JURNAL CAHAYA MANDALIKA

P-ISSN: 2828-495X
E-ISSN: 2721-4796

EXPLORING THE LINK BETWEEN CREATIVITY AND ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS: EVIDENCE FROM DESIGN STUDENT AT UNIVERSITAS XYZ, TANGERANG, INDONESIA

Benny Aristo[1*]; Joshua C.A.T. Duque[2]
[1,2]Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang Indonesia
Email: benny.aristo@uph.edu

Keywords:
Creativity, Entrepreneurial intention, Risk-taking propensity, Entrepreneurial self-efficacy, Structural equation modelling

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the correlation between creativity and the aspiration to pursue entrepreneurship, an essential area for individuals looking to innovate and create new products or services. The focus is on understanding how creativity, coupled with the willingness to take risks and entrepreneurial self-confidence, influences the intention to start a business. Utilizing a quantitative methodology, data was collected from 184 design students at Universitas XYZ located in Tangerang Indonesia. The study employs structural equation modelling to examine the construct relationships within the theoretical framework, with SmartPLS v.4.0.8.4 used for data analysis. The results indicate that entrepreneurial self-confidence significantly predicts the intention to become an entrepreneur. However, creativity and the tendency to take risks do not show a significant impact on entrepreneurial aspirations. This research contributes to the existing body of knowledge on the factors driving entrepreneurial intentions and details the relationship between creativity and the desire to embark on an entrepreneurial journey. The findings have significant implications for the design of programs aimed at fostering entrepreneurial skills.

INTRODUCTION

The allure of entrepreneurship as a career choice has grown, fuelled by globalization and technological advances that open new market opportunities (Sesen, 2013). This trend promises economic growth, job creation, and innovation (Crijns & Vermeulen, 2007; Turker & Sonmez Selcuk, 2009). In Southeast Asia, Indonesia stands out for its entrepreneurial activity, particularly among its youth who show a strong desire for entrepreneurship, as indicated by a World Economic Forum in its 2019 survey's where they scored 35.6% in entrepreneurial interest. Indonesia's startup scene reflects this, with notable successes in e-commerce and innovative ventures like Tokopedia, Traveloka, Bukalapak, Kopi Kenangan, Ajaib, and Sayurbox, showcasing a burgeoning generation of entrepreneurs.

Siegel et al. (2007) and Robson et al. (2009) observed a surge in entrepreneurship within universities and an accompanying increase in academic interest. Despite this, Harding & Bosma (2006) found surprisingly low entrepreneurial engagement among under-25s, highlighting the need for government and organizational support to foster young entrepreneurial intentions. Reflecting on entrepreneurship's evolution, models like Shapero & Sokol (1982) suggest intentions are key to starting a business, influenced by recognized opportunities. Further research links creativity directly to entrepreneurial intentions (Shane & Nicolaou, 2015; Yar Hamidi et al., 2008), reinforcing the established connection between creativity and innovation (Sarooghi et al., 2015). Creativity, often narrowly associated with the arts, is crucial across fields, including science, for its role in problem-solving, enhancing productivity, and driving growth. This broad applicability underscores the demand for creativity and innovation in tackling complex business challenges (El-Murad and West, 2004).

This study investigates the essential role of creativity in navigating the dynamic business landscape, addressing gaps identified in Bello et al. (2017) regarding low creativity levels. Focusing on design students, the research aims to assess their creativity perception, risk-taking tendencies, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Creativity is linked to risk-taking, a necessary trait for innovation and facing potential criticism of unique ideas. By selecting design students from Universitas XYZ, located in Tangerang, Indonesia, as participants, this research explores the relationship between creativity and risk-taking (Merrifield et al., 1961; Pankove & Kogan, 1968), examining non-business majors' entrepreneurial qualities. The findings could reveal design students' entrepreneurial potential and suggest their inclusion in entrepreneurial training programs to foster innovative capabilities.

METHOD

This study focuses on examining creativity, Entrepreneurial Self Efficacy and Risk taking Propensity as a potential predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. This research specifically probes into the dynamics of design and arts-related degrees in assessing creativity, targeting majors such as Visual Communication Design, Architecture, Product Design, and Interior Design within the School of Design (Fakultas Desain dan Teknik Perencanaan, FDTP). The study utilizes primary

data gathered through questionnaires. Questionnaires will be distributed both online and in person using Convenience sampling. Participants include 184 active Indonesian students from Universitas XYZ, Tangerang, Indonesia, aged 17 up to 25 years old, who are predominantly exposed to an environment that may enhance their inclination towards entrepreneurship.

The study utilizes primary data gathered through questionnaires, which measure creativity, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, risk-taking propensity, and entrepreneurial intentions using self-reported scales. This research using 4 variables, with total 24 measured item. The scales using 5 Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The measured items were translated to Bahasa Indonesia for easy understanding.

Entrepreneurial Intentions variable used as dependent variable in this research, its defined as a person desire to own a business or starts an Entrepreneurship, the item measured adapted from Kruegger, Reilly & Carsrud(2000) and Chen(1998) aim to gauge the entrepreneurial intentions by assessing their interest in establishing their own business, the extent of their consideration and preparation for such an endeavour, their determination to pursue business setup, and the anticipated timeline for initiating their business. This approach seeks to understand not only the depth of their entrepreneurial ambition but also the practical steps they are taking towards realizing it.

The Independent variables consist of 3 variables: Creativity, Entrepreneurial Self Efficacy, Risk-taking Propensity. Creativity involves generating original and useful ideas, either individually or in groups, encompassing both the process of ideation and the ideas themselves. Its provide with 8 items in demonstrate a strong capacity for creativity, adept at developing and implementing innovative ideas to enhance performance and achieve objectives, willingness to embrace risk for the sake of innovation and your ability to propose diverse, practical solutions highlight the role as a valuable source of creativity ((Amabile, 1983; Sternberg, 1988; Weisberg, 1988; Zhou and George, 2001).

Entrepreneurial Self Efficacy was the next variable and refers to an entrepreneur's confidence in their abilities to successfully execute different tasks and projects. It encompasses the individual's capability to engage motivation, cognitive resources, and a specific action plan to achieve desired outcomes in any given task. Measured by (Boyd and Vozikis, 1994; Chen et al., 1998; Linan and Chen, 2009) ability in controlling the process of creating a new business, likelihood of success in initiating a venture. The ease of starting and maintaining a business, a thorough understanding of the practical details required, readiness in launching a viable venture and Knowledge in developing an entrepreneurial project.

Last variable is Risk-taking propensity, define as the inclination to pursue potential rewards by engaging in situations with uncertain outcomes. It describes an individual's tendency to seize opportunities despite the uncertainties involved in decision-making processes. The measurement items are: Indifference to small but consistent profits, a readiness to embrace high risks for substantial returns, and a willingness to operate under uncertainty if reasonable prospects of gain exist are notable. There's no fear in investing in ventures with calculated dividends, and risks are deemed acceptable when the probability of success is 60% or higher.(Brockhaus, 1980; Koh, 1996)

This study utilized quantitative methods for data collection and analysis. The field of mathematics offers a branch dedicated to number processing known as statistics, which includes both descriptive and inferential statistics—key tools in quantitative research (Sutopo and Slamet, 2017). The analysis of this data was conducted using the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) approach, with the help of SmartPLS software version 4.0.8.4.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

In a survey of 184 participants, divided into male and female categories, 60 males (32.6%) and 124 females (67.4%) responded, as detailed in **Table 1**

Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Male	60	32.6%
Female	124	67.4%
Total	**184**	**100 %**

Table 1 Respondents Gender

Regarding the study programs of the participating students (Table 2), the distribution was as follows: Architecture with 40 students (21.7%), Interior Design with 43 students (23.4%), Visual Communication Design with 67 students (36.4%), and Product Design with 34 students (18.5%). The largest group of respondents came from the Visual Communication Design department.

Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Architecture	40	21.7 %
Interior Design	43	23.4 %
Visual Communication Design	67	36.4 %
Product Design	34	18.5 %
Total	**184**	**100 %**

Table 2 Respondents Study Program

After distributing questionnaires among design school students, analysis of the responses from 184 participants revealed they spanned batches from 2015 to 2022 (see Table 3). The breakdown was as follows: 1 respondent (0.5%) from 2015, 2 (1.1%) from 2016, 9 (4.9%) from 2017, 6 (3.3%) from 2018, 38 (20.7%) from 2019, 67 (36.4%) from 2020, 31 (16.8%) from 2021, and 30 (16.3%) from 2022. The data indicates the largest group of respondents came from the 2020 batch.

Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage
2015	1	0.5 %
2016	2	1.1 %
2017	9	4.9 %
2018	6	3.3 %
2019	38	20.7 %
2020	67	36.4 %
2021	31	16.8 %
2022	30	16.3 %
Total	**184**	**100 %**

Table 3 Respondent Cohort

Prior to the main study, a preliminary test was carried out to assess the validity and reliability of the study's variables and indicators, using data from 30 respondents. This pre-test identified poor validity and reliability for certain indicators (CR1, CR2, CR7, RP1, and RP2), which were subsequently removed from

the model. Adjustments were made based on these findings before proceeding with the full study, which will analyse data from 154 respondents. The comprehensive analysis will include descriptive and inferential statistics, along with various tests for validity, reliability, and model evaluation, using SmartPLS v.4.0.8.4.

Outer Model Test Result

In the validity testing using real data from 154 respondents, researchers applied convergent and discriminant validity. The test considers variables like creativity, entrepreneurial intention, risk-taking prospects, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy as valid if their outer loading exceeds 0.7. Results showed that creativity, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intention met the validity criteria, but one indicator within the risk-taking prospects variable fell short.

Variable	Indicator	Outer Loading	Validity
Creativity	CR3	0.738	Valid
	CR4	0.720	Valid
	CR5	0.701	Valid
	CR6	0.794	Valid
	CR8	0.737	Valid
Risk-Taking Propensity	RP3	0.547	Acceptable
	RP4	0.862	Valid
	RP5	0.751	Valid
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy	SE1	0.739	Valid
	SE2	0.840	Valid
	SE3	0.728	Valid
	SE4	0.809	Valid
	SE5	0.848	Valid
	SE6	0.839	Valid
Entrepreneurial Intention	EI1	0.775	Valid
	EI2	0.838	Valid
	EI3	0.868	Valid
	EI4	0.792	Valid
	EI5	0.732	Valid

Table 4 Indicator Outer Loading

The model's reliability and validity were assessed using Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability (rho c and rho a), and average variance extracted (AVE). Table 5 reveals that the Cronbach's alpha and both forms of composite reliability for constructs like Creativity, Entrepreneurial Intention, Risk Taking Propensity, and Entrepreneurial Self Efficacy are above the 0.700 benchmark. This indicates that the model achieves a satisfactory level of reliability (Hair et al., 2014). Moreover, the AVE values for these constructs—0.546, 0.644, 0.535 and 0.643, respectively—exceed the 0.500 standard, affirming adequate convergent validity according to Hair et al. (2014).

	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Creativity	0.792	0.795	0.857	0.546
Entrepreneurial Intention	0.861	0.868	0.900	0.644
Risk-taking Propensity	0.591	0.701	0.770	0.535
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy	0.889	0.902	0.915	0.643

Table 5 Construct Reliability and Validity

The Fornell-Larcker criterion is employed to verify discriminant validity, essential for proving the uniqueness of each latent variable from others, as explained by Hair et al. (2014). In the Fornell-Larcker criterion's correlation matrix **(seen in Table 6)**, the diagonal elements display the square roots of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each construct, highlighted in bold. These values are contrasted with the off-diagonal elements that depict the correlations among different constructs. To establish discriminant validity, it is crucial that the square root of the AVE for each construct (bolded on the diagonal) is greater than the correlations with other constructs (off-diagonal elements). Discriminant validity is considered adequate when every diagonal value exceeds the corresponding off-diagonal values, indicating clear differentiation between constructs.

	R	I	P	E
Creativity	.739			
Entrepreneurial Intention	.345	.802		
Risk-taking Propensity	.265	.235	.732	
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy	.413	.658	.471	.802

Table 6 Fornell Larcker Result

The Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio emerges as a more sophisticated technique for assessing the reliability of discriminant validity. This method, as elucidated by Henseler et al. (2016), evaluates the ratio of the correlations between constructs (heterotrait) against the correlations within the same construct (monotrait). The application of the HTMT ratio provides a nuanced measure of how distinctly separate each construct is from another. In the present analysis, as shown in Table 7, all the HTMT ratios fall below the threshold of 0.9. This result suggests a strong level of discriminant validity among the constructs studied, indicating that the constructs are well differentiated and maintain a high level of uniqueness. Such findings underscore the effectiveness of the HTMT ratio as a refined and reliable indicator of discriminant validity, offering a clearer understanding of the relationships and distinctions between constructs in the model.

	CR	EI	RP	SE
Creativity				
Entrepreneurial Intention	0.501			
Risk-taking Propensity	0.740	0.495		
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy	0.532	0.642	0.605	

Table 7 HTMT Result

The coefficient of determination, also known as R-Squared, gauges how well a model can explain the variation in the dependent variable, ranging from 0 to 1. A higher R-Squared value suggests that independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable's variance. According to Chin (1998), R-Squared values are categorized as substantial (0.67), moderate (0.33), and weak (0.19). To address sample bias, Adjusted R2 is also considered, acknowledging that R2 tends to increase with the addition of new variables to the model, as noted by previous studies (Carter, 1979; Fan, 2001; Ranney and Thigpen, 1981). In the current analysis result in table 8 below, an R-Squared of 0.447 and an Adjusted R2 of 0.436 suggest a moderate impact on entrepreneurial intentions, indicating a significant influence of the independent variables on this outcome.

Variable	R-Squared (R^2)	Adjusted R^2
Entrepreneurial Intention	0.447	0.436

Table 8 R- Squared and Adjusted R- Squared

This research utilized the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) test to assess the relationships among independent variables and the standard error of the regression coefficient, aiming to eliminate multicollinearity and bias (Hair et al., 2014; Garson, 2016). Garson (2016) notes that VIF values below 5 indicate no multicollinearity issues, while Kock (2015) suggests a stricter cutoff of 3.3 to avoid common method bias. Given that all VIF values in this study (see Table 9) fall below these thresholds, it's likely that multicollinearity is not a concern, affirming the reliability of the indicators and methods used.

	CR	EI	RP	SE
Creativity		1.215		
Entrepreneurial Intention				
Risk-taking Propensity		1.295		
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy		1.451		

Table 9 Inner VIF Actual Test Result

To verify the study's hypotheses, researchers assess the significance and connections between variables, using hypothesis testing to determine if hypotheses are to be accepted or rejected, as outlined by

Taeger and Kuhnt (2014). The acceptance or rejection hinges on T-statistics and P-value criteria. As per Hair et al. (2017), a T-statistic above 1.65 (one tailed) at a 95% confidence level and a P-value below 0.05 are required for a hypothesis to be considered statistically significant and accepted. Hypotheses not meeting these standards are deemed unsupported and rejected. The accompanying table 10 below, summarizes the outcomes for the three hypotheses evaluated.

Hypothesis	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Hypotheses Result
CR -> EI	0.098	0.101	0.073	1.340	0.180	Not Supported
RP -> EI	-0.104	-0.081	0.077	1.355	0.176	Not Supported
SE -> EI	0.666	0.659	0.065	10.326	0.000	Supported

Table 10 Hypotheses Test Result

H1: Creativity positively correlates with entrepreneurial intentions. Result: unsupported

The outcome of testing the first hypothesis is presented in **Table 10**. The findings indicate a T-statistic of 1.340, which falls short of the required threshold of 1.65 for acceptance. Furthermore, the P-value recorded is 0.180, which does not meet the significance criterion of being less than 0.05. These results lead to the conclusion that the first hypothesis, which proposed a positive relationship between creativity and entrepreneurial intentions, is not substantiated by the data. Thus, it is concluded that there is no significant positive correlation between the two variables under study.

The first hypothesis positing a positive correlation between creativity and entrepreneurial intention has been refuted. Analysis reveals minimal support for this claim, with a sample mean of 0.101 suggesting a negligible effect of creativity on entrepreneurial intention, and a P-value of 0.180 indicating insufficient grounds to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, it's concluded that creativity does not significantly impact entrepreneurial intention, challenging the notion of creativity as a direct precursor to entrepreneurial intention. This disconnect may stem from the complexity and varied definitions of creativity, rendering it less directly applicable to entrepreneurship as previously thought. Research by Lee and Wong (2004), Hamidi et al. (2008), and Rodrigues et al. (2019), among others, supports this conclusion, highlighting either weak or statistically insignificant links between creativity and entrepreneurial intention. These findings suggest that the influence of creativity on entrepreneurship might be contingent upon mediators or moderators within this relationship. Consequently, this study concludes that creativity does not directly enhance entrepreneurial intention, contrary to traditional beliefs.

H2: There is a positive relationship between Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Entrepreneurial Intentions. Result: Supported

Table 10 displays the results for the second hypothesis, examining the link between self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions. With a T-statistic of 10.326, significantly surpassing the acceptance benchmark of 1.65, and a P-value of 0.000, which is well below the 0.05 threshold for significance, the data strongly supports the second hypothesis. These findings confirm a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions, validating the hypothesis.

The second hypothesis, suggesting a positive link between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions, is strongly supported by the evidence. The significant mean value of 0.659 and a

T-statistic of 10.326, well above the critical threshold of 1.96, alongside a p-value of 0.000, robustly confirm the hypothesis. These findings underscore the substantial influence of entrepreneurial self-efficacy on intentions to pursue entrepreneurship, aligning with previous research by Chen et al. (1998) and Krueger (2007), among others. However, concerns about the potential for overly similar indicators, suggested by high Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values, hint at a possible overestimation of this relationship. Despite this, the overall evidence validates the significant role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy as a precursor to entrepreneurial intentions, reaffirming the established theoretical framework.

H3: There is a positive relationship between Risk-Taking Propensity and Entrepreneurial Intentions. Result: Unsupported

The analysis of the third hypothesis, regarding the link between risk-taking propensity and entrepreneurial intentions as shown in **Table 10**, reveals a T-statistic of 1.355 and a P-value of 0.176. Since the T-statistic does not exceed the required threshold of 1.65 and the P-value is above the critical level of 0.05, the hypothesis does not find support in the data. Thus, the evidence suggests no significant positive relationship between risk-taking propensity and entrepreneurial intentions.

The third hypothesis, positing a positive link between risk-taking propensity and entrepreneurial intentions, found no supportive evidence, marking an unexpected deviation from the commonly held view of entrepreneurs as natural risk-takers. Analysis revealed a t-statistic of 1.355 and a p-value of 0.176, indicating that risk-taking propensity does not significantly affect entrepreneurial intentions. Survey responses highlighted ambiguity among participants regarding their willingness to embrace risk, with many opting for neutral responses that suggest indecision. This ambivalence complicates establishing a clear relationship with entrepreneurial intentions. Factors such as a lack of exposure to entrepreneurial training or business knowledge, especially among design students compared to their business major counterparts, could explain the absence of a significant relationship. Previous research by Ferreira et al. (2012) and Brockhaus (1980) similarly suggests that risk-taking propensity does not distinguish entrepreneurs from the general population. Supporting this, Palich and Bagby (1995) found that entrepreneurs do not necessarily seek risk but rather have a more positive perception of risk, focusing more on opportunities than threats. This notion aligns with the perspective that risk preference, based on perception rather than mere propensity, is a more accurate predictor of entrepreneurial intentions.

This study draws on the framework by Bello, Mattana, & Loi (2017), which explored the positive impact of creativity on entrepreneurial intentions among Italian secondary students engaged in entrepreneurship projects. In contrast, the present research was conducted in Indonesia, focusing on design students who had not participated in any entrepreneurial programs, diverging from Bello et al.'s focus on a specific educational context. The selection of design students aimed to investigate the influence of academic programs on entrepreneurial intentions, a departure from commonly studied demographic factors such as age, gender, education level, and parental influence. Additionally, this choice was motivated by a desire to explore creativity levels within the sample, responding to a perceived gap in previous studies. The findings indicated a high level of creativity among participants, highlighting the importance of considering the study's distinct geographical, contextual, and sample characteristics.

CONCLUSION

Utilizing SmartPLS v.4.0.8.4 for analysis, the study confirms one hypothesis while rejecting two. The findings indicate that creativity and risk-taking propensity do not significantly influence entrepreneurial intention. In contrast, a positive correlation between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention is strongly supported.

Theoretical Implication

This study explores the precursors to entrepreneurial intention, with a specific focus on the

role of creativity. Despite its recognized importance, creativity's impact on entrepreneurial intention has been overlooked in existing models, prompting calls for further investigation (Hamidi et al., 2008; Shane and Nicolaou, 2015). Contrary to expectations and some prior research, our findings indicate that creativity does not directly influence entrepreneurial intention. Instead, the significance lies in the indirect effect, where entrepreneurial self-efficacy acts as a crucial moderator, aligning with Zhao et al. (2005)'s theory on entrepreneurial self-efficacy as a mediator. This study suggests the need to consider additional factors to fully understand the complex link between creativity and entrepreneurial intentions, incorporating traits-based and risk-taking perspectives. Yet, similar to creativity, risk-taking propensity showed no significant effect on the entrepreneurial intentions of design students, diverging from findings in prior research (Chen et al., 1998; Fayolle & Liñán, 2014).

Managerial Implication

This study found that self-efficacy is crucial in fostering entrepreneurial intentions, overshadowing the perceived relevance of creativity and risk-taking abilities. Many individuals hesitate to pursue entrepreneurship due to a lack of confidence, likely stemming from the high failure rates of startups and the inherent challenges of business operations. This hesitancy is further compounded by a general lack of knowledge about business and risk management among respondents.

Despite recognizing the value of creativity in product development and marketing, participants identified a significant gap in their business execution skills and experience. There's a consensus on the need for educational support in entrepreneurship, highlighting the role of self-efficacy in successful entrepreneurial ventures.

The findings suggest that entrepreneurship programs should prioritize building individual competence and self-efficacy. To boost entrepreneurial activity, governments and institutions should offer programs that not only enhance self-efficacy but also provide comprehensive entrepreneurship education. This approach will ensure that potential entrepreneurs are well-equipped with the necessary knowledge and support to navigate the complexities of starting and running a business, potentially leading to more innovative solutions and startups.

Limitation

This study faced several limitations, including a sample restricted to students from Universitas XYZ, excluding a broader demographic across Indonesia due to unavailable targeted population demographics. A convenience sampling method was adopted to mitigate these constraints. The study's focus was limited to specific creative majors like Architecture and Design, with an uneven distribution among them, particularly skewed towards Visual Communication Design students, affecting the representativeness of the findings. Additionally, the scarcity of research on the direct link between creativity and entrepreneurial intention posed challenges in interpreting the results. The study's generalizability is also limited by the chosen sample and method. Notably, design students' entrepreneurial intentions have been underexplored in existing models, further compounded by an unclear consensus on defining creativity levels. Moreover, the neutral average response to risk-taking propensity suggests possible misunderstandings or unfamiliarity with entrepreneurship among participants, potentially impacting survey responses.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings and limitations, several key recommendations emerge for future research. There's a clear need for further exploration into the direct link between creativity and entrepreneurial intentions, particularly within the context of design students. Future studies should aim to broaden the demographic and background understanding of these students across various Indonesian universities, potentially employing purposive sampling methods for a more targeted analysis. Given the broad nature of creativity, diverse samples and backgrounds would enrich the understanding of its impact on entrepreneurial intentions. Additionally, the study's model could benefit from adjustments to better capture the relationship between creativity, risk-taking propensity, and entrepreneurial intentions. A more narrowly defined creativity construct tailored to entrepreneurship may enhance research outcomes. Surprisingly, risk-taking propensity showed minimal significance, suggesting future research should refine this construct or explore new measures to better assess its predictive power regarding entrepreneurial intentions.

REFERENCES

Bello, B., Mattana, V., & Loi, M. (2017). The power of peers: A new look at the impact of creativity, social context and self-efficacy on entrepreneurial intentions. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research.

Ahlin, B., Drnovšek, M., & Hisrich, R. D. (2014). Entrepreneurs' creativity and firm innovation: the moderating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Small Business Economics, 43(1), 101–117. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43553736

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity and innovation in organizations. Harvard Business School.

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(3), 367–403.

Ames, M., & Runco, M. A. (2005). Predicting Entrepreneurship From Ideation and Divergent Thinking. Creativity and Innovation Management, 14(3), 311–315. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2004.00349.x

Anwar, I., & Saleem, I. (2019). Exploring entrepreneurial characteristics among university students: an evidence from India. Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 13(3), 282–295. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-07-2018-0044

Athayde, R. (2009). Measuring Enterprise Potential in Young People. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 33(2), 481–500. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00300.x

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bird, B. (1988). Implementing Entrepreneurial Ideas: The Case for Intention. The Academy of Management Review, 13(3), 442. https://doi.org/10.2307/258091

Boyd, N. G., & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The Influence of Self-Efficacy on the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 18(4), 63–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879401800404

Brockhaus, R. H. (1980). Risk Taking Propensity of Entrepreneurs. Academy of Management Journal, 23(3), 509–520. https://doi.org/10.2307/255515

Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? Journal of Business Venturing, 13(4), 295–316.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00029-3

Crijns, H., & Vermeulen, S. (2007). How entrepreneurial are our Flemish students? Flanders District of Creativity.

Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2002). Self-Employment as a Career Choice: Attitudes, Entrepreneurial Intentions, and Utility Maximization. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26(3), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225870202600305

Drnovšek, M., Wincent, J., & Cardon, M. S. (2010). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and business start-up: developing a multi-dimensional definition. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 16(4), 329–348. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552551011054516

Drucker P. F. (1985). Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Pan Books Ltd.

El-Murad, J., & West, D. C. (2004). The definition and measurement of creativity: what do we know?. Journal of Advertising research, 44(2), 188-201. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/S0021849904040097

Fatoki, O. O. (2010). Graduate entrepreneurial intention in South Africa: motivations and obstacles. International Journal of Business and Management, 5(9), 87–98.

Frese, P. A., & Gielnik, M. M. (2014). The psychology of entrepreneurship. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1(1), 413–438. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091326

Garson, G. D. (2016). Partial Least Squares: Regression & Structural Equation Models. Statistical Associates Blue Book Series.

Gielnik, M. M., Frese, M., Graf, J. M., & Kampschulte, A. (2012). Creativity in the opportunity identification process and the moderating effect of diversity of information. Journal of Business Venturing, 27(5), 559–576. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2011.10.003

Gurel, E., Altinay, L., & Daniele, R. (2010). Tourism students' entrepreneurial intentions. Annals of Tourism Research, 37(3), 646–669. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.12.003

Gürol, Y., & Atsan, N. (2006). Entrepreneurial characteristics amongst university students. Education + Training, 48(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910610645716

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). Multivariate Data Analysis: Pearson New International Edition (7th Edition). Pearson International Content.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) (2nd Edition). Sage.

Hansen, D. J., Lumpkin, G. T., & Hills, G. E. (2011). A multidimensional examination of a creativity based opportunity recognition model. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 17(5), 515–533. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552551111158835

Harding, R., & Bosma, N. (2006). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2006 Results.

Henseler, J. (2017). Partial Least Squares Path Modeling. In Advanced Methods for Modeling Markets (pp. 361–381). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53469-5_12

Hmieleski, K. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2006). Proclivity for Improvisation as a Predictor of Entrepreneurial Intentions. Journal of Small Business Management, 44(1), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2006.00153.x

Honig, B. (2004). Entrepreneurship Education: Toward a Model of Contingency-Based Business Planning. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 3(3), 258–273. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2004.14242112

Karabulut, A. T. (2016). Personality Traits on Entrepreneurial Intention. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 229, 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.109

Karlsson, T., & Moberg, K. (2013). Improving perceived entrepreneurial abilities through education: Exploratory testing of an entrepreneurial self efficacy scale in a pre-post setting. The International Journal of Management Education, 11(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2012.10.001

Koh, H.C. (1996). Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11(3), 12–25. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683949610113566

Kolvereid, L. (1996). Prediction of Employment Status Choice Intentions. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 21(1), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879602100104

Krueger, N. F., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 5(4), 315–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985629300000020

Krueger, N. F., & Brazeal, D. v. (1994). Entrepreneurial Potential and Potential Entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 18(3), 91–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879401800307

Krueger, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. Journal of Business Venturing, 15(5–6), 411–432. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(98)00033-0

Krueger, N. F. (2007). The Cognitive Infrastructure of Opportunity Emergence*. In Entrepreneurship (pp. 185–206). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48543-8_9

Laviolette, E. M., Radu Lefebvre, M., & Brunel, O. (2012). The impact of story bound entrepreneurial role models on self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 18(6), 720–742. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552551211268148

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a Unifying Social Cognitive Theory of Career and Academic Interest, Choice, and Performance. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45(1), 79–122. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027

McGee, J. E., Peterson, M., Mueller, S. L., & Sequeira, J. M. (2009). Entrepreneurial Self–Efficacy: Refining the Measure. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 33(4), 965–988. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00304.x

Merrifield, P. R., Guilford, J. P., Christensen, P. R., & Frick, J. W. (1961). Interrelationships Between Certain Abilities and Certain Traits of Motivation and Temperament. The Journal of General Psychology, 65(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.1961.9920461

Okpara, F. O. (2007). The value of creativity and innovation in entrepreneurship. Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability, 3(2).

Pankove, E., & Kogan, N. (1968). Creative ability and risk-taking in elementary school children 1. Journal of Personality, 36(3), 420–439. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1968.tb01483.x

Robson, P. J. A., Wijbenga, F., & Parker, S. C. (2009). Entrepreneurship and Policy. International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship, 27(5), 531–535. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242609338753

Runco, M. A. (2004). Creativity. Annu. Rev. Psychol, 55, 657–687.

Sarooghi, H., Libaers, D., & Burkemper, A. (2015). Examining the relationship between creativity and innovation: A meta-analysis of organizational, cultural, and environmental factors.

Journal of Business Venturing, 30(5), 714–731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2014.12.003

Sesen, H. (2013). Personality or environment? A comprehensive study on the entrepreneurial intentions of university students. Education+ Training, 55(7), 624–640.

Shane, S., & Nicolaou, N. (2015). Creative personality, opportunity recognition and the tendency to start businesses: A study of their genetic predispositions. Journal of Business Venturing, 30(3), 407–419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2014.04.001

Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. Prentice-Hall.

Sheppard, B. H., Hartwick, J., & Warshaw, P. R. (1988). The Theory of Reasoned Action: A Meta-Analysis of Past Research with Recommendations for Modifications and Future Research. Journal of Consumer Research, 15(3), 325. https://doi.org/10.1086/209170

Siegel, D. S., Wright, M., & Lockett, A. (2007). The rise of entrepreneurial activity at universities: organizational and societal implications. Industrial and Corporate Change, 16(4), 489–504.

Stenholm, P., & Renko, M. (2016). Passionate bricoleurs and new venture survival. Journal of Business Venturing, 31(5), 595–611. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-01-2021-0002

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. Handbook of Creativity, 1, 3–15.

Stewart, W. H., Watson, W. E., Carland, J. C., & Carland, J. W. (1999). A proclivity for entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venturing, 14(2), 189–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00070-0

Turker, D., & Sonmez Selcuk, S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? Journal of European Industrial Training, 33(2), 142–159. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590910939049

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(3), 407–415. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.3.407

Yar Hamidi, D., Wennberg, K., & Berglund, H. (2008). Creativity in Entrepreneurship Education. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15. https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000810871691

Zhang, P., Wang, D. D., & Owen, C. L. (2015). A Study of Entrepreneurial Intention of University Students. Entrepreneurship Research Journal, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2014-0004

Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2001). WHEN JOB DISSATISFACTION LEADS TO CREATIVITY: ENCOURAGING THE EXPRESSION OF VOICE. Academy of Management Journal, 44(4), 682–696. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069410