 44% of university degree holders can be considered underemployed (Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, 2016).

A college degree once meant a guarantee for job security but during the last decade, this supposed known fact has proven false. The job market is more competitive with some college graduates having turned to entrepreneurship as an answer. There are situations that may push someone into entrepreneurship and these include not only future unemployment, but also the need for work life balance and having been exposed to entrepreneurship in the past. Self-employment is important to not only the individual starting the business, but also to the economy. In fact, the majority of new ventures started are small businesses. These businesses create sixty-five percent of the net new jobs in the United States, make up over ninety-nine
percent of all employers, and employ about fifty percent of all private sector workers (United States Small Business Administration, 2012). When one is deemed unemployable by prospective employers, creating a business for one’s self may be the answer. Many college graduates have also found entrepreneurship to be a more lucrative career path than working for someone else because the average pay for a newly hired graduate decreased from $30,000 in 2007 to $27,000 in 2010 (Godofsky et al., 2011). Since then, pay has risen consistently and according to data from the National Association of Colleges and Employers, graduating seniors of 2016 have seen a salary increase of 3.6% over 2015; from $50,651 to $52,569. It’s critical to include that the reported increase is due to an increase in the top five earning degrees and that starting salaries vary considerably by college major. Despite this increase, many college graduates find themselves faced with underemployment once schooling ends and their careers begin.

Although entrepreneurship is a viable option for newly graduated college students, many may not pursue this endeavor because of the challenges and obstacles inherent for those who try. With a business failure rate of 50% within the first five years (United States Small Business Administration, 2012), students must be taught the necessary skills of how to survive in a highly competitive market.

Believing in one’s ability to succeed is critical in any task. This belief is often referred to as self-efficacy and can be defined as a person’s belief in whether he or she can complete a task (BarNir, Watson, & Hutchins, 2011). Self-efficacy has been associated with varying subjects ranging from academic outcomes to exercise behavior. A positive correlation has been found between not only self-efficacy and academic outcomes (Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991) but also self-efficacy and exercise maintenance (McAuley, 1993).
Entrepreneurial self-efficacy was developed as a construct to further specialize self-efficacy and to test a person’s belief in whether he or she can complete the tasks necessary to open a business (McGee, Peterson, Mueller, & Sequeira, 2009). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy affects entrepreneurial intent, action, and varying other behaviors.

Training may help to increase self-efficacy, which in turn may increase one’s desire and ability to pursue entrepreneurship. Garavan and O’Cinneide (1994) agree that there is a critical role for the teaching and training of entrepreneurship, and the theory of planned behavior shows that perceived behavioral control, which is closely linked to self-efficacy, influences intent to perform an action. Increasing self-efficacy is definitely important for those who wish to pursue an entrepreneurial career in the fashion industry because fashion life cycles change constantly and there is a constant demand for new and fresh design concepts. Having only a desire to pursue entrepreneurship in the fashion field is not enough, students must feel confident in his or her ability to do so successfully. One must be aware of the fashion product life cycle, along with lead times and merchandising techniques. For fledgling fashion designers, Fatt (2001) recommends practical experience, seeking the services of professionals, expanding overseas or finding a niche market, acquiring skill, and advertising.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

Entrepreneurship is a viable option for students with majors in textiles, apparel design, and merchandising. With eBay and Amazon at a student’s fingertips, a fashion business can be started with a small amount of overhead and material. However, students need the appropriate amount of efficacy in his or her ability to accomplish setting up a fashion business and must also be able to see entrepreneurship as another option upon graduation.
Previous research tends to focus on students majoring in business. In order to understand where to go with training and education in entrepreneurship, it must be determined what role, if any, a student’s major plays on intent and what primary constructs and substructs should be taken into consideration when desiring to increase entrepreneurial intent.

1.3 Research Objectives

The research objectives of this study are listed as follows:

(1) To examine the relationship between entrepreneurial intent and perceived desirability and perceived feasibility among college students with majors in textiles, apparel design, and merchandising.

(2) To examine the relationship between subjective norm and perceived feasibility and perceived desirability.

(3) To examine the relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and perceived feasibility and perceived desirability.

(4) To examine the relationship between prior exposure to entrepreneurship and perceived feasibility and perceived desirability.

(5) To examine the relationship between future family commitments and perceived feasibility and perceived desirability.

(6) To examine the relationship between future unemployment and perceived feasibility and perceived desirability.

(7) To examine the relationship between creativity and perceived feasibility and perceived desirability.
1.4 Limitations

The major limitation of this study is generalizability. The fashion major students tested will be those from a major university in a southern area and will not be generalizable to students of other universities. Similar studies at historically black colleges and universities, community colleges, and online universities may produce different results. Another limitation of the study could include social desirability bias. Students may feel the need to exaggerate their self-efficacy or ability to accomplish certain tasks often undertaken by entrepreneurs. This could be because of a desire to please the researcher or a desire to inflate his or her skill. Another response bias that is likely is acquiescence response set. This bias is often associated with the use of Likert scales because respondents have the tendency to give a response of agreement to a question even if he or she feels the opposite (Singleton & Straits, 2010).

A fourth limitation may involve the results. Even if the research objectives are found to be significant, further research may be needed to test actual action. A person’s intent to pursue entrepreneurship does not necessarily equate to action to start a business upon graduation or in the years to come.

1.5 Definition of Terms

Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy – “strength of a person’s belief that he or she is capable of successfully performing the various roles of entrepreneurship” (Chen, Greene, and Crick, 1998, p. 295).

Entrepreneurship – the starting of a new business venture and the exploiting of opportunities to create new products and services (Kao, 1993).

Fashion-Entrepreneurship – The start of a new venture in the fashion industry.
Fashion Industry – Any and all products and services associated with the fashion sector (Fatt, 2001, p. 72)

Fashion Major - any college major or concentration in textile science, apparel design, and fashion merchandising.

Self-Efficacy - a person’s belief in whether he or she can complete a task.

Intent - motivation to perform action. (Dependent Variable)
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 About Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship Defined

The true definition of entrepreneurship has eluded researchers for quite some time. According to Shane and Venkataraman (2000), it is not as easily definable as some researchers have suggested. Hebert and Link (1989) suggest that those in academia and economists alike have failed to clearly define an unambiguous term for entrepreneurship. Mars (2016) studied innovation and entrepreneurship and also noted that the true term of entrepreneurship is obscure in meaning and hasn’t been fully explored. John Freeman, one of the original researchers on entrepreneurship, chose to define it as the study of businesses that are newly opened (Engel & Teece, 2012). Freeman made this distinction because he believed that corporate institutions tend to stifle out of the box thinking not based on the businesses starting strategy, which in turn tends to hinder true entrepreneurial thought (Engel & Teece, 2012). During the first stage of his study, Gartner (1990) sent out questionnaires to various leaders in academia and business asking how they define entrepreneurship and, of those who participated, found no single definition for the term. Therefore, one must ask, is entrepreneurship simply the starting of a new business enterprise or must the definition dig deeper and possibly include how the business actually contributes to society? Shane and Venkataraman (2000) concluded that it is not merely the starting of a new business venture, but a description of the entrepreneur and the process in which opportunities are pursued. This definition embodies not only who the entrepreneur is but also how he or she chooses to pursue entrepreneurship and the opportunities available.

Eckhardt and Shane (2003), define entrepreneurship as “situations in which new goods, services, raw materials, markets and organizing methods can be introduced through the
formation of new means, ends, or means-ends relationships” (p.337). This definition is concerned with the opportunities that exist for someone to pursue entrepreneurship. Within academia, Venkataraman (1997) concluded that it would be inaccurate to define entrepreneurship by defining the entrepreneur. Instead, Venkataraman (1997) suggested that we “seek to understand how opportunities to bring into existence future goods and services are discovered, created, and exploited, by whom and with what consequences” (p. 120.) Similar to the previous definition, this one focuses on more than just the entrepreneur. It is clear that from the above definitions, defining entrepreneurship is not an easy task.

Kao (1993) noted that the definition should include not only an increase of monetary funds for the business owner, but also for the community and for the economy: this way, illegal activity cannot be considered a type of entrepreneurship. This particular definition is critical because it suggests that simply starting a new business enterprise is not enough. The business should help society and if it does not, it does not deserve the title of entrepreneurship.

Despite a plethora of definitions for entrepreneurship, several researchers have found themes in their quest for the optimal classification of the term. Hebert and Link (1989) found that entrepreneurs take on the roles of investor, creator, negotiator, and supervisor, among many others. Gartner (1990) found the following eight themes within his research:

“The Entrepreneur. The entrepreneur theme is the idea that entrepreneurship involves individuals with unique personality characteristics and abilities.

Innovation. The innovation theme is characterized as doing something new as an idea, product, service, market, or technology in a new or established organization.

Organization Creation. The organization creation theme described the behaviors involved in creating organizations.

Creating Value. This theme articulated the idea that entrepreneurship creates value.
Profit or Nonprofit. The profit/nonprofit theme is concerned with whether entrepreneurship involves profit-making organizations only.

Growth. At issue in this theme is the importance of growth as a characteristic of entrepreneurship.

Uniqueness. This theme suggested that entrepreneurship must involve uniqueness.

The Owner-Manager. This theme suggested that entrepreneurship involves individuals who are owners and managers of their businesses.” (p. 16)

Despite differences in the definition of entrepreneurship, similar themes do exist and it is apparent that the entrepreneur must play varying roles throughout his or her business ownership. Often times, entrepreneurship and small business management are considered one in the same. Business owners in many communities are considered entrepreneurs. It is often assumed that one who starts a small business, whether full or part time, is an entrepreneur. Carland, Hoy, Boulton, & Carland (1984) note that one must distinguish between entrepreneurship and small business management. They conclude that small business owners are motivated by his or her aspirations while entrepreneurs are motivated by one major factor, gaining revenue. According to these definitions, small business owners are not necessarily entrepreneurs.

One can go even further when defining entrepreneurship by distinguishing between social and corporate entrepreneurship. According to Dees (1998), the goal of the social entrepreneur is his charity and the financial aspect of the business allows the social entrepreneur to dedicate more time and resources to his cause. With this definition, one can see that profit is not the main goal of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs measure business success through the success of his or her mission or main goal. Jennings and Lumpkin (1989) define corporate entrepreneurship as “the extent as to which new products and/or new markets are developed: an organization is entrepreneurial if it develops a higher than average number of new products
and/or new markets” (p. 489). Corporate entrepreneurship does not require social responsibility but it does require innovation and a constantly changing environment. It is not enough for a company to just sell a product. The company must also innovate what it sells and how it sells it to be considered entrepreneurial. Research for this literature review is not concerned with corporate entrepreneurship, but it is important to include definitions of both social and corporate entrepreneurship to show how extensive the definition of entrepreneurship really is.

Shane and Venkataraman (2000) concluded that entrepreneurship should include not only the starting of a new business venture but also the opportunities that are exploited to create new products and services. Kao (1993) concluded that the definition should include creating wealth and adding value to society. By combing these two definitions, we get the scope of what entrepreneurship entails.

For the purpose of this study, small business development and management will be considered entrepreneurship. The primary objective of this paper is to test the factors that influence intent to start a business among college students in the fashion area. Businesses that would be started soon after these students graduate from college, or even while they are in school, may very well be a small business because in the beginning stages of various ventures, the owner may be the only employee. It is not a desire of this study to exclude any new business venture, whether large or small. It may not be probable for an individual to start a business that can support multiple employees due to funding issues. According to the United States Small Business Administration (2011), some small businesses can be created for under $3,000. It is understandable that a business owner may not be able to employ others on such a tight budget. For this reason, businesses of any size will be considered entrepreneurial. When discussing
entrepreneurship, it is critical to also include the argument of whether entrepreneurs are born or made. The next section will explore this debate in greater detail.

Are Entrepreneurs Born or Made?

Are entrepreneurs just born to seek out possible opportunities to exploit for financial gain or can entrepreneurs be created through the exposure of entrepreneurship classes, seminars, competition and the like? Many researchers have been in quest to find the answer to this particular question. Flora (2006) suggested that the following characteristics are typically inherent in individuals who seek out entrepreneurship: nonconformity, self-efficacy, achievement motivation, preference for innovation, and low uncertainty avoidance. She studied whether a rural or urban environment is more conducive of entrepreneurship and found that by combining education, technical assistance, and financing, entrepreneurship can occur in either environment (Flora, 2006). However, the question still remains whether one is simply born with the natural traits of an entrepreneur or if these skills can be taught.

Henderson and Robertson (2000) suggested that although imagination, perseverance, and the ability to think outside the box are associated with those who pursue entrepreneurship, it is critical not to underestimate the role of actual training. Many respondents of their study, young adults in the United Kingdom between the ages of nineteen and twenty-five, still found entrepreneurship to be outside the realm of achievement (Henderson & Robertson, 2000). Because of this, students must be made aware that entrepreneurship is attainable and that he or she can be taught the logical steps that are necessary to start and run a business (Henderson & Robertson, 2000).

Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) note that the media often portrays entrepreneurs as embodying unattainable characteristics that are clearly not inherent in all individuals and that
readers are drawn to this type of information not only because it is easy to comprehend, but also because these entrepreneurs exemplify desired characteristics. Although the authors do not delve into whether the showcase of this type of entrepreneur is in fact deceptive, research by Etzkowitz gives a different perspective.

When discussing whether entrepreneurs are born or made, Etzkowitz (2003) writes that contrary to the assumption that culture and religion play major roles in the pursuit of new venture formation, entrepreneurship can occur for both individuals and groups with differing beliefs and experiences as long as preparation occurs. Therefore, one’s culture is less relevant than whether one has had formal training in entrepreneurship to produce success. Training is key and lends one to believe that entrepreneurs can in fact be made. Now that general entrepreneurship has been defined and the decision has been made that entrepreneurship can be taught, the next section will define the theory of planned behavior.

2.2 The Theory of Planned Behavior and Research Framework

The theory of planned behavior is a social cognitive theory developed by Icek Azjen. It concludes that behavior can be predicted through intention and that intention is composed of three specific factors: attitude toward the behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control. Before these factors are discussed in greater detail, it is imperative to include that the theory of planned behavior is an extension of the theory of reasoned action.

The theory of reasoned action suggests that intention to perform a given act is dependent upon one’s belief of a predetermined end result (Madden, Ellen & Ajzen, 1992). It is made up of three components: behavioral beliefs, perceived norm, and perceived behavioral control. Behavioral belief can be defined as an individual’s predisposition toward a pre-determined end result (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). Perceived norm is dependent upon the influences of family,
friends, and acquaintances and how these individuals see the end result of a certain action, while perceived behavioral control is dependent on whether a person believes that she has the necessary resources, skills, etc. to carry out the desired task or outcome (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). It is easy to see how the theory of planned behavior builds upon the theory of reasoned action. Now that it is understood where the theory of planned behavior originated, the following paragraphs in this section will look at research conducted on the model.

Carr and Sequeira (2007) used the theory of planned behavior to examine the influence of one’s familiarity with family business ownership on intent to pursue entrepreneurship and concluded that yes, family business ownership does in fact correlate to not only intent, but also attitude, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and subjective norm. All of which are integral parts of the decision to move beyond thought and into action. Mokhtar & Zainuddin (2016) surveyed 88 engineering and accounting graduating seniors in Malaysia and, like many previous researchers, found that subjective norm, perceived behavioral control, and attitude toward the behavior did have a positive effect on student intent to own a business.

Kautonen, Gelderen & Tornikoski (2013) took the theory of planned behavior a step further, a feat which had not been previously conducted, to study its actual impact on behavior. The authors noted that a plethora of research had been conducted on intent with a serious gap exhibited in action itself. The authors conducted a study of individuals in Finland, once in November 2006 and again in November 2009, and found that the theory of planned behavior is in fact an adequate indicator of entrepreneurial intention. This research is important because it goes beyond theory and further shows that intent is linked to behavior.

Van Gelderen et al. (2008) studied a group of business students to determine the relationship between the theory of planned behavior and entrepreneurship. One particularly
An interesting fact included in the article was that most business students leave university without having a clearly defined career path, with the exception of those studying accounting (Van Gelderen et al., 2008). This is interesting to note because these students, even after receiving a degree, must now delve into what exactly he or she wants to do with it. In the midst of this determination, entrepreneurship should be an option. The authors found that financial security and entrepreneurial alertness, the ability to detect and find entrepreneurial business ventures, had the greatest influence on entrepreneurial intention (Van Gelderen et al., 2008).

Gird and Bagraim (2008) conducted research on undergraduate South African students to determine if the following four factors influenced the theory of planned behavior’s effect on entrepreneurial intent: personality traits, situational factors, prior exposure to entrepreneurship, and demographics. The authors concluded that the theory of planned behavior is the greater indicator of intent. They also concluded that only subfactors of three of the above main factors influenced the theory of planned behavior. When discussing demographics, gender was the only substruct to find correlation. Pertaining to prior exposure, only business ownership showed significance. For situational factors, whether an individual had the ability to obtain financial and business resources and an audience to sell to all played a role. Like previous research, this study confirmed that the theory of planned behavior influences intent and that other variables can influence the theory of planned behavior.

The Malaysian Government enacted various collegiate programs to promote entrepreneurship (Ariff et al. 2010). However, despite the opportunities put into place, students did not respond with enthusiasm. The authors conducted research on Malaysian graduating seniors who majored in accounting in order to determine their intent for pursuing entrepreneurship. The authors found that intent to pursue entrepreneurship increased from the
date of graduation. Intent was considered low for students upon graduation but significantly increased five years after graduation. The authors also found perceived behavioral control to be the greatest indicator of intent.

Do Paço et al (2011) studied the way in which entrepreneurship is taught in different countries. Noticing a gap in the study of entrepreneurial intentions of high school students, the authors conducted research on high school students involved in an entrepreneurship pilot program. Using the theory of planned behavior as the basis for their hypotheses, the authors found only subjective norm to be an insignificant predictor of intention. Perceived behavioral control and attitude toward the behavior were found to be significant (Do Paço et al. 2011). The authors did conclude that the changing of student attitudes to positively reflect entrepreneurship should be the main basis for entrepreneurship education (Do Paço et al. 2011).

Steinmetz, Knappstein, Ajzen, Schmidt and Kabst (2016) analyzed 82 journal articles that used the theory of planned behavior to test varying intention models that ranged from substance abuse to exercise routines. The authors found that the theory significantly affected outcomes for most of the evaluated journal articles. Now that the theory of planned behavior has been discussed extensively, the next section will examine intent.

Krueger, Reilly, and Carsrud (2000) compared Azjen’s theory of planned behavior and Shapero’s model of the entrepreneurial event and found that “intentions are the single best predictor of any planned behavior, including entrepreneurship” (p. 412). If intention does in fact breed action, then the study of intent is very likely to give accurate information on an individual’s future endeavors concerning a specified topic.

Prodan and Drnovsek (2010) studied academic spin-offs, the development of technological ventures following academic studies, and found that “entrepreneurial self-efficacy,
type of research, perceived role models, number of years spent at the academic institution, and patents are significantly related to formation of academic-entrepreneurial intentions regardless of cultural context” (p. 341). From this research, evidence is supported that entrepreneurial self-efficacy, along with other factors, does in fact influence intention and that education does help. This research teaches us that not only does entrepreneurial self-efficacy have a major role in intention but also education.

Brice and Spencer (2007) found that the degree of entrepreneurial intent that an individual possesses can determine what factors he or she considers necessary for entrepreneurship. This research is important because it shows that intent determines more than just behavior. It can also determine the importance of one’s thoughts when pursuing entrepreneurship. Kautonen, Gelderen and Fink (2015) sought to test the effectiveness of the theory of planned behavior as pertaining to intent and subsequent action by surveying its Austrian and Finnish participants at two different times and found the theory to be valid in predicting intent.

The Theory of Planned Behavior clearly states that intent determines behavior and that intent is in turn determined by the following three factors: attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1991). The authors define attitude toward the behavior as the positive or negative attitude that an individual demonstrates toward a particular action, while subjective norm is defined as the outside influences that a person feels encourage or discourage an individual to take action (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived behavioral control is closely correlated with self-efficacy and is defined as the level of complexity that an individual believes it will take to perform an action (Ajzen, 1991).
The theory of planned behavior is important to literature on intent because it gives an understanding into what factors influence intent and how intent then influences action. If the factors that influence intention can be determined for any given study, then one can learn how to impact the desired outcome. This is precisely what this research seeks to decipher. It is my hypotheses that not only do the major constructs of the theory of planned behavior influence intent both directly and indirectly, but also additional substructs. The below figure provides a visualization of this framework.

![Diagram of the Theory of Planned Behavior](image)

**Figure 1: Fashion-Domain Based Entrepreneurial Framework**

The basis of all of the listed research remains the same: find what influences the intent to perform an action and in essence, learn how to create and/or manipulate that intent. The next section will dig deeper into each aspect that makes up the Theory of Planned Behavior.
2.3 Attitude Toward the Behavior: Perceived Desirability and Perceived Feasibility

Attitude toward the behavior is one major construct that makes up the theory of planned behavior. It is the notion that someone has toward a given outcome, regardless of whether that notion is positive or negative (Ajzen, 1991). Ross, Laing & Parle (2015) defined attitude toward the behavior as one’s initial reaction to an analyzed or tested goal. In this study, we conceptualized attitude into two dimensions, desirability, and feasibility based on functional attitude theory (Katz, 1960), which specifies that individual attitudes are formed and function for different purposes including utilitarian and affective purposes. We conceptualized desirability as affective attitude, and feasibility as utilitarian attitude.

Krueger (1993) defined feasibility as the belief, that one holds, that entrepreneurship can be attained. The author defined desirability as one’s desire/wish to pursue entrepreneurship. Krueger (1993) tested 126 business students in their junior and senior year of study and found that intention to start a business is positively associated with feasibility. Peterman & Kennedy (2003) chose to study the perceived feasibility and desirability of adolescents with exposure to entrepreneurship teachings. The authors studied high school students involved in a program that teaches youth about the components of entrepreneurship. After testing the students, along with a control group, both before and after the program was complete, the authors found that the program did promote an increase in feasibility and desirability for those students involved in the entrepreneurship program (Peterman & Kennedy, 2003). This research can lead us to believe that not only can entrepreneurship be taught, but also that one’s feasibility and desirability to pursue starting and/or owning a business can be both influenced and increased. This conclusion is critical because it allows one to understand the impact of knowledge on intention to pursue a desired outcome. For the purpose of this research, it allows us to see the impact that a semester
long class can have on students. As previously stated, if entrepreneurship can be seen as a viable option, then and only then will students consider pursuing owning his or her own business.

Krueger & Brazil (1994) stated that “Before there can be entrepreneurship there must be the potential for entrepreneurship…” This potential for entrepreneurship is precisely where feasibility, along with desirability, comes into play and where we’re allowed to see the impact that these two constructs really have. If an individual can foresee a business endeavor as being attainable, then the hurdles of entrepreneurship may not seem so daunting. Dealing with an increased amount of unemployment, Shiri, Mohammadi & Hosseini (2012) studied the desirability of entrepreneurship on university students in Iran. The author’s note that entrepreneurship isn’t typically viewed as a respectable field of employment because of the country’s culture. Parents and friends find admiration in career fields that include medicine and politics (Shiri, et al. 2012). The author’s did find a significant relationship between the intention to pursue entrepreneurship and students’ desirability and found that this construct was the most significant of all variables.

Minola, Criaco, and Obschonka (2016) used data collected from over 14,000 people in 21 countries to test the impact of age and culture on desirability and feasibility to start a business. The authors found that not only do feasibility and desirability influence intent, but also that age is directly correlated with the two constructs. Therefore, younger respondents had a more favorable attitude toward feasibility and desirability than older respondents. This is critical to my research because if college aged students can be considered more susceptible to start their own businesses due to their age, then at that juncture they need to be exposed to training and seminars.
Guerrero, Rialp & Urbano (2006) conducted their study on university students in Spain. These students were classified into three groups: those with entrepreneurship type majors, those without, and those with engineering majors. The authors desired to test the feasibility and desirability of small business creation on all groups. They found that 77% of students found entrepreneurship to be desirable while only 30% considered it feasible. Also, student characteristics were consistent among both groups. The authors concluded that when grouping students by major, both desirability and feasibility are significant. However, both feasibility and desirability were found to be greater among students with entrepreneurship type majors. It is not difficult to comprehend that students with entrepreneurship majors would have a higher feasibility and desirability. These students are more likely to desire to start a business. The gap exists in those students who are not entrepreneurship majors. These students need to know that entrepreneurship is an option.

Kennedy, Drennan, Renfrow, & Watson (2003) used a total of 1,075 freshman students in their research to test desirability and feasibility and their impact on entrepreneurial intentions. They found significant results and this research is used as the basis of my research to test both feasibility and desirability. This leads to the first set of hypotheses:

H1: (a) desirability and (b) feasibility will positively affect intent toward pursuing entrepreneurship.

2.4 Subjective Norm

Subjective Norm is one of three critical parts that make up the theory of planned behavior. Azjen (1991) defined subjective norm as “the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior” (p. 188). Therefore, subjective norm is essentially the impact that an individual’s friends, family and acquaintances will have on his or her actions.
Souitaris, Zerbinati & Laham (2007) concluded that the more positive an individual’s subjective norm, the more likely she is to act. They tested the theory of planned behavior on science and engineering students in the United Kingdom and France. The authors focused on entrepreneurship education over a five-month period and chose to include a control group in their research. The hypothesis that subjective norm would be increased for those students who took an entrepreneurship course was found to be significant.

Byabashaija & Katono (2011) studied university students in Uganda who were taking an entrepreneurship course and noted that, in general, it is considered unfavorable to pursue business ownership. The authors hypothesized that subjective norm would have an impact on not only a student’s desirability and feasibility but also his self-efficacy. While the effect of subjective norm on desirability and feasibility was supported and increased from the beginning of the study to afterwards, its effect on self-efficacy was not. From this research, we can see that not only does an individual’s circle influence a person’s desire to pursue entrepreneurship but also that subjective norm has an impact on desirability and feasibility. This research supports the Fashion-Domain Based Entrepreneurial Framework listed on page seventeen because it supports the notion that subjective norm positively influences feasibility and desirability.

Research by Byabashaija & Katono (2011) tells us that if an individual’s family and friends consider business ownership to be a good thing, then his or her perception on whether or not they have the necessary skills & ability to do so is affected. This also applies to desirability. If one’s family perceives entrepreneurship as a positive endeavor, then one’s desire to own a business is viewed more favorably. The following authors studied subjective norm on individuals with prior business exposure.
Carr & Sequeira (2007) defined subjective norm as “perceived family support” (p. 1091). The authors did not use students to test their research but used locals from a city who were part of different business or social groups or those who had willingly participated in small business courses. Not only did the authors find sufficient evidence that prior business exposure does have a positive impact on intent but also that perceived family support has a correlation to entrepreneurial intent. This particular research gives a glimpse into the role that others play in one’s desire to pursue business ownership.

Dinc and Budic (2016) used the theory of planned behavior to test the influence of gender on intent to own a business. The authors surveyed 216 Bosnian women and discovered that although subjective norm didn’t influence intent, it did impact the other two constructs that comprise the theory planned behavior: perceived behavioral control and attitudes toward the behavior. Even when taking this research into account, subjective norm may not have influenced intent but it did influence other factors that influenced intent. Therefore, it can still be considered to play a critical role in the research on entrepreneurial intent. Bagheri and Pihie (2015) surveyed 722 Malaysian university students with varying majors and also found that subjective norm did not have a significant effect on entrepreneurial intent. The authors did find, however, that subjective norm had a significant effect on both perceived behavioral control and attitude toward the behavior. This reinforces my previous conclusion that even when subjective norm does not directly influence intent, it still serves a purpose indirectly by affecting other constructs that do have a direct influence on intent.

Kennedy, Drennan, Renfrow, & Watson (2003) looked at students to determine the impact of subjective norm on feasibility and desirability to pursue entrepreneurship and found a
positive correlation for both substructs. Their research was used as the basis for the testing of subjective norm in my research, which leads to the second set of hypotheses:

H2: Subjective norm will positively affect (a) desirability and; b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship in the fashion area.

2.5 Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy as Perceived Behavioral Control

Perceived behavioral control, like previously stated, encompasses whether or not an individual perceives him or herself as having the necessary skills to obtain a desired outcome (Ajzen, 1991). I have included entrepreneurial self-efficacy as a substruct because it is similar in nature to perceived behavioral control. The next section will discuss this element further.

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy derived from self-efficacy, which must be defined first. According to BarNir, Watson, & Hutchins (2011), self-efficacy can be defined as whether or not individuals believe that they have the ability to complete a task. Wang, Chang, Yao and Liang (2016) made sure to note in their definition of self-efficacy that it is dependent on having an end result that is positive. Prat-Sala & Redford (2010) suggest that individuals with a high self-efficacy are more likely to view a complex issue as taxing. Self-efficacy can pertain to any task, and research has been conducted on self-efficacy and mathematical problem solving, computer literacy, weight loss, pain relief, arthritis, breastfeeding, work-performance, academic motivation, newcomer adjustments to organizations, parenting quality, control over AID’s infection, and countless other subjects. It is apparent that self-efficacy has a significant effect on whether a person can accomplish a desired outcome or refrain from a negative one.

Zhao, Seibert & Hills (2005) define self-efficacy as the reason that people seek to obtain certain accomplishments and the amount of time and resources that are exerted when attempting to reach said accomplishments. These authors also note that a person’s self-efficacy is possibly
influenced by the following four characteristics: enactive mastery, role modeling and vicarious experience, social persuasion and judgments of one’s physiological state (Zhao et al., 2005). Markman, Baron & Balkin (2005) note that self-efficacy has a direct influence on not only how a person reacts to the inevitable trials and hardships that occur when attempting to accomplish a goal, but also whether the outcome actually materializes.

Wilson, Kickul & Marlino (2007) correlate the definition of self-efficacy with that of self-confidence and define self-efficacy as one’s perceptions of his or her abilities and skills. They conclude that a person can have a higher self-efficacy in one trait than in another and that self-efficacy correlates with one’s career choice (Wilson et al., 2007). A person’s self-efficacy plays a role in how he or she sees him or herself and what career choice he or she will pursue. Career choice can include whether or not an individual chooses to pursue entrepreneurship, and research has been conducted to explore the role that self-efficacy plays on entrepreneurial intention and subsequent action.

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy is clearly an extension of self-efficacy, and according to Chen, Greene and Crick (1998), it can be defined as whether or not an individual believes that he or she has the skills to pursue self-employment. McGee, Peterson, Mueller, and Sequeira (2009) define the term a little more precisely and note that the belief is whether individuals feel they have the ability to actually bring the business to fruition. The definition of entrepreneurial self-efficacy remains the same, whether or not a person perceives him or herself as having the necessary characteristics to pursue starting or owning a business. Because entrepreneurial self-efficacy is dependent on how people view themselves, it can be seen how it fits into the perceived behavioral control construct.
Chen et al. (1998) also concluded that entrepreneurial self-efficacy contains the following five aspects: marketing, innovation, management, risk-taking, and financial control. It is clear that entrepreneurial self-efficacy encompasses more than just one’s belief; the necessary skill set must also be present or obtained. McGee et al. (2009) note the importance of researching entrepreneurial self-efficacy because it includes a study of both personality and environmental factors. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy research is imperative because it researches more than just whether individuals think that they can start a business. This research also encompasses whether individuals have the adequate resources, skills and characteristics to pursue a business venture. Kickul, Gundry, Barbosa and Whitcanack (2009) propose that entrepreneurial self-efficacy enlightens one to the characteristics that he or she may be lacking so that these characteristics can be honed or outsourced and entrepreneurship can begin.

Forbes (2005) writes that understanding entrepreneurial self-efficacy is critical because it not only tests the willingness of a person to pursue entrepreneurship, but also proves important to those who have started and continue to manage a business. Koenig (2016) surveyed 324 Croatian undergraduate students to test the effect of entrepreneurial self-efficacy on intent, sport participation and organization membership. The author found a significance between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and not only intent to pursue self-employment but also sport participation and organization membership. This research allows us to deduce that entrepreneurial self-efficacy influences intent and that it may be able to be increased by extracurricular activities.

Hallam, Zanella, Dosamantes and Cardenas (2016) tested the impact of entrepreneurial self-efficacy on short and long term entrepreneurial intent on 1,046 students from the United States, Mexico and Spain. The authors found a correlation between efficacy and both short-term
and long-term intent. Short term was defined as entering self-employment upon graduation while long term was defined as a foreseeable time in the future. This research is vital because it indicates the clear role that self-efficacy has on intent. By increasing efficacy, we can increase intent to start a business in the near and distant future.

Hmieleski & Corbett (2008) studied improvisational behavior and entrepreneurial self-efficacy’s effect on new venture performance and work satisfaction. The authors wanted to examine how an entrepreneur’s ability to improvise is linked to success in continuing to manage a new venture and satisfaction in doing so. Their results found that an increase in entrepreneurial self-efficacy does in fact play a positive role between improvisational behavior and new venture formation but has no direct correlation to work satisfaction (Hmieleski & Corbett, 2008).

Kickul et al. (2009) segmented entrepreneurial intent into four sections: searching, planning, marshalling, and implementing. The searching section focused on whether a student believed they could drum up business ideas, and the planning section dealt with whether students could create an actual business plan. The marshalling section pinpointed whether students could find monetary resources to support their business while the implementing section concentrated on whether students could physically start and run a new venture. The authors surveyed 138 MBA students and found a correlation between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intent at each stage. If a person can actually see him or herself pursuing entrepreneurship, then he or she is more likely to do so (Wilson et al., 2007). Increasing entrepreneurial self-efficacy will in turn increase an individual’s belief that entrepreneurship can occur (Krueger et al., 2000).

This is the basis for the third hypothesis:

H3: Entrepreneurial self-efficacy is positively associated with (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship.
2.6 Situational Factors: Prior Exposure to Entrepreneurship, Future Family Commitments, Future Unemployment and Creativity

Situational factors can be defined as external events or influences that lead individuals toward entrepreneurship (Kennedy et al., 2003). These factors can have either a positive or negative connotation (Kennedy et al., 2003) but the end result, entrepreneurship, remains the same. Situational factors make self-employment an option when it may or may not have been considered one before. For the purposes of this study, prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments, future unemployment and creativity are all considered situational factors. Prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments and future unemployment are all external factors that can cause a person to look to entrepreneurship as an option. Creativity is a situational factor in that it allows someone to think of new and innovative ideas that may “push” him or her to pursue business formation. The next sections will explain, in detail, each of these sub structs.

Prior Exposure to Entrepreneurship

This section investigates the influence that entrepreneurial exposure plays on predisposing one to start a business. This early exposure includes being employed by not only family members but also others who own a small business. Zapkau, Schwens, Steinmetz, & Kabst (2015) used the theory of planned behavior to test the influence that prior exposure had on entrepreneurial intent on a mix of German university students and individuals who had settled into a career. They found two specific findings, which are critical to this study. First, the authors concluded that having a parent who owned a small business influenced subjective norm but not behavioral control or one’s preference toward entrepreneurship. However, working for a small business had an opposite effect. These individuals had a greater desirability and feasibility toward entrepreneurship, along with a more positive attitude about starting a business. This
research guides us to believe that prior exposure, regardless of the extent, has an influence on intent to pursue entrepreneurship.

Mueller, Zapkau, and Schwens (2014) added a different element to this theory and used the theory of planned behavior to suggest that culture is a requirement for intent to start a business. They defined different cultures as having either an individualistic or collective mindset. Surveying students from both Ethiopia and Germany, the authors concluded that although culture had no direct link on attitude and subjective norm, perceived behavioral control was found to be an adequate predictor. German students, who are associated with a more individualistic culture, had a lower desirability and feasibility to pursue entrepreneurship when compared to their Ethiopian counterparts. This research tells us that not only can prior exposure have an impact but also the type of exposure. Collective cultures, like that of Ethiopia, nurture individuals to believe that entrepreneurship is a feasible and desirable career path. Germany, on the other hand, has a more individualistic culture where citizens are encouraged to pursue what interests them, which doesn’t produce a substantial amount of aspiration toward entrepreneurship.

Carr & Sequeira (2007) looked only at the construct of prior exposure through the lens of family ownership and tested the impact that it would have on intent to pursue entrepreneurship. They found that it can play a significant role. The authors tested their hypotheses using a random sample of 308 people in a large city within the southwestern portion of the United States. The authors concluded that the greater the extent of prior familial entrepreneurial exposure, the greater one’s intent to pursue entrepreneurship. This research, combined with the research previously presented, supports the theory that prior business exposure, whether through a relative or other means, does in fact have an impact on entrepreneurial intent.
Peterman & Kennedy (2003) tested the effect of prior entrepreneurial exposure on desirability and feasibility using students involved in a five-month Australian business program. The authors found that students who had a positive previous experience with entrepreneurship did show a desire to pursue entrepreneurship, but this was not the case for feasibility. Although this research did not find significant results between prior exposure and either feasibility or desirability, other research has found correlations, which leads to my fourth hypothesis:

H4: Prior exposure to entrepreneurship will affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship.

**Future Family Commitments**

Future family commitments can be seen as a viable reason for one to pursue entrepreneurship. Many individuals consider parenting and other household commitments as full time jobs. Balancing the responsibilities of both home and work can be extremely challenging and because of this, many view entrepreneurship as a way to strike that balance.

Dawson & Henley 2012 studied the “push” vs “pull” entrepreneurial strategy to test the factors that directly influence a person’s decision to start a business. It is important to note that “push” refers to an individual starting a business based on opportunities found in the marketplace (Dawson & Henley, 2012). In essence, a future business owner is pulled into entrepreneurship because they see a need or gap in the market that has yet to be filled. The “pull” portion of the strategy refers to one pursuing entrepreneurship out of necessity (Dawson & Henley, 2012), with the main reason being unemployment. The authors found that 23% of the female business owners tested cited family commitments as their reason for starting a business (Dawson & Henley, 2012).
Research by Harbi, Anderson, & Mansour (2009) is of particular interest because although a correlation was found between females’ intent to pursue entrepreneurship and future family commitments, the Tunisia students polled considered business ownership to be a potential hindrance to their home life obligations. It is apparent that this is due to cultural differences and the roles that these North African women play in the home (Harbi et al., 2009), which is vastly different from that of the US and other first world countries. It is fascinating that even when we can account for cultural differences, family commitments are still taken into consideration when pursuing entrepreneurship. For women in the US, family commitments are seen as a reason to pursue owning a business. In contrast, the women in the study by Harbi et al. (2009) consider family commitments to be an obstacle.

Terjesen (2005) took a qualitative approach to studying women’s motivations to pursue entrepreneurship and found that of the ten women in leadership positions interviewed, family commitments were considered when making the jump from working at a corporate headquarters to business ownership. It is clear from this research that women do consider entrepreneurship as an avenue to “have it all”; the career and the family. Balance is imperative and business ownership may be the key to this for those who choose to own their own storefront.

Dawson, Henley and Latreille (2014) studied business owners across different regions in the United Kingdom and found, once again, that women are more likely to report family commitments as their reason for pursuing entrepreneurship. In fact, they found that their married respondents were 14% more likely to cite family obligations as their primary reason for having started their own business.

Nel, Maritz, and Thongprovati (2010) explored the idea of nascent mumpreneurs, mothers who are entrepreneurs, and the commitment that is required to begin business ownership
as a parent. These mothers often felt a sense of cognitive dissonance when it came to striking a balance between work and family. Pursuing entrepreneurship as a mother is considered one way to ease this internal battle.

Kennedy et al. (2003) tested the impact of future family commitments on both feasibility and desirability but, between the two, only found a significance on desirability. It is important to note that this significance was only accurate for the female students polled. This significance tells us that the students who perceived starting a business as favorable, also viewed pursuing entrepreneurship because of future family commitments in the same light. The authors tested future family commitments on both feasibility and desirability, which is the basis for my fifth hypothesis:

H5: Future family commitments will affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship.

**Future Unemployment**

Future unemployment could also be a catalyst for pursuing entrepreneurship. When there are no other opportunities, individuals may feel the need to create their own opportunities. Entrepreneurship can be just that opportunity.

The “push” vs “pull” entrepreneurial strategy was briefly touched on in the previous section but will be reviewed here because of the relevance to the topic. This strategy suggests that individuals are either forced into entrepreneurship through a means like unemployment or are lead into it by gaps in the market. Kirkwood (2014) examined the “push” vs “pull” theory on both men and women and found that they did not feel that they had the adequate characteristics, feasibility, or the desire to pursue entrepreneurship unless they were unemployed.
The Nigerian unemployment rate is astronomically high and researcher Nkwatoh (2015) sought to find a link between unemployment and entrepreneurship in the third world country. Nkwatoh (2015) used the weighted least squares regression method to study data between 1982 and 2013 and found two specific outcomes: entrepreneurship training in Nigeria did in fact reduce unemployment because entrepreneurship was viewed as a viable option and that a high unemployment rate did “push” individuals into pursuing self-employment. This research supports the notion that unemployment can have a direct impact on individuals starting their own firm. When there are no options, one can create an opportunity for oneself.

Hombert, Schoar, Sraerm & Thesmar (2014) took a deeper look at the French Reform of 2003, which gave entrepreneurs unemployment benefits that they did not originally have, to analyze the impact that it had on long term firm success. New businesses increased by 25% and some concluded that the reform would motivate individuals to start businesses who didn’t possess the necessary skills and characteristics, thereby decreasing overall long term firm success. The authors tested this theory and found that the reform did not have a significant effect on long-term business success. This research is unique in that it shows that creating unemployment benefits for entrepreneurs can not only reduce risk but can also have a positive result on the percentage of people who choose to start a business.

Dvoulety and Mares (2016) researched Portugal’s unemployment rate on entrepreneurship and found a direct link between entrepreneurship and business formation. Specifically, the authors’ hypotheses were to determine if an increase in the unemployment rate would lead to an increase in business ownership and if a reduced unemployment rate would eventually spur the creation of new businesses. As previously stated, the researchers found this to
be true. This shows us that when faced with unemployment, individuals do see entrepreneurship as a viable option.

Kennedy et al. (2003) used the theory of planned behavior to survey university freshman about pursuing entrepreneurship due to unemployment and/or lack of other opportunities. However, no direct links were found between entrepreneurship and unemployment due to perceived desirability or feasibility. The authors concluded that the surveyed students could be motivated to pursue entrepreneurship at any time. However, the authors did find a correlation between subjective norm and unemployment. Students felt that there would be pressure to pursue entrepreneurship when unemployed because of perceived pressure from family and friends. The students surveyed for my thesis will vary in their years of schooling and may have different perceptions of the effect of unemployment on feasibility and desirability. This leads to my sixth hypothesis:

H6: Future unemployment will affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship.

Creativity

Creativity is an additional substruct to consider when discussing entrepreneurship. To test creativity is to test whether an individual believes they are creative. Creativity and entrepreneurship often go hand and hand and could be considered even more so when discussing fashion entrepreneurship.

The fashion industry could be considered a perfect mix between creativity and business, with those pursuing this career path needing the skills to work under pressure and, for some segments, have a creative flair (Giacobello, 1999). According to Vogt (2007), an individual with a desire to work in the fashion field should have the necessary technical skills and be adaptable
to a constantly changing working atmosphere in not only the industry, but also in his or her work environment. Vogt (2007) also notes the importance of being able to forecast and see what’s happening in the industry. From these two authors, it is easy to see that students must be confident in their ability to obtain the necessary skill set to pursue a position in the fashion industry. This is even more critical for those students who would like to pursue owning a business in this field.

Creativity in entrepreneurship is necessary to find new ways to satisfy customers. Sternberg and Lubart (1993) define creativity as “the ability to produce work that is both novel (i.e. original, unexpected) and appropriate (i.e. useful, adaptive concerning task constraints)” (pg. 3). Belitski and Desai (2016) suggest that it is improbable to teach creativity due to its inherent nature. Roelof and Nieuwenhuis (2016) argue that creativity is essential in order to continuously progress and that it can in fact be taught using unorthodox techniques. The argument of whether creativity can be taught is not as vital as knowing the value that it adds. A great example of creative entrepreneurship can be found in Cathy Deano and Renee Maloney of Mandeville Louisiana. These two women opened a business, Painting with a Twist, that combined wine and step by step painting for their customers (Weiss, 2012). Many of their patrons were displaced after Hurricane Katrina and desired to start a similar business in their new cities. This opened up a franchising opportunity for the fledging entrepreneurs and within five years, business sales topped twenty million dollars (Weiss, 2012). This can certainly be considered both creative and entrepreneurial. Still, in order for this type of creativity to manifest, certain factors must be present. The truth of the matter is that in order for students to desire to pursue entrepreneurship, they must feel confident to do so: confident in their ability to make the right contacts, delegate the necessary business activities that aren’t familiar, and diminish the fear and/or risk that
accompanies the vast uncertainty of business ownership. One way in which this apprehension can be decreased is through knowledge.

Ward (2004) states that creativity is the appropriate mix of differentiation from competition and awareness of the desired subject (pg. 173). Sternberg and Lubart’s (1993) research on creativity can be considered closely related to that of Wards in that they define creativity as being composed of six distinctive properties: intelligence, knowledge, thinking styles, personality, motivation, and environment. Intelligence is defined as the ability to think outside of the box when solving issues, knowledge as a strong grasp on the subject being studied, and thinking styles as the way in which an individual processes information (Sternberg & Lubart, 1993). Personality is explained as those characteristics that are necessary for ideas to become action: ability to work and think past idea formation road blocks, dedication and commitment to pursuits, capable of expanding upon business ideas, self-efficacy, and balance of risk and reward (Sternberg & Lubart, 1993). Motivation is the ability for individuals to propel themselves forward to achieve objectives, while Environment deals with one’s surroundings and whether or not it encourages a positive attitude toward those ideas that are diverse (Sternberg & Lubart, 1993). Lee, Florida and Acs (2004) also conclude that one’s environment is critical to bolstering creativity and thus, entrepreneurship.

Potential entrepreneurs must be able to bring desired products and services to the corresponding target market (Ward, 2004). When considering creativity in fashion entrepreneurship, the story of Sarah and Jenifer Caplan is a great example. These sisters decided to pursue the idea that one of them had years before, shoes that can “roll up and can fit into a purse” (Thomas, 2012, p. 2). The sisters decided on the business name FootzyFolds, designed a prototype, and began selling their shoes to potential department and store buyers (Thomas, 2012,
Due to the product’s popularity, years later, sales reached several million dollars (Thomas, 2012, p. 3). Still, it must be discovered where and at what point one moves from idea formation to intent and eventually, action.

Hamidi, Wennberg & Berglund (2008) studied a group of forty entrepreneurship students to test one particular hypothesis that is critical to my research: “creativity is positively related to students’ intention to start their own firm” (pg. 307). The authors found a positive correlation. For the purposes of this study, the indirect relationship between creativity and intent will be assessed. Creativity in entrepreneurship is associated with whether individuals believe that they can generate business ideas, which should increase desirability and feasibility to pursue entrepreneurship. This leads to my seventh hypothesis:

H7: Creativity will affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the proposed methodology, including: (1) research design; (2) research instrument; (3) sampling.

3.1 Research Design

In order to determine what factors influence intent to pursue entrepreneurship among students with majors in textiles, apparel design and merchandising, a quantitative approach was taken. An online survey was developed using qualtrics.com. Participants were asked to complete a survey containing two parts. The first part tested the following factors: online survey was developed using qualtrics.com The second portion asked for demographic information.

Five point Likert scales were used to test the following constructs: perceived desirability, perceived feasibility, subjective norm, future unemployment, creativity and entrepreneurial intentions. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy was tested using a seven-point Likert scale while prior exposure to entrepreneurship used dichotomous, yes or no, questions. The survey questions were adopted and/or adapted from previous research. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the variables tested and the authors.

Table 1: Measurements and Corresponding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source of Questions</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>(Kickul et al., 2009)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7-pt Likert-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Not Confident At All – Absolutely Confident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Desirability</td>
<td>(Kennedy et. al, 2003)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-pt Likert-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Given responses vary by question but all questions have only five choices for respondents to choose from)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Feasibility</td>
<td>(Kennedy et. al, 2003)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-pt Likert-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Given responses vary by question but all questions have only five choices for respondents to choose from)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>(Kennedy et. al, 2003)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5-pt Likert-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Strongly Disagree - Strongly Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Unemployment</td>
<td>(Kennedy et. al, 2003)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-pt Likert-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Strongly Disagree - Strongly Agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scales assessing entrepreneurial self-efficacy were adapted from research by Kickul et al. (2009), which consisted of ten items. The authors’ use of the research questions was to examine the correlation between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intent to start a business among those with differing dominant cognitive styles: intuitive or analytic. It’s imperative to note that the ten questions used were grouped into four sections and/or stages: searching, planning, marshalling, and implementing. Each section was found to be reliable with an internal reliability score of .77, .79, .88, and .75 respectively.

Scales from the research conducted by Kennedy et al. (2003) were adopted to assess the following constructs: perceived desirability, perceived feasibility, subjective norm, future unemployment, future family commitments, and entrepreneurial intentions. Four of the six constructs were tested using questionnaires from other researchers. These four constructs were perceived desirability with a reliability scale of .69 (Krueger, 1993; Krueger, 2000), perceived feasibility with a scale of .67 (Krueger, 1993; Krueger, 2000), subjective norm with a scale of .78 (Kolvereid, 1996), and entrepreneurial intentions with a scale of .80 (Davidsson, 1995).
Future unemployment and future family commitments only showed a correlation with subjective norm (p < .001).

Creativity was tested using scales adopted from research by Zampetakis and Moustakis (2006), who found creativity and entrepreneurial intent to be significant (p < 0.001). Peterman and Kennedy (2003) tested prior exposure to entrepreneurship but did not find breadth of experience to be related to either of the tested constructs: feasibility or desirability.

3.2 Research Administration

Pretesting

A pretest was conducted on undergraduate students enrolled in a major university in a southern area of the United States. A few students took the online survey to check the face validity and to make sure all questions were stated clearly. Pretesting found survey questions valid with all questions being considered ready for data collection.

Sampling

A convenience sample was recruited for the following reasons: funding issues, preliminary research, and time constraints. One hundred and twenty responses were collected from students majoring in textiles, apparel design and merchandising on the campus of a major university in a southern state. An email was sent out to all students in the department of textiles, apparel design and merchandising, and professors were contacted at the beginning of a spring semester and asked to encourage their students to fill out the survey.

Summary

This chapter described the research design in detail. It broke down each variable being tested, along with its source and the number of questions used to test each construct. Pretesting and sampling methods were then given.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This section will contain the following parts: participant and descriptive information and hypothesis results. Descriptive statistics give insight into the characteristics that make up the respondents and summarizes the data given (Bui, 2014).

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Participant Characteristics

The survey was emailed to 129 students to complete. 120 survey responses were received and 102 were completed and deemed usable. Age, gender, ethnicity, major, class level and estimated family household income of all participants are displayed in the below table. 87% of respondents were between the ages of 19-24 and 99% were female. 72.5% were white and 66.7% majored in merchandising. Also, 39.2% were university seniors and 32.4% reported an annual household income of $100,000 or greater.

Table 2: Demographic Information of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or under</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 or Over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Spain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel Design</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Family Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $15,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Measurement Assessments

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to test validity on all nine research constructs respectively, which included intent, perceived desirability, perceived feasibility, subjective norm, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments, future unemployment, and creativity. Table 3 lists EFA results showing that all scale items have item loadings higher than .6, and commonality higher than .5. It is important to note that four of the substructs had reliability lower than .7.

Table 3: Nine-Factor Structure of Intent to Pursue Entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scale Statements</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Identify market opportunities for a new business.</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan a new business.</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write a formal business plan.</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raise money to start a business.</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convince others to invest in your business.</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grow a successful business.</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Scale Statements</td>
<td>Factor Loadings</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>I think I am a very creative person</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can easily think a lot and come up with different ideas.</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Exposure</td>
<td>Has anyone else you know started a business?</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever worked for a small or new company?</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>I believe that my closest family think that I should be self-employed.</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that my closest friends think that I should be self-employed.</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that people who are important to me think that I should be self-employed.</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>How practical is it for you to start your own fashion business?</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you started your own fashion business, how certain of success are you?</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability</td>
<td>How attractive is it for you to start your own fashion business?</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you started your own fashion business, how would you feel about doing it?</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>Estimate the likelihood that you’ll start your own business in the next 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate the likelihood that you’ll start your own business in the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate the likelihood that you’ll start your own business in the next 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have plans to launch your own fashion business.</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Unemployment</td>
<td>I expect I will have to start up a fashion business because there won't be jobs available.</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'll only set up my own fashion business if I'm unemployed.</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Family Commitments</td>
<td>Future family commitments may make it difficult for me to start my own fashion business.</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I may set up a fashion business to work from home in order to meet family commitments.</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Hypotheses Testing

Summit indicator was created by averaging scale items for each research construct. Then summit indicators were used to conduct multiple regressions to test the hypotheses. Table 4 shows standardized coefficients and their significance levels generated from running regression models.

Table 4: Results of Regression Analysis (n=102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Feasibility$^c$</th>
<th>Desirability$^b$</th>
<th>Intent$^a$</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Testing Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>H2a &amp; H2b</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H3a &amp; H3b</td>
<td>H3a supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Exposure</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H4a &amp; H4b</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Family Commitments</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H5a &amp; H5b</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Unemployment</td>
<td>-.311</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H6a &amp; H6b</td>
<td>H6a Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H7a &amp; H7b</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R$^2$ | .213 | .120 | .502 |

Note: Table entries are regression coefficients. Standardized regression coefficients (Beta) are given in parentheses and * p<0.001

Regression models:
a. The model is Intent = f(desirability, feasibility)
b. Desirability = f(social norm, entrepreneurship self-efficacy, prior exposure, future family commitments, future unemployment, creativity)
c. Feasibility = f(social norm, entrepreneurship self-efficacy, prior exposure, future family commitments, future unemployment, creativity)

H1 suggested that (a) desirability and (b) feasibility would positively affect intent toward pursuing entrepreneurship and was found to be significant. This is depicted in Table 4 for both desirability ($\beta = .418, p < .001$) and feasibility ($\beta = .333, p < .01$).
H2 suggested that subjective norm would positively affect (a) desirability and; b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship in the fashion area. This hypothesis was supported for desirability ($\beta = .346, p < .001$) and feasibility ($\beta = .234, p < .001$).

H3 suggested that entrepreneurial self-efficacy would be positively associated with (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship. Regression analysis found that entrepreneurial self-efficacy only affects feasibility ($\beta = .270, p < .01$).

H4 suggested that prior exposure to entrepreneurship would affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship. No significance was found and therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

H5 suggested that future family commitments would affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship. This hypothesis was also not supported.

H6 suggested that future unemployment would affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship and was found to negatively affect feasibility ($\beta = -.311, p < .001$).

H7 suggested that creativity would affect (a) desirability; and (b) feasibility toward pursuing entrepreneurship and was found to be invalid.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Not only is entrepreneurship on the rise but also the scholarly research and teaching of the subject. During the 2007 recession, salaries for newly graduated students decreased while underemployment increased, the results of which are still affecting many degree holders. The economy has improved and college graduates have seen an uptick in salary rates but entrepreneurship still needs to be seen as a viable option. Manso (2016) argues that entrepreneurs make more money than their salaried colleagues over a lifetime. It is also important to note that this increase in lifetime earnings is not just contingent on whether the entrepreneur has stayed self-employed. The benefits of business ownership can even be seen when one goes back to working for someone else. In order for entrepreneurship to be viewed as an employment option during and/or after postsecondary education, certain attitudes must be in place. Understanding these attitudes can help shape the necessary educational classes, seminars, and competitions so that they better serve students and provide them with the appropriate skill set necessary for self-employment.

5.1 Discussion of Major Findings

The purpose of this research was to highlight the major factors that influence intent to start a business. This paper contributes to current literature by pinpointing the attitudes that have a direct and indirect impact on entrepreneurial intent. By researching these factors, insight is gained on those constructs that influence entrepreneurship and those that do not. Research on the theory of planned behavior suggests that attitude toward the behavior, perceived behavioral control and subjective norm all influence intent in some way and my research supports that conclusion. Attitude toward the behavior is a predetermined thought that an individual has toward an outcome (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived desirability and perceived feasibility were listed as
substructs under attitude toward the behavior and both were found to have a direct effect on influence. Students who had a higher desire to pursue entrepreneurship and those who felt it was more feasible to start a business showed a greater intent to pursue business ownership. This research supports previous findings and suggests that one way to increase intent is to increase feasibility and desirability. Both substructs can be increased through knowledge. If students are aware of the commitment and skills that are necessary for business ownership, then they are more likely to see the feat as achievable.

Subjective norm can be described as the impact that an individual’s friends, family and acquaintances have on his or her actions. Prior research indicates that the construct had an indirect effect on entrepreneurial intent by influencing feasibility and desirability (Kennedy, Drennan, Renfrow, & Watson, 2003). My research supports previous data by showing a link between subjective norm and both feasibility and desirability. The knowledge that one’s family, friends, and acquaintances are integral to the process of entrepreneurship should be used to help support business ownership among college students. This could be done by having local business owners come in and speak about the process that they went through to start their own businesses and the obstacles, risks, and rewards of doing so.

Perceived behavioral control can be defined as whether a person believes he or she possesses the necessary skill-set to obtain a desired outcome (Ajzen, 1991). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy was listed as a substruct of perceived behavioral control and is defined as whether an individual feels they have the skills to pursue entrepreneurship. Previous research shows a link between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and both feasibility and desirability, which was supported with this research. It is understandable how feeling that one can start a business is linked to whether one feels that it is feasible. The more knowledge that an individual has about
entrepreneurship and whether he or she has the appropriate contacts, resources, and other necessary skills all play an important role on whether or not it is seen as feasible. A relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and desirability is also understandable because believing that one has the necessary skill set should make the feat more desirable.

Situational factors are characterized as external events or influences that lead individuals toward business ownership (Kennedy et al., 2003). Prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments, future unemployment, and creativity were all listed as substracts under situational factors because of their influence to “push” or “pull” a person into entrepreneurship. There are positive research implications for all substracts to affect the starting of a business, but only future unemployment was shown to have any type of significance. In fact, future unemployment was shown to have an inverse effect on feasibility. Perhaps students think that they will not have the time or the resources to pursue entrepreneurship when unemployed. Prior exposure had no effect on either desirability or feasibility, along with future family commitments and creativity. Prior exposure may not have influenced desirability and feasibility because the students may not have worked for a family or small business before. Also, the students surveyed may not fully understand the toll that family commitments can play on those employed because they may not have been employed full-time before and had to balance the workload of both home and work. Creativity was included as a substruct because it was thought to be able to help with generating business ideas. However, no link was shown between creativity and desirability. This may be because creativity is in fact difficult to test. Creative students may not see themselves as being creative, even if they are. For future studies, a separate creativity test could be given to students to determine their level of creativity. This way, creativity would not be determined by whether the student believes he or she is creative.
5.2 Conclusions

This research adds to current literature by showcasing a few of the major factors that influence entrepreneurial intent. Perceived feasibility and perceived desirability were both found to influence self-employment while subjective norm indirectly influenced intent by impacting desirability and feasibility. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy also indirectly effected intent by influencing feasibility. Future unemployment was found to negatively affect feasibility. No supporting evidence was found to link prior exposure to entrepreneurship, future family commitments, or creativity to business formation. Still, there are factors that do impact intent and these should be studied extensively.

5.3 Implications

Entrepreneurship is an employment option and should be considered as such when students get ready to make employment decisions. This research strengthens past studies to confirm the factors that influence business ownership the most. This study is significant for teachers because it can dictate what factors should be reinforced for students to actually consider a business startup. Students are more likely to pursue entrepreneurship when they can see it as desirable, feasible and important to their friends and family. They must also feel that they have the necessary skills to accomplish such a task, also known as entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

Entrepreneurship courses should be created with these major factors in mind and should also include business plan competitions that go a step further and require students to actually sell a product or service. This way, students can truly understand what it takes to not only brainstorm an idea, but also implement it. Big business ideas require more capital and knowledge, which may be unattainable for most students. Classes should first focus on small products and business ideas so that students can get a feel for the feasibility of entrepreneurship. For example, students
could be required to create a t-shirt design and market it online. Entrepreneurship is in no way an easy or uncomplicated venture. However, when broken down into its smaller parts, it is easier for one to comprehend and could be seen as both feasible and desirable.

5.4 Limitations and Future Research Directions

The major limitation of this study is generalizability. Students were surveyed from a public university in Louisiana. Not only could geographic area play a role in the survey outcome, but also university status. Private universities could produce different results, along with community colleges and historically black colleges and universities. Future research could focus on all or one of these areas and report the differences. It was noted in chapter four that four of the sub structs had low reliability. Future research may need to include more reliable scales.

Also, only students majoring in textiles, apparel design and merchandising were surveyed. Future research should target student from other non-business disciplines. Most testing on entrepreneurship is done on business and engineering students. Another limitation is sample size. Only 102 usable surveys were analyzed for this research. A larger sample size could produce different results.

This research could also be extended by surveying students while in college and again post-graduation and/or after having been employed full time for six months to a year. Time could play an important role on the desirability of entrepreneurship.
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APPENDIX A: IRB FORMS

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/ projects using living humans as subjects, or samples, or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

--- Applicant, Please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-E, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please submit two copies of the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at http://research.lsu.edu/CompliancePoliciesProcedures/InstitutionalReviewBoard%28IRB%29/item24737.html

--- A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:
(A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of part B thru E.
(B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1 & 2)
(C) Copies of all instruments to be used.
   *If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
(D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)
(E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (https://php.nihtraining.com/users/login.php)
(F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: (http://research.lsu.edu/files/item2674.pdf)

1) Principal Investigator: Charity Washington
   Dept: Human Ecology
   Rank: Graduate/Master's Student
   Ph: 318-527-9484
   E-mail: cwash28@lsu.edu

2) Co-Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each
   *If student, please identify and name supervising professor in this space
   Dr. Chuanlan Liu, Associate Professor, 225-334-2400, cliu@lsu.edu

3) Project Title: Fashion Entrepreneurship Intention

4) Proposal? (yes or no) NO
   If Yes, LSU Proposal Number
   Also, if YES, either
   ○ This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant
   OR
   ○ More IRB Applications will be filed later

5) Subject pool (e.g. Psychology students)
   College Students
   *Circle any "vulnerable populations to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the ages, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

6) PI Signature
   Date 03-21-12
   (no per signatures)

** I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changes, I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU Institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for three years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Screening Committee Action: Exempted Yes Not Exempted No Category/Paragraph

Reviewer Mathews Signature Date 3/22/12
APPENDIX B: SURVEY QUESTIONS

LOUSIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Hello Students,

Thank you for your participation in this research. The purpose of this survey is to better understand how college students’ perceived ability to accomplish tasks related to starting a fashion business affect his or her intent to start a fashion business.

The survey should only take about 10 minutes to complete and all responses will be anonymous. You may stop filling out this survey at any time. By filling out this survey, you are agreeing to participate in this study.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask the researchers. We will be glad to assist you.

Researchers can be contacted Monday-Friday 8:00am – 4:30 pm:

Charity Washington M.S., Graduate Student phone (318-527-9484): cwash28@lsu.edu
Chuanlan Liu, Ph. D., Assistant Professor clliu@lsu.edu

You may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If you have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, you can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225)578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb.
This section focuses on your confidence in accomplishing tasks related to starting a business. Please select the answer choice that is indicative of the level of confidence that you have in completing each task.

Please select the answer choice that is indicative of the level of confidence that you have in completing each task.

Conceive a unique idea for a business.
Identify market opportunities for a new business.
Plan a new business.
Write a formal business plan.
Raise money to start a business.
Convince others to invest in your business.
Convince a bank to lend you money to start a business.
Convince others to work for you in your new business.
Manage a small business.
Grow a successful business.

This section focuses on the desirability and feasibility that you associate with starting a fashion business. Please select the answer choice that is indicative of how you feel about each question.

How attractive is it for you to start your own fashion business?

Very Unattractive
Unattractive
Neutral
Attractive
Very Attractive

If you started your own fashion business, how would you feel about doing it?

I’d Hate Doing It
I’d Dislike Doing It
Neutral
I’d Like Doing It
I’d Love Doing It

https://bsu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4T93J7kYwty3KeA
If you started your own fashion business, how tense would you be?
Very Tense
Tense
Neutral
Relaxed
Very Relaxed

If you started your own fashion business, how enthusiastic would you be?
Very Unenthusiastic
Unenthusiastic
Neutral
Enthusiastic
Very Enthusiastic

How practical is it for you to start your own fashion business?
Not Very Practical
Not Practical
Neutral
Practical
Very Practical

How hard do you think it would be to start your own fashion business?
Very Hard
Hard
Neutral
Easy
Very Easy

If you started your own fashion business, what do you think your workload would be?
Very High
High
Neutral
Low
Very Low

If you started your own fashion business, how certain of success are you?
  Very Certain of Failing
  Certain of Failing
  Neutral
  Certain of Success
  Very Certain of Success

Do you know enough to start your own fashion business?
  Know Absolutely Nothing
  Know Nothing
  Neutral
  Know Everything
  Know Absolutely Everything

Half done
Please select the answer choice that is indicative of how you feel about each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I care what my closest family think about my employment decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care about what my closest friends think about my employment decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care what people who are important to me think about my employment decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my closest family think that I should be self-employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my closest friends think that I should be self-employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that people who are important to me think that I should be self-employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect I'll have to start up a fashion business because there won't be jobs available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'll only set up my own fashion business if I'm unemployed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future family commitments may make it difficult for me to start my own fashion business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may set up a fashion business to work from home in order to meet family commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section will focus on your perceived creativity. Please circle the number that is indicative of your level of creativity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I think that I am a very creative person.
I like to try novel thinking, despite failure probability.
I can easily think a lot and come up with different ideas.

Have you ever thought about starting your own business?

- Never Thought About It At All
- Rarely Thought About It At All
- Neutral
- Thought About It
- Seriously Thought About It

Please select the answer choice that is indicative of your past experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Have your parents ever started a business?
Has anyone else you know started a business?
Have you ever worked for a small or new company?
Have you ever started a business?

Please select the response that is indicative of your level of intent to perform the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Estimate the likelihood that you'll start your own business in the next 3 years.
Estimate the likelihood that you'll start your own business in the next 5 years.
Estimate the likelihood that you'll start your own business in the next 10 years.

Almost done......
**Thinking of yourself, how true or untrue is each statement of your behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Untrue</th>
<th>Untrue</th>
<th>Slightly Untrue</th>
<th>Slightly True</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Very True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intend to set up a fashion company in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan your future carefully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read fashion business newspapers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never search for fashion business start-up opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read financial planning books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are saving money to start a fashion business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not read books on how to set up a fashion business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan your finances carefully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have plans to launch your own fashion business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time learning about starting a fashion business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>>
In this section of the questionnaire, basic demographic questions will be asked. This information will be used to align you with other participants who share similar characteristics. Your responses are strictly confidential.

**Age**
- 18 or under
- 19 - 24
- 25 - 34
- 35 or Over

**Gender**
- Male
- Female

**Ethnicity**
- White
- African-American
- Hispanic/Latino/Spanish
- Asian
- Other

**Major**
- Textile Science
- Apparel Design
- Merchandising
- Business
- Other

**Class Level**
- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Master's Student

https://isu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4T93hi7Ywy3K4
Doctoral Student

GPA
2.5 or below
2.6 - 3.0
3.1 - 3.6
3.6 or above

Estimated Family Household Income
Under $15,000
$15,000 - $29,999
$30,000 - $49,999
$50,000 - $74,999
$75,000 - $99,999
$100,000 and over

If you wish to be entered in the drawing for cash prizes, please leave your email address below.
VITA

Charity Washington received her Bachelor of Science degree from Louisiana State University. She expects to graduate with her Master’s Degree in Human Ecology in August of 2017. She strives to live by Galations 6:9.