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PURPOSE
The present study is an attempt to study the female entrepreneurs’ attitude towards entrepreneurship and measure the impact of entrepreneurial orientation and desirability on the intention of entrepreneurial students.

Design/Methodology/Approach: To test the research framework and hypotheses, female university students in Oman who have undergone with entrepreneurship subject in their syllabus have been considered as the respondents of the study. Data have been collected through structured questionnaire based on five points Likert scale ranging from 1 as (strongly disagree) to 5 as (strongly agree). To ensure the selection of appropriate participants and their intention level, data were collected in Oman and participants were recruited online via Google Docs as per the convenience sampling method to collect primary data. Survey through Google Docs was conducted in period of April 2019 to May 2019, through which 300 questionnaires were sent and 269 sets were returned, out of which 225 responses were found as useful for data analysis.

Findings: Entrepreneurship education plays a significant role for the female students having an inclination to entrepreneurship as their career goal. The study also found that personal attitude and innovativeness come from the entrepreneurial education. Unfortunately, the study found no influence of risk-taking propensity towards intention. This shows that the entrepreneurs are not willing to take risk or are unable to face the loss or worst circumstances if any, from the entrepreneurship ventures they perform.

Research Limitations: The study has several limitations. For instance, it engaged theory of planned behavior to develop the entrepreneurship model. Future there is a need to expand the model by integrating it with other entrepreneurship models. Furthermore, the sample was selected from private universities and colleges in Oman.

Managerial Implications: Practically, it shed light on the willingness of the students and their intention to be an entrepreneur. The study, thus, suggests polishing the students’ entrepreneurship skills, knowledge and competencies to increase their entrepreneurship intention.

Originality/Value: The study highlighted the importance of Theory of Planned Behavior supported by the entrepreneurship orientation model at an individual level.

* Asst. Professor, College of Business, University of Buraimi, Sultanate of Oman.
** Asst. Professor, College of Business, University of Buraimi, Sultanate of Oman.
*** Associate Professor, Manipur University, Dept. of Economics, Manipur, India.
**** Director, Student Affair Dept., University of Buraimi Sultanate of Oman.
***** Lecturer, College of Business, University of Buraimi Sultanate of Oman.
Thoudam Prabha Devi, Shrikant Krupasindhu Panigrahi, Chinglen Maisnam, Wafa Al Alyani and Ermal Bino

Key Words: Entrepreneurship Education; Entrepreneurship Desirability; Entrepreneurship Orientation, Entrepreneurship Intention, Oman.

Introduction
Women are viewed as a reservoir of entrepreneurial talent, as a growth engine (Westhead, & Solesvik, 2016) and as a source of innovation and wealth creation (Brush, & Cooper, 2012) by the practitioners and policymakers. At global level, entrepreneurship has been viewed as an alternative for changing economic scenario and for economic development. In today’s competitive market and economy, it has been very difficult for students especially in Oman to secure their job after their graduation. Oman has been relying heavily on expatriates at 43.7 per cent as of February 2019. A relatively stable government and low taxes is making Oman a desired location for entrepreneurship venture. Thus, realizing the importance of entrepreneurship for economic development of the nation is crucial. The core purpose of this study is to investigate the willingness of the female university students to become an entrepreneur and engage in the nation’s development activities. Next section will highlight on the critical literature in the context of entrepreneurship theory and concepts.

Literature review
The conceptual model which has been used in the present study is an extended version of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) with the addition of entrepreneurial characteristics namely; risk-taking propensity, innovativeness, and locus of control. Rationale behind applying TPB might rest upon two arguments. Firstly, TPB has been applied by numerous researchers in their studies across the globe and it has been able to furnish significant empirical findings thus the strength of this model has been validated (Lortie, & Castogiovanni, 2015; Peterman, & Kennedy, 2003; Liñán, & Chen, 2009; Guerrero, Rialp, & Urbano, 2008; Kolvereid, 1996; Tkachev, & Kolvereid, 1999; Krueger, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000; Anwar, & Saleem, 2019; Roy, Akhtar, & Das, 2017; Bazan, Shaikh, Frederick, Amjad, Yap, Finn, & Rayner, 2019). According to web electronic database ‘Scopus’ TPB has received more than 28000 citations until the year 2019 which depicts the robustness of the model. Secondly, TPB model has been applied nearly in each and every other field of research namely; health sciences (Godin, & Kok, 1996), leisure studies (Hagger, Chatzisarantis, Culverhouse, & Biddle, 2003), psychology (Austin, & Vancouver, 1996), and marketing (Pavlou, & Fygenson, 2006) in order to measure behavioral intention and it has fetched remarkable outcomes, therefore, this model outshines any other models or approaches used for prediction of behavioral intention. Most of the scholars from the area of entrepreneurial intention research have used TPB (Liñán, & Chen, 2009; Anwar, & Saleem, 2019; Roy, et al., 2017; Bazan, et al., 2019; Krueger, et al., 2000; Kolvereid, & Isaksen, 2006; Shook, Priem, & McGee, 2003). Hence, the same variables have been used in the present study with the view to measure entrepreneurial intention among the students of University of Buraimi, Sultanate of Oman.

Theory of Planned Behavior
“Theory of planned behavior explains three basic foundations for the formation of behavioral intentions namely; attitude for behavior, personal norms, and perceived behavioral control” p. 179 (Ajzen, 1991). ‘Attitude toward behavior’ refers to the degree of positive or negative personal valuation possessed by one individual about a certain activity of behavior while ‘social norm’ hints toward the positive or negative opinion of a reference group (family, friends, relatives, and peers) about making a certain decision. At last, ‘perceived behavioral control’ points out one’s own self-confidence in one’s own skills and attributes from performing a particular behavioral action.

Planned Behavior Theory and Entrepreneurship
Across the world of academia, TPB has predicted behavioral intention in various dimensions of researches and has successfully explained the entrepreneurial intention phenomenon ranging between 21% (Autio, Keeley, Klofsten, GC Parker, & Hay, 2001) to 55% (Liñán, & Chen, 2009). In many of the studies, basic antecedents of TPB; Entrepreneurial Attitude (ATE), Social Norm (SN),
and Perceived Behavior Control (PBC) have shown significant statistical relationships with the Entrepreneurial Intention (EI) (Anwar, & Saleem, 2019; Krueger, et al., 2000; Kautonen, Gelderen, & Fink, 2015; Lüthje, & Franke, 2003; Kolvereid, 1996; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Al-Laham, 2007).

The first variable ‘Attitude toward entrepreneurship’ explains one’s attitudinal attraction towards entrepreneurial intention as a choice of livelihood option. Findings from earlier studies have established that more is the attitude toward entrepreneurship stronger the intention to start own business (Anwar, & Saleem, 2019; Krueger, et al., 2000; Autio, et al., 2001; Pruett, Shinnar, Toney, Llopis, & Fox, 2009; Segal, Borgia, & Schoenfeld, 2005; Gelderen, & Jansen, 2008). Not only in the area of entrepreneurial intention research, but also in other fields of studies; consumer behavior, marketing, psychology, etc, attitude has emerged as a significant predictor of the outcome variable (Ajzen, 1991). Kazmi, & Khan (2017) highlighted that financial conditions and working environment are the important contributors to the success of an entrepreneur. Therefore, citing the given evidence, it can be posited that someone’s favorable attitude toward entrepreneurship makes him more inclined to start a business. Datta (2018) recommended that “to enhance socio-economic development through setting locally suitable small and medium industries and service oriented, less risky entrepreneurship using locally produced raw materials, labor including other resources by the local government under an efficient management control” p.2.

Second variable ‘Social norm’ compounds the positive or negative opinion of a reference group such as; family, relatives, and friends which might affect concerned persons’ decision to start own business hence establishing the notion that positive opinion of the reference group might strengthen one’s entrepreneurial spirit while negative opinion might weaken it (Anwar, & Saleem, 2019; Roy, et al., 2017; Bazan, et al., 2019).

The third variable of TPB is Perceived Behavior Control (PBC) which refers to one’s belief in one’s own skills and attributes regarding performing a particular task or job. In other words, one’s perceptual senses regarding easiness or difficulty in doing an act is termed as ‘Perceived Behavior Control’. Thus, it can be posited that greater level of perceived behavior control leads to stronger Entrepreneurial Intention (Bandura, 1986; Swan, Chang-Schneider, & McClarity, 2007). In many of the studies, PBC has been found as the strongest predicting factor or entrepreneurial intention which establishes the notion that greater level of PBC leads to higher self-confidence which in turn leads to higher entrepreneurial intention. Citing the abovementioned theoretical background findings from the literature, the following hypotheses have been proposed::

H1: Attitude toward entrepreneurship is positively related with entrepreneurial intention.
H2: Social norm is positively related with entrepreneurial intention.
H3: Perceived behavior control is positively related with entrepreneurial intention.

**Personality characteristics and entrepreneurship**

From the literature available on various approaches and models applied in the field of entrepreneurial research, it could be possible to discern those factors which affect entrepreneurial behavior which can be categorized into individual, social, and environmental factors. The essence of social factors model is to investigate into personal and family background of the concerned person along with considering their career stage (Robinson, Stimpson, Huefner, & Hunt, 1991; Alstete, 2002; Green, David, Dent, & Tyshkovsky, 1996). Furthermore, Gibb (1993) was of the opinion that one’s life experiences are also part of social factors approach. In addition, environmental factors comprise of such contextual and economic factors that might make an impact in shaping one’s career option such as quantum of wealth, possibilities of career opportunities, economic conditions, societal stability or disarray, etc. (Alstete, 2002; Green, et al., 1996).
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“Individual factors affecting entrepreneurial behavior of individuals, also known as trait model of entrepreneurship, focus on personality characteristics of the individuals” p.13 (Koh, 1996). This model emphasizes that entrepreneurs are different from other non-entrepreneur people and possess some unique traits and characteristics which lead to distinguished attitudinal values in order to make them entrepreneurially inclined (Thomas, & Mueller, 2000; Koh, 1996). Many studies have been conducted applying trait approach with an endeavor to answer the following questions; who becomes entrepreneur and why, what makes people a successful entrepreneur, do successful entrepreneurs differ from unsuccessful entrepreneurs characteristically? (Bygrave, & Hofer, 1991; Littunen, 2000) and up to some extent, this trait approach has been successfully able to predict entrepreneurial behavior significantly. Entrialgo, Fernandez, & Vazquez (2000) in their study found that “locus of control, need for achievement, and tolerance of ambiguity are determinants of entrepreneurial tendency”, p. 187. Stewart, Watson, Carland, & Carland (1998) concluded that “need for achievement, risk-taking propensity, and innovativeness are differentiating factors between entrepreneurs and corporate managers”, p. 189. In a recent study, Anwar, & Saleem (2019) also empirically testified that levels of innovativeness, locus of control, and risk-taking propensity along with tolerance of ambiguity and need for achievement are significantly higher in students having an inclination towards entrepreneurship compared to students having no inclination. Thus, keeping the literature in mind, three characteristics namely; “risk-taking propensity, innovativeness, and locus of control” have been taken into consideration for the present study.

Risk-Taking Propensity
Risk-taking propensity compounds on the capability of a person to either take or avoid risk in a perilous or odd situation. Propensity to take risk can be called closely related with the entrepreneurship citing the earlier example from Cantillon (1755), which demonstrates that the basic difference between employees and the owner of the business is the ability to take up the risk and uncertainty by the latter (Entrialgo, et al., 2000; Thomas, & Mueller, 2000). Risk-taking ability also differentiates entrepreneurs from the managers basing on the fact that they undertake the risks related to financial and other concerns under an unpredictable and uncertain business environment (Erdem, 2001; Brockhaus, 1980; Littunen, 2000). Plenty of entrepreneurial literature is also in support that entrepreneurs possess higher risk-taking ability when compared to others (Anwar, & Saleem, 2019; Cho, & Lee, 2018; Cromie, 2000; Thomas, & Mueller, 2000; Teoh, & Foo, 1997).

Innovativeness
Among the various characteristics, innovativeness is considered as a must-have characteristic for the entrepreneurs so they can look for further entrepreneurial opportunities through different new ways and techniques of production, entering into new markets, managing the business and competing with business rivals (Zacharakis, 1997; Entrialgo, et al., 2000; Hansemark, 1998). Drucker also claimed that entrepreneurs always look for further innovation for tapping entrepreneurial opportunities which enables an entrepreneur in identifying required changes within the enterprise to keep up with the changing markets with the help of new ideas and products (Cromie, 2000; Utsch, & Rauch, 2000). Stewart, Carland, Carland, Watson, & Sweo (2003) also contended that innovativeness is an integrated part of entrepreneurship and cannot be detached from it. Thus, it differentiates entrepreneurs from their managers. Utsch, & Rauch (2000) claimed that there is a close relationship between innovativeness and performance of a business. Furthermore, Anwar, & Saleem (2019) in their study also stated that innovativeness was found higher in students having an inclination towards entrepreneurship than others.

Locus of Control
Locus of control is another personality trait that has been widely tested and proven as a vital characteristic to be possessed by an entrepreneur. Locus of control refers to one’s own belief in one’s
own inner capabilities regarding controlling a situation (Leone, & Burns, 2000) or other way round, people who have internal locus of control think that whatever happens in their lives, be it positive or negative, is only because of their own acts and they have the control over the outcomes of their doings (Koh, 1996; Riipinen, 1994; Hansemark, 1998). It is considered that those who look to start their own business should possess internal locus of control and this assumption has been confirmed by many studies (Mueller, & Thomas, 2000; Hansemark, 1998; Koh, 1996; Utsch, & Rauch, 2000). Gilad (1982) successfully testified that locus of control is higher among successful small business owners when compared with unsuccessful small business owners. In another study, Thomas, & Mueller (2000) also confirmed that entrepreneurs are highly equipped with locus of control than others. Recently, Anwar, & Saleem (2019) also contended that students who are inclined towards entrepreneurship are possessing higher level of locus of control than the students not inclined towards entrepreneurship. After going through above literature support, the following hypotheses have been proposed:

H4: Risk-taking propensity is positively related with entrepreneurial intention.
H5: Innovativeness is positively related with entrepreneurial intention.
H6: Locus of control is positively related with entrepreneurial intention.

**Mediating Role of Entrepreneurial Education**

Compounding on the notions established by two theoretical concepts; (1) human capital theory (Becker, 2009) and (2) self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1993), it is found that entrepreneurial education is a strong mediator of entrepreneurial intention (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014; Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998). Becker (2009) in his theory of human capital that knowledge or skill set gained by either classroom teaching, training or any other method of learning can be termed as human capital while on the other hand, theory of self-efficacy refers to volume of one’s belief in one’s capability of doing or performing a particular task successfully (Bandura, 1993). Martin, McNally, & Kay (2013) confirmed that entrepreneurial education is directly linked with entrepreneurial intention as it not only strengthens entrepreneurial intention but also enhances one’s entrepreneurial self-efficacy which accounts for the belief one possesses for successfully performing entrepreneurial activities (Chen, et al., 1998). In another study, “entrepreneurial education has been found as a moderating factor on the relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention” p. 1 (Yun, 2010).

Previously, studies were conducted measuring the impact of entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurial intention (Auito, et al., 2001; Liñán, 2004; Lüthje, & Franke, 2003) but in recent times, it has been used in many different ways while integrating it with theory of planned behavior and trait approach as well (Anwar, & Saleem, 2018; Martin, et al., 2013). In their study, Rauch, & Hulsink (2015) also confirmed that entrepreneurial education does not only affect entrepreneurial intention directly but the relationships between attitude toward entrepreneurship, social norm, and perceived behavior control are also partially mediated by entrepreneurial education. Henceforth, the following hypotheses have been proposed:

H7: Entrepreneurial education mediates the relationships between Risk-taking propensity, Innovativeness, Locus of control and Entrepreneurial intention.
H8: Entrepreneurial education mediates the relationships between Attitude toward entrepreneurship, Social norm, Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and Entrepreneurial intention.

Based on the previous studies on entrepreneurship orientation and desirability towards entrepreneurial education and intention, the study presents the theoretical framework as shown in figure no. 1.
Methodology

In order to test the research framework and hypotheses, female university students in Oman who have undergone with entrepreneurship subject in their syllabus have been considered as the respondents of the study. Data have been collected through structured questionnaire based on five points Likert scale ranging from 1 as (strongly disagree) to 5 as (strongly agree). To test the research hypotheses, a survey was conducted with university students. University students have been chosen as an appropriate sample, given that entrepreneurship has rapidly changed innovativeness and skills of the students. To ensure the selection of appropriate participants and their intention level, data were collected in Oman and participants were recruited online via Google Docs as per the convenience sampling method to collect primary data. Survey through Google Docs was conducted in period of April 2019 to May 2019, through which 300 questionnaires were sent and 269 sets were returned, out of which 225 responses were found as useful for data analysis. Sample size was computed based on G power analysis as recommended by (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007).

Pretest

Card sorting method as suggested by Moore, & Benbasat (1991) including all the questions in separate index cards were printed out. The cards were shuffled and presented to two experts from the marketing field and were asked individually to sort the measurement items. This method is also known as “Q-sort method that helps the researchers to assess reliability and validity of the questionnaire” p.1 (Nahm, Rao, Solis-Galvan, & Ragu-Nathan, 2002).

Analysis and Interpretation

Table no. 1 depicts the demographic profile of the respondents. In total 92 (40.9%) were male and 133 (59.1%) were female. 143 (63.6%) respondents were under the age of 25 years; 56 (24.9%) were from 25 to 30 years of age category; 22 (9.8%) respondents were in the range of 31 to 40 years, and finally only 4 (1.7%) respondents were above the age of 40 years.
In terms of the interest of the students to setup their own business, it was revealed that 162 (72%) participants agreed to possess their own business, whereas 63 (28%) of them were not interested to have their own business. Finally, 97 (43.11%) respondents confirmed that their family members are business owners and 128 (56.89%) students' family members were not having any business.

Data collected through online mode were analyzed using SPSS version 21 and AMOS version 21. Analysis was initiated first with the reliability and validity assessment followed by the measurement for validity and reliability test. This study prioritized Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) over Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), for hypotheses testing suggested by Kline (2011) as there is no need to conduct both the analyses.

**Reliability and Validity Assessment**

In order to perform reliability and validity assessment, two stages analytical process as suggested by well-known scholars like (Anderson, & Gerbing, 1988) have been followed. At the first stage of analysis, reliability and validity were tested, whereas, in the second stage of analysis, structural model was examined for testing the hypothesized relationship. In order to test the significance of the loadings (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014), reliability was measured using Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach, 1951) and composite reliability (Bacon, Sauer, & Young, 1995) whereas the convergent validity of the measurement was examined using average variance extracted (AVE). Table no. 2 depicts that the reliability and AVE for validity was higher than the threshold value of 0.70 and 0.50 significantly.

In terms of the interest of the students to setup their own business, it was revealed that 162 participants agreed to possess their own business whereas 62 of them were not interested to have their own business. Finally, 97 respondents confirmed that their family members are business owner and 128 student’s family members were not having any business.

Data collected through online mode were analyzed using statistical package for social science (SPSS) 21 and AMOS 21. Analysis was initiated first with the reliability and validity assessment followed by the measurement model for validity and reliability test. This study prioritized confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) over exploratory factor analysis (EFA), for hypotheses testing as suggested by Kline (2011) of there is no need to conduct both the analysis. However, final structural model provided in figure no. 2 already highlighted the outer loadings for the measured items.

---

**Table No. 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 to 30 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 to 40 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interest to setup own business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family members as a business owner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>56.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data*
Table No. 2: Reliability and Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENT_OR</td>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>IN1</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN2</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN3</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN4</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN5</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN6</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC5</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk taking propensity</td>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT3</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT4</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT_DES</td>
<td>Personal attitude</td>
<td>PA1</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA3</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA4</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA5</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE2</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE6</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN5</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN6</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT_EDU</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship education</td>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT_INT</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship intention</td>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IN – innovativeness; LC-Locus of control; RT-Risk taking propensity; PA-Personal attitude; SE-Self-efficacy; SN-Social Norms; EE-Entrepreneurship education; EI-Entrepreneurship intention
Source: Primary Data
Results of Structural Equation Modelling
In order to confirm the Structural Model, we looked at the results of R-square ($R^2$), beta coefficients ($\beta$), factor loadings and corresponding t-values through the structural equation modelling technique (Hair, et al., 2014). First, we looked at the three dimensions of entrepreneurship desirability. Innovativeness ($\beta = 0.365, t = 3.708, p-value < 0.01$), locus of control ($\beta = 0.06, t = 0.554, p-value > 0.01$), risk taking propensity ($\beta = -0.146, t = -1.595, p-value > 0.01$), personal attitude ($\beta = 0.225, t = 2.412, p-value < 0.01$), self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.123, t = 1.033, p-value > 0.01$), social norms ($\beta = 0.311, t = 1.954, p-value < 0.01$) was positively related to entrepreneurship education explaining 0.50 (50%) of variance on entrepreneurship education as shown in table no. 3. Further, it was found that Innovativeness ($\beta = 0.223, t = 2.016, p-value < 0.01$), locus of control ($\beta = 0.222, t = 0.554, p-value > 0.01$), risk taking propensity ($\beta = -0.146, t = -1.595, p-value > 0.01$), personal attitude ($\beta = 0.225, t = 1.963, p-value < 0.01$), self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.044, t = 0.353, p-value > 0.01$), social norms ($\beta = 0.396, t = 2.257, p-value < 0.01$) towards entrepreneurial intention. Finally, entrepreneurial education was having ($\beta = 0.266, t = 2.419, p-value < 0.01$) an influence on entrepreneurship intention. The loadings of all the items were above the minimum cut off value of 0.50 level (Hair, et al., 2014). All the loadings were greater than 0.70 on their respective constructs with the t-statistics above 1.96. This result of factor loading provided evidence of the convergent validity.

Table No. 3: Standardized Path for Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Exogenous</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Education</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Education</td>
<td>Locus_Control</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-0.554</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Education</td>
<td>Risk_Taking</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-1.595</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Education</td>
<td>Self_Efficacy</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Education</td>
<td>Social_Norms</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Intention</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Intention</td>
<td>Locus_Control</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Intention</td>
<td>Risk_Taking</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.675</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Intention</td>
<td>Personal_Attribute</td>
<td>-0.921</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.909</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Intention</td>
<td>Self_Efficacy</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur_Intention</td>
<td>Social_Norms</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

As depicted in Figure no. 2, R-square ($R^2$) value for entrepreneurial intention is 0.530 and for entrepreneurial education and $R^2$ value is 0.500 with adequate explanatory significance. However, only $R^2$ is not enough for supporting the model (Radovic-Markovic, Farooq, & Markovic, 2017). Therefore, Q-square ($Q^2$) test was performed in order to assess the relevance of the structural model (Hair, et al., 2014).

Conclusion and Recommendations
This study was conducted with an aim to determine the level of intention of the university undergraduate students in Oman and identify the influence of entrepreneurship orientation, desirability and education on intention. Results of the study revealed that entrepreneurship education plays a significant role for
the female students having an inclination to entrepreneurship as their career goal. The study also
found that personal attitude and innovativeness come from the entrepreneurial education. Unfortunately,
the study found no influence of risk-taking propensity towards intention. This shows that the
entrepreneurs are not willing to take risk or are unable to face the loss or worst circumstances if any,
from the entrepreneurship ventures they perform.

On the top, the entrepreneurship education must focus on motivating the needs of individuals. For
instance, business students have different risk-taking propensity as compared to that of the non-business

Figure No. 2: Final Structural Model

Source: Primary Data
students. Thus, developing a common entrepreneurship education that caters all the students from various fields will be a good and innovative strategy. Students must be engaged with real businesses as a case in order to make their innovativeness and improve their risk-taking abilities. Universities should involve entrepreneurship incubators or hubs to make the students proactive and make them realize the real business scenarios.

In terms of theoretical implication, this study highlighted the importance of TPB supported by the entrepreneurship orientation model at an individual level. Practically, it shed light on the willingness of the students and their intention to be an entrepreneur. The study, thus, suggests to polish the students’ entrepreneurship skills, knowledge and competencies to increase their entrepreneurship intention.

Limitations of the Study
Finally, this study has several limitations. For instance, it engaged theory of planned behavior to develop the entrepreneurship model. Future there is a need to expand the model by integrating it with other entrepreneurship models. Furthermore, the sample was selected from private universities and colleges in Oman.

Future Areas of Research
Future research should include students from public universities. It is recommended that, future research study is conducted with only female students as respondents. The sample can also be expanded by assimilating working adults or individuals other than students to be an entrepreneur in future.
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