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**FROM PERSONAL VALUES TO ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTION: A**

**SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW**

# Abstract

**Design/methodology/approach** – To conduct this SLR, three widely used databases were searched (Scopus, ABI-INFORM and Web of Science). 451 initial hits were successively narrowed down to a final list of 22 journal articles matching our inclusion criteria. This field of research is very recent, since the selected papers have all been published since 2011, half of which have appeared since 2017.

**Purpose -** This systematic literature review (SLR) analyses the existing contributions, jointly studying personal values (PVs) and intentions in entrepreneurship. Despite the long tradition that these two constructs enjoy in social psychology, they have only recently been considered together in entrepreneurship research.

**Findings -** The predominant approach in these papers is the consideration of PVs as antecedents in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions (EIs). In particular, the basic human values (BHV) theory for PVs, and the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) for intentions, are the prevalent frameworks. The influence of PVs differs notably depending on the motivational antecedent of intention being considered, and also on the specific (general vs. social) EI analysed.

**Originality/value -** This SLR is, to the best of our knowledge, the first review that addresses this fastgrowing area of research. It provides a comprehensive mapping of the contributions to date, as well as an integrative conceptual framework to synthetize accumulated knowledge. It also identifies subsisting knowledge gaps and a number of future research opportunities.

**Keywords –** personal values; entrepreneurial intention; systematic literature review; integrative framework

# Introduction

For decades, entrepreneurship scholars have tried to increase their understanding of the entrepreneurial process (Galanakis and Giourka, 2017; Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad, 2014). In particular, the entrepreneurial intention (EI) has attracted increasing attention as a key driver in predicting new venture creation behaviours (Bird, 1988; Kautonen, Gelderen, and Fink, 2015). The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) is undoubtedly the most widely-used model in EI research (Liñán and Fayolle, 2015; Schlaegel and Koenig, 2014).

Intentions are considered the single best predictor of behaviour (van Gelderen, Kautonen, Wincent, and Biniari, 2018; Krueger and Carsrud, 1993). In this respect, intentions reflect the magnitude of the effort the individual is prepared to exert to perform a certain behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Intention itself is the better-established and the best empirically-tested antecedent of entrepreneurial behaviour, according to the consolidated empirical literature (Delanoë‐Gueguen and Liñán, 2019; Kautonen et al., 2015; Kautonen, Van Gelderen, and Tornikoski, 2013; Liñán and Rodríguez‐Cohard, 2015; van Gelderen,

Kautonen, Wincent, and Biniari, 2018) and theoretical literature (Fayolle and Liñán, 2014; Krueger, 2007; Krueger and Carsrud, 1993).

Research has striven to delve into the understanding of EI formation. For instance, several additional variables have been considered, such as the entrepreneurial identity (Pfeifer, Šarlija, and Zekić Sušac, 2016). Other authors, in turn, advocate the analysis of the role of Personal Values (PVs) in the entrepreneurial process (Fayolle, Liñán, and Moriano, 2014). Related to this, certain studies have found that PVs play a key role in the entrepreneurial decision-making process. Thus, according to Gorgievski, Ascalon and Stephan (2011), the criteria to define success in entrepreneurial endeavours is related to prioritised PVs. Likewise, Bolzani and Foo (2018) associate the decision to internationalise with the

PV system.

According to Veroff and Smith (1985), values are cognitive, deliberate, and evaluative determinants of goals. Moreover, they establish the conception of the desirable (Kluckhohn, 1951). Personal Values represent the cognitive recognition of the correct way to behave or the correct end-state to strive for (Rokeach, 1973). The importance of PVs lies in their capacity to guide goal-setting and to act as the decision criteria in ambiguous or uncertain scenarios (Feather, 1995; Gorgievski, Stephan, Laguna, and

Moriano, 2018). These PVs are important in explaining human actions (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). They have been regarded as one of the most significant drivers in guiding intentions and subsequent behaviour (Maio, Olson, Allen, and Bernard, 2001; Murray, Haddock, and Zanna, 1996).

The majority of research finds that individualistic-like PVs (such as achievement, stimulation, and selfdirection) are those that exhibit a positive relationship with EI (Liñán, Moriano, and Jaén, 2016; Yang et al., 2015). In contrast, more recently, Hueso, Jaén, Liñán and Basuki (2020) found that collectivisticlike values are also related to EI, although the relationship remains mostly indirect. Nevertheless, there are still relatively few studies analysing the relationship between PVs and EI (Tipu and Ryan, 2016). Moreover, existing research is only partial and lacks an integrative perspective regarding this relationship. Therefore, the present research aims to identify and analyse the extant literature on the role that PVs play in the formation of EIs. To this end, all articles published in academic journals up until the beginning of 2020 have been examined.

As a result of this literature review, a general overview of the accumulated knowledge on the relationship between PVs and EI can be presented. This is important due to the role that PVs play in prompting decisions and actions (Feather, 1980; 1995), especially given the inherent complexity in entrepreneurial behaviour. Choosing to become an entrepreneur has far-reaching implications for the individual. Therefore, personal goals and priorities are likely to affect EIs through several mechanisms.

The present research identifies several of these mechanisms, although others still need to be addressed.

Additionally, the study proposes an integrative conceptual framework where the reviewed literature is synthetized, including potential relationships between PVs and other elements in the entrepreneurial process. Based on this framework, the manuscript identifies the specific knowledge gaps and proposes a future research agenda in this academic field. This study may therefore become a most relevant reference point for researchers in this field.

In the next section, the relevant theoretical framework is reviewed. The methodology section then details how this literature review identifies the research work to be included. Section four describes the findings from our review. Section five discusses those results and considers their implications, and is followed by a brief conclusion section.

# Theoretical framework

Both the concept of PVs and that of intention originate from the literature on psychology. In particular, the work by Rokeach (1973) is considered to be one of the fundamental contributions to the theory of human values. Similarly, the work by Fishbein in collaboration with Ajzen (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975) is also regarded as foundational in the study of behavioural intentions. However, there has been relatively little integration of both concepts within the entrepreneurship field of research.

*Personal Values*

The importance of the PVs for each individual has long been recognised (Kluckhohn, 1951). Without a hierarchically organised system of PVs, individuals would not be able to make decisions and pursue their goals in life (Allport, 1961). Values should be given centrality as descriptive and explanatory concepts and, further, personality could be understood as a system of values (Rokeach, 1973). Personal Values are considered as guiding principles in life, where individual values remain relatively stable across situations and during human lifespan (Schwartz, 1992). Values are ordered by the relative importance that the individual attaches to each of them (Allport, 1961; Maslow, 1959; Pepper, 1958; Rokeach, 1973). The prevalence of certain values over others determines the individual’s "dominating force" that conditions their day-to-day decisions (Allport, 1961, p. 543).

Values affect how people view situations, consider their alternatives, and eventually act (Holland and

Shepherd, 2013). These abstract structures, held as “organized summaries of experience”, provide

“continuity and meaning under changing environmental circumstances” (Feather, 1980, p. 249).

However, definitional inconsistency remains epidemic in values theory and research (Rohan, 2000). The importance of people´s value priorities in understanding and predicting attitudinal and behavioural decisions has been emphasised (Rohan, 2000). The understanding of these PVs is important because they induce valences on possible actions (Feather, 1995). Therefore, the PV structure does indeed affect the individual perspective and how individuals make decisions and behave.

Personal Values guide individuals’ intentions, choices and executed behaviours (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). Values are about desirable end states or behaviours and transcend specific situations. As a consequence, they guide selection or evaluation of behaviour and events (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987). Individuals behave according to their PV structure because they need a level of consistency between their beliefs and actions (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003; Rokeach, 1973). For this reason, PVs have been identified as a key factor in the decision-making process (Feather, 1980; Rokeach, 1973; Bardi and Schwartz, 2003).

Schwartz’s (1992) Theory of Basic Human Values (BHV) is probably the most widely used framework to explain personal values. It identifies ten basic values that are prevalent in all individuals and these values form a quasi-circumplex structure based on the inherent conflict or compatibility between their motivational goals (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987). Adjacent values are compatible, while opposing values are conflicting. The ten basic values may be grouped into four value-dimensions (Schwartz, 1992): selfenhancement (including power and achievement values), openness to change (stimulation and selfdirection values), self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence), and conservation (tradition, conformity and security). Hedonism would be placed between achievement and stimulation in the value-circumplex, and shares elements of the two corresponding value-dimensions; for this reason it is usually excluded when the value dimensions are studied (Gorgievski et al., 2018). According to this circumplex structure, self-enhancement and self-transcendence are opposing dimensions, as are openness to change and conservation.

*Entrepreneurial intention models*

The literature considers that intention models are central to ascertaining how individuals behave and develop their actions (Galanakis and Giourka, 2017). Therefore, a stronger intention to carry out this behaviour should reflect itself in a higher likelihood of it being performed (Ajzen, 1991). Behaviours are the consequence of affective (feeling and emotional responses), cognitive (beliefs, memories, and perceptions of events), and conative variables (intentions and predictions about individual behaviour in response to an event) (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

Entrepreneurship (or new venture creation) qualifies as a voluntary and conscious behaviour under volitional control (Bird, 1988; Krueger and Carsrud, 1993; Schlaegel and Koenig, 2014). Therefore,

EIs are widely studied as a relevant antecedent for entrepreneurial behaviour (Delanoe-Gueguen and Liñán, 2019; Kautonen et al., 2015; van Gelderen et al., 2018). Entrepreneurial intentions are individual states of mind that direct attention, experience, and actions towards the idea of starting up a new venture (Bird, 1988).

In entrepreneurship research, the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) stands out as the most prominent model to explain the start-up intention (Krueger and Carsrud, 1993; Kautonen et al., 2013; 2015). In this model, the constructs explaining the individuals’ entrepreneurial intentions include the personal attitude towards entrepreneurship (PA), subjective norms (SN), and the perceived behavioural control (PBC). First, PA refers to the positive or negative evaluation, or appraisal, of the entrepreneurial behaviour and its consequences. Second, SN symbolizes the support expected from the individual’s close environment (family, friends, relatives, etc.) if the individual exhibited start-up behaviours. Third, the PBC indicates the perceived ease or difficulty in undertaking entrepreneurial actions (Ajzen, 1991; Krueger and Carsrud, 1993; Kautonen et al., 2013; 2015).

The number of research studies into EIs is substantial (Liñán and Fayolle, 2015) and continues to grow (Donaldson, 2019). This research has identified a considerable amount of variables affecting the formation of intentions that include both personal and context variables (Liñán and Fayolle, 2015). In particular, PVs have been considered a motivational determinant of EIs (Fayolle et al., 2014).

*Personal Values and Entrepreneurial Intention*

Starting a venture is a complex process that involves the realisation of several tasks and usually includes considerable time delays (Galankis and Giourka, 2017; Kautonen et al., 2015). For this reason, it may be best described as a goal-directed behaviour (Bagozzi and Kimmel, 1995). Therefore, since PVs are the guiding principles that help both set and strive towards achieving personal goals (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992), they should be relevant in the determination of EIs.

Despite this fact, few studies consider PVs as an antecedent of EI (Liñán and Fayolle, 2015). Although research on the values of entrepreneurs remains relatively scarce (Holland and Shepherd, 2013), it indicates a significant relationship between individualist values and entrepreneurial behaviour (Liñán et al., 2016). Similarly, individualist values positively predict the EI of respondents (Liñán et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2015). More recently, additional research has confirmed this relationship (Gorgievski et al., 2018; Morales, Holtschlag, Masuda, and Marquina, 2019)

Individualistic PVs, such as achievement, power, and self-direction, are considered as being more consistent with entrepreneurship (Gorgievski et al., 2018), since they emphasise the pursuit of goals that may be achieved through this career choice. This influence may depend on the predominating cultural values in society and is thus affected by context (Liñán et al., 2016; Morales et al., 2019; Munir,

Jianfeng, and Ramzan, 2019). On the other hand, research on the role of so-called collectivistic PVs on

EI is even scarcer. It finds support for the argument that certain collectivistic values could have a small indirect positive effect on EI (Hueso et al., 2020). Therefore, there seems to be some conflict and substantial gaps in our knowledge regarding the PVs/EI relationship. The literature review carried out in this paper may well contribute to shedding light on this relationship.

# Methodology

In order to perform this systematic review of the literature on PVs and EIs, the present research follows previous methodological recommendations (Armitage and Keeble-Allen, 2008; Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart, 2003; Pittaway, Holt and Broad, 2014; Rauch, 2020). Literature reviews are most useful to systematise knowledge in any field, since they serve to identify, evaluate, and relate previous contributions in the research area (Mulrow, 1994). The distinct feature of a systematic literature review (SLR) is a well-established procedure that specifies the method employed to identify, select, assess, and synthesise the evidence derived from previous publications (Armitage and Keeble-Allen, 2008; Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015). It offers a normalised procedure to investigate the existing literature: a method that is replicable, transparent, objective, unbiased and rigorous (Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015). This SLR is a domain-based review. It synthetizes and extends a body of literature that resides in the same substantive domain (Palmatier, Houston and Hulland, 2018).

The relevant search terms were selected in accordance with the aims of this study, as shown in Figure

1: personal\* AND value\* AND entrepreneur\* AND intent\*. The search was carried out within the Scopus, ABI-INFORM and Web of Science databases. These three different databases were selected to make the search more comprehensive. The search terms were included in the following fields: article title, abstract, and keywords. The timeframe for the search was left open, and unrestricted to any dates (the last search was carried out on 22nd March, 2020).

This search initially yielded 491 matches with 181 duplicates, which were immediately removed. The remaining 310 studies included 27 conference papers, 6 book chapters, 4 dissertations, 7 non-academic journals, and 27 non-English-language papers. All of these were excluded to avoid possible variability in the peer review process (Jones, Coviello, and Tang, 2011). The remaining 239 publications were content-analysed to confirm their relevance. Publication dates range from 1992 (1 paper), 2001 (1 paper), and show a clear upward trend throughout the years up to 2019 (60 studies). The year 2020 (with 5 papers) remains incomplete. This is presented in Figure 2. Therefore, the studies jointly mentioning PVs and EIs are very recent and their production rate is also increasing very rapidly.

*Figure 1* – Steps in the systematic literature review



Each of these 239 papers was read by one of the authors to confirm its relevance according to our conceptual boundaries. First, 49 research papers were excluded. Despite the use of the key terms, they were not focused on either EIs or PVs. A second realisation was that up to 103 papers were focused on EI, but they used the term “values” in a very loose manner, not referring to PVs. These include papers on entrepreneurship education, which is generally argued should help instil “entrepreneurial values” in the participants, and papers measuring attitudes through the “expectancy value theory”. In other words, the term “value” is used with the meaning of “valuable” or “worthy” or “characteristic”, but not as personal goals or guiding principles (Schwartz, 1992). Several papers analysed “social values” as an indirect measure of culture or social norms, which again falls outside the scope of the study.

There are 66 other papers using the term “values” in the title, abstract or keywords, but are effectively analysing “personality traits”. Several of these papers analysed the Big Five personality traits (e.g., Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010), or other personality variables such as locus of control (e.g., de Pillis and

Reardon, 2007), risk-taking propensity (e.g., Duffy et al., 2006), ability to identify opportunities (e.g., Pilková, Holienka and Jančovičová, 2017), and narcissism and Machiavellianism (e.g., Wu et al., 2019). Personality traits and PVs are both important in the configuration of the individual’s mind. However, consolidated results from the psychology literature consider traits and values as distinct constructs

(Olver and Mooradian, 2003). Traits are more biologically based (Goldberg, 1993; McCrae and Costa Jr, 2008), whereas values are a product of a person’s environment, including culture, education, parental upbringing, and life events (Rokeach, 1973). Personal values reflect an individual’s intentional goals and intentional commitments, while personality traits do not (Bilsky and Schwartz, 1994).

After the screening process, 21 documents were selected for inclusion. As a final check to guarantee comprehensiveness, additional relevant work from the key authors (authors of two or more of these 21 papers) were sought. One additional paper was thus found (Gorgievski et al., 2018), thereby yielding a total of 22 final papers included in the SLR. This additional paper was overlooked in the initial systematic search because it did not use the keyword “personal” in the search fields (instead, it used “human” and “individual”).

# Findings

Results are very recent in general. The years of publication range from 2011 to 2020, half of which (11 papers) have appeared from 2017 onwards (see Figure 2). Thus, the first findings are that the study of

PVs and EI is a very novel area of research, and that the term “value” is used with very different meanings, and not only as “personal guiding principles”. In fact, it is only in 2011 that any papers using PVs in EI research are found at all.

*Figure 2* –Timeframe for the SLR



*Synthesis of the results*

Summary information regarding the 22 articles matching the inclusion criteria is presented in Table A1 in the Appendix. Most of the papers are empirical and employ quantitative techniques, except for one theoretical, two qualitative, and one mixed-method (qualitative and quantitative) articles. The great majority of articles consider PVs as an antecedent that aids in the explanation of EIs. The only exceptions are the papers by Farrington et al. (2011) and by Geldhof et al. (2014). The former compares the work values associated with entrepreneurship in two different samples (business students and actual business owners), and finds that students exhibit values of a more idealistic nature than in the case of firm owners. In turn, Geldhof et al. (2014) use both PVs and EI as predictors of entrepreneurial behaviours, and their results indicate that entrepreneurial career values can predict innovation-related behaviours. Since the objective of this research is the analysis of papers jointly studying PVs and EIs, these two articles were maintained. They also provided some insight for the development of an integrative conceptual framework (see subsection below).

The remaining 20 papers consider PVs as direct or indirect antecedents of EIs. Here a theoretical paper is included (Fayolle et al., 2014), which proposes this to be the case, but also argues that PVs may moderate the intention-action link. Two other papers propose and test PVs as direct antecedents of the entrepreneurial attitude (Sihombing, 2018; Yang et al., 2015), but they do so within a framework in which attitudes explain the intention to start up (Yang et al., 2015) or the intention to quit (Sihombing, 2018). Finally, there are two qualitative papers that analyse the goals motivating entrepreneurial decisions: either internationalisation (Bolzani and Foo, 2018), or starting up (Muhammad et al., 2019). The former considers PVs (as defined by Schwartz, 1992) as the more abstract values that motivate the internationalisation decision. The latter, in turn, uses no specific framework for PVs, but the values elicited are very close to some of Schwartz's (1992) values.

*Table I-*  Combinations of PV and EI theories used in the papers selected

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Personal** **Values** **Theory**  | **Type of entrepreneurial intention**  |
| **Start-up Intention**  | **Social Entrepr. Intention**  | **Other intention**  |
| **Basic** **Human** **Values**  | Fayolle et al. (2014) Espiritu-Olmos and Sastre-Castillo (2015) Yang et al. (2015) Liñán et al. (2016) Schmidt and Tatarko (2016) Fernandes et al. (2018) Gorgievski et al. (2018) Hueso et al. (2020)  | Sastre‐Castillo et al. (2015) Kruse et al. (2019)  | Bolzani and Foo (2018)  |
| **Work** **Values**  | Farrington et al. (2011) Hirschi and Fischer (2013)a Geldhof et al. (2014) Tipu and Ryan (2016) Lechner et al. (2018)a  | Kunttu et al. (2017)b  |   |
| **Rokeach**  |   |  | Sihombing (2018) |
| **Other PVs**  | Watchravesringkan et al. (2013) Muhammad et al. (2019)  | Bacq and Alt (2018)  | Ye et al. (2020)  |

Note: a Hirschi and Fischer (2013) define work values to match Schwartz's (1992) personal value dimensions. Lechner et al. (2018) take Hirschi and Fischer (2013) as a reference and adopt a similar approach.

 b Kunttu et al. (2017) compare social entrepreneurial intentions with traditional start-up intentions.

As shown in Table I, the majority of papers (15) focus on the intention either to start up a commercial venture or to become an entrepreneur in general. In turn, there are four studies specifically focusing on the social entrepreneurial intention (SEI). Finally, there are three papers that centre on the intention to perform other entrepreneurial behaviours. They include the internationalisation intention (Bolzani and Foo, 2018), the green EI (Ye et al., 2020), and the intention to quit (Sihombing, 2018). These papers analysing alternative intentions are all very recent, which indicates that the study of PVs is expanding, not only in quantity (number of studies) but also in scope.

Similarly, the theoretical approach used in each paper to define PVs differs notably (see Table I). Overall, there are six papers focusing on work values, of which Farrington et al. (2011) and Geldhof et al. (2014), as mentioned above, jointly analyse PVs and EIs to explain behaviour. Three of these papers focus on the relationship with general start-up intentions. Among these three, Hirschi and Fischer (2013) specifically merge the concept of work values with personal values to analyse the effect on EIs. Similarly, Lechner et al. (2018) also define work values as a reflection of PVs, with explicit reference to Schwartz's (1992) framework and to Hirschi and Fischer's (2013) paper. In both cases, significant gender differences are found. In contrast, Tipu and Ryan (2016) explore how work ethics affect the individuals’ EIs. The sixth paper (Kunttu et al., 2017) compares the effect of work values on sociallyoriented EIs and goals, relative to traditional EIs. They find altruism to be positively related to SEI (but not to EI), while EI is related to security (negatively) and to intrinsic reward (positively).

Additionally, there are other approaches to measuring personal values which are not specifically termed as work values, but remain relatively close. This is the case of self-actualisation and social-affiliation values (Watchravesringkan et al., 2013), empathy (Bacq and Alt, 2018), reasons/motives to start up

(Muhammad et al., 2019), and altruistic values (Ye et al., 2020). Sihombing (2018), in turn, adopts Rokeach's (1973) approach to measuring PVs. She observes that instrumental values are not relevant in predicting the entrepreneurial attitude, whereas terminal values are positively related to this attitude. Finally, the remaining eleven papers use the Basic Human Values (BHV) theory (Schwartz, 1992) to conceptualise PVs, which renders this theory as the most common framework (more detailed results below).

Regarding the specific EI model, ten papers explicitly adopt Ajzen's (1991) Theory of Planned

Behaviour (TPB), which is by far the most common framework for EI. Only one of these papers focuses on the SEI (Kruse et al., 2019), while the remaining nine papers use the TPB to analyse the general intention to start up a new business. The theoretical contribution by Fayolle et al. (2014) has been included here, together with one of the qualitative papers (Muhammad et al., 2019). The remaining papers adopting a TPB framework carry out a quantitative empirical analysis. In particular, there are five quantitative papers integrating Schwartz's (1992) BHV and Ajzen’s (1991) TPB to measure general start-up intentions (Gorgievski et al., 2018; Hueso et al., 2020; Liñán et al., 2016; Schmidt and Tatarko, 2016; Yang et al., 2015), as discussed in greater detail in the following sub-section.

Other papers adopt very different approaches to model EI. In fact, a number of papers use an eclectic approach to defining this variable. They combine contributions from different frameworks to develop the hypotheses regarding the effect of PVs and other variables on EIs. This is the case of seven papers:

Hirschi and Fischer (2013), Espiritu-Olmos and Sastre-Castillo (2015), Sastre‐Castillo et al. (2015), Tipu and Ryan (2016), Kunttu et al. (2017), Fernandes et al. (2018), and Lechner et al. (2018). Geldhof et al. (2014) also use an eclectic framework to define EIs but, in this case, this variable is employed to predict behaviours.

Finally, there are four papers adopting other less commonly used approaches to define and model EI. Bacq and Alt (2018) employ a combined model of SEI (Mair and Noboa, 2006) to analyse the influence of empathy on this variable. Bolzani and Foo (2018) adopt a laddering theory (Reynolds and Gutman, 1988) to predict the internationalisation intention, and uncover five of Schwartz’s basic values at the base of the internationalisation intention. Sihombing (2018) follows the value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy as defined by Homer and Kahle (1988) with a focus on the intention to quit as an entrepreneur. Finally, Ye et al. (2020) use the push-pull-mooring model (Moon, 1995) to predict the intention to switch to green entrepreneurship.

*Integrative conceptual framework*

Despite the considerable complexity and variability in the approaches found within these 22 papers, certain overarching patterns emerge that enable an integrative conceptual framework to be developed.

The overwhelming majority of papers consider PVs as an antecedent of EIs that are either directly connected or mediated by other variables (e.g., Gorgievski et al., 2018; Hueso et al., 2020). Nevertheless, there are two contributions in which EIs and PVs are considered as independent variables jointly affecting actual behaviour (Farrington et al., 2011; Geldhof et al., 2014). This is in line with the possible mediating effect of PVs on the intention-behaviour relationship, suggested by Fayolle et al.

(2014).

*Figure 3* – Integrative Conceptual Framework



Note: Solid lines represent relationships tested in the papers analysed. Dotted lines represent relationships yet to be tested.

Given that the TPB (Ajzen, 1991) and the BHV (Schwartz, 1992) are the most commonly applied theories, and that their joint use is found in nearly one third of the papers (7 out of 22, six empirical and one theoretical), it seems appropriate to base the integrative framework thereon. In this respect, the first reflection is that PVs are considered as distant predictors of intention, through the mediation of motivational antecedents. Nevertheless, a number of papers test the direct relationship between PVs and EI. Liñán et al. (2016) is one of them using the BHV-TPB framework. Figure 3 presents the integrative conceptual framework. Solid lines indicate relationships that have been analysed in these 22 papers, while dotted lines represent relationships yet to be tested. In particular, as Fayolle et al. (2014) suggest, PVs may moderate the intention-action link. Similarly, Delanoë‐Gueguen and Liñán (2019) find the security work motivation (very close to the PV of security) to moderate this relationship and also to exert an independent and direct negative effect on start-up behaviour.

The influence of each value dimension on the TPB variables has been independently analysed in these papers and consistent results are found. They are not presented in Figure 3 for reasons of clarity, but are instead summarised in Table II, based on the six empirical papers that test the BHV-TPB approach. Five of these papers propose and test a partial or total mediation model (Gorgievski et al., 2018; Hueso et al., 2020; Kruse et al., 2019; Schmidt and Tatarko, 2016; Yang et al., 2015), and this is also the relationship proposed in the theoretical paper (Fayolle et al., 2014). The main results are described below, organised in terms of personal value dimensions.

*Table II -* Influence of BHV dimensions on TPB variables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Personal value dimensions**  | **TPB antecedents**  | **Entrepreneurial intention**  |
| **Attitude to entrepreneurship**  | **Subjective norms**  | **Perceived behavioural control**  |
| **Self-enhancement**  | ± (EI) + (SEI)  | - (EI)  | + (EI, SEI)  | + (EI) - (SEI) |
| **Openness to change**  | + (EI, SEI)  | + (EI)  | + (EI, SEI)  | + (EI, SEI)  |
| **Self-Transcendence**  | ± (EI) + (SEI)  | + (EI)  | - (EI) + (SEI) | + (SEI)  |
| **Conservation**  | - (EI)  | + (EI)  | - (EI)  | - (SEI)  |

Note: Based on the results from Gorgievski et al. (2018), Hueso et al. (2020), Kruse et al. (2019), Liñán et al. (2016), Schmidt and Tatarko (2016), and Yang et al. (2015).

+ = positive relationship; - = negative relationship; ± = conflicting results. EI = General entrepreneurial intention; SEI = Social entrepreneurial intention.

Within the self-enhancement value dimension (achievement and power values), the results for Liñán et al. (2016) indicate a direct positive relationship with EIs, even after controlling for the TPB antecedents.

Yang et al. (2015), in turn, note mixed results for the indirect effect of these values through the entrepreneurial PA. Gorgievski et al. (2018) observe that self-enhancement values positively predict self-efficacy (a proxy for PBC), while they negatively affect SNs. In the case of SEIs, Kruse et al. (2019) point towards not only a positive indirect relationship between these values and the SEI through both PA and PBC, but also towards a negative direct relationship, whose direct and indirect effects cancel each other out. Related to this, although without applying the joint BHV-TPB framework, Bolzani and Foo (2018) find both self-enhancement values at the basis of the internationalisation decision. Similarly, Espiritu-Olmos and Sastre-Castillo (2015) also remark that self-enhancement positively relates to EIs; Sastre‐Castillo et al. (2015) agree and also find it to be negatively related to a social orientation. Finally, both Hirschi and Fischer (2013) and Lechner et al. (2018) observe a positive relationship between self-enhancement-related work values and EI.

In the case of openness to change values (self-direction and stimulation), the results are much clearer. Schmidt and Tatarko (2016) find a positive relationship between self-direction and all three motivational antecedents of EI. Gorgievski et al. (2018) replicate this finding for PA and PBC. Yang et al. (2015) confirm this result for the PA antecedent, while Liñán et al. (2016) corroborate a positive direct relationship between these values and EI. In the case of SEIs, Kruse et al. (2019) also note that this value dimension relates positively and significantly to PA, PBC, and to SEIs directly. Additional support for this relationship may be found in those papers that do not combine TPB and BHV theories. In this way, Sastre‐Castillo et al. (2015) observe a direct positive relationship with EI, but not with the social orientation. Bolzani and Foo (2018) also remark self-direction to be at the basis of the internationalisation decision. Again, Hirschi and Fischer (2013) and Lechner et al. (2018) report a positive relationship between variety and autonomy work values (matching the openness to change dimension) and EIs.

The remaining value dimensions (self-transcendence and conservation) are more strongly associated with collectivistic values. In this respect, Yang et al. (2015) report a negative relationship of all the values in these dimensions (except for universalism) with the entrepreneurial PA. Similarly, Schmidt and Tatarko (2016) observe security (a conservation value) to negatively affect the PA. In turn, Hueso et al. (2020) report a more complex relationship, where all these values have a negative relationship with PA and PBC (although not always significant), while they all have a positive relationship with SNs (again, not always significant). Other papers (not combining TPB and BHV theories) find certain conflicting results, since conservation values are found to have a direct positive relationship with EI (Fernandes et al., 2018). Bolzani and Foo (2018) note security and benevolence values to be at the basis of the intention to internationalise. Finally, Hirschi and Fischer (2013) report that security and authority work values (matching the conservation dimension) negatively relate to EIs, while Lechner et al. (2018) observe security and social/interpersonal work values (close to the conservation and self-transcendence dimensions, respectively) to be associated with a lower EI.

It should be borne in mind that different results are found when the SEI is considered. In this case,

Kruse et al. (2019) find self-transcendence to be positively related both to the antecedents of intention (PA and PBC) and also directly to the SEI itself. Conservation, in contrast, is not related to the antecedents, and has a negative influence on the SEI. This is supported by other research based on alternative theoretical models. Thus, Kunttu et al. (2017) note altruism (close to self-transcendence values) to be positively related to SEIs. Bacq and Alt (2018) report a similar positive result for empathy. In turn, the results from Sastre‐Castillo et al. (2015) support a positive relationship between selftranscendence and conservation values and a social entrepreneurial orientation.

# Discussion

This systematic literature review has identified 22 articles that jointly examine the role of PVs and EIs in entrepreneurship. Although this is a recent area of research (all papers are from 2011 or later), it is growing rapidly. The review is timely in that it offers a comprehensive panoramic view of the accumulated knowledge to date and develops an integrative conceptual framework. A first conclusion to be drawn is that research to date overwhelmingly considers PVs as an antecedent in the formation of EIs, in accordance with the conceptualisation of personal values as basic guiding principles in life (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). Thus, they should be expected to play a role in making decisions regarding desirable and/or feasible courses of action (one of which being entrepreneurship).

The BHV-TPB is the most frequent combination of theories used. There are practically no alternative theoretical formulations that may compete in this respect. In the case of PVs, up to six papers analyse work values, but with no common underlying framework. In fact, two of these papers (Hirschi and Fischer, 2013; Lechner et al., 2018) base their work values on Schwartz’s (1992) BHV theory. The results from the BHV-TPB-based research tend to be consistent, with few exceptions. Only in the case of the relationship between self-transcendence and self-enhancement values and PA does there seem to be clear conflict. Yang et al. (2015) find opposing relationships for each of the basic values in these dimensions. In turn, Hueso et al. (2020) observe a negative relationship between universalism and PA. There may be cultural elements underlying these differences. Previous research has shown that shared cultural values affect the individual’s intention-formation process (Jaén and Liñán, 2013; Liñán et al., 2016; Munir et al., 2019).

Another major source of difference is the specific intention under analysis. Kunttu et al. (2017) explicitly compare SEIs and (general) EIs. They remark that the work values predicting each of these intentions do indeed differ. Similarly, Kruse et al. (2019) use the BHV and TPB to explain the formation of SEI. Their results are most insightful when compared to similar models for general EI (Gorgievski et al., 2018; Hueso et al., 2020; Schmidt and Tatarko, 2016; Yang et al., 2015), (see Table II). For several relationships, the effect of PVs on the TPB variables appears to be consistent (e.g., openness to change values affecting any TPB variable), while for others a conflict is found (e.g., the influence of self-transcendence on PBC).

*Implications and future research opportunities*

Several implications for academic research may be derived from this SLR. As a relatively new area of research, there are substantial knowledge gaps yet to be filled. The papers reviewed here provide a basic framework from which new research lines may be identified. The most relevant research questions emerging from this review are summarised in Table III. However, this is not to be taken as an exhaustive list, since many additional questions may be posed.

*Table III –* Knowledge gaps and future research opportunities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge gaps**  | **Research opportunities**  |
| Value dimensions vs. basic human values  | * Role of individual values
* Specific combinations of basic values
 |
| Single dimensions vs. complete value-circumplex  | * Role of individual dimensions
* Combinations of two adjacent dimensions
* Combinations of opposing dimensions
* Cancelling out effects
* Direct and indirect effects of value dimensions
 |
| Effects on different types of intentions  | * Social EIs vs. general EIs
* Sustainable EIs
* Small life-style venture vs. scalable start-up
* High-tech vs. traditional craft venture
* Intention to internationalize, to grow, to innovate, or to quit
 |
| Theoretical frameworks  | * TPB vs. competing intention models (e.g., entrepreneurial event model, social cognitive career theory)
* BHV vs. alternative value theories (e.g., work values)
 |
| Different samples  | * Representativeness of student samples
* Young vs. older adults
* Natives vs. immigrants
 |
| Context characteristics  | * Cultural values
* Life stages
* Family or personal circumstances
 |
| PVs in entrepreneurship education  | * Malleability of PVs
* Design of education interventions to affect PVs
* Evaluation of entrepreneurship education
* PVs and learning
* PVs and entrepreneurial identity
 |

With few exceptions (Fernandes et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2018), research tends to group the basic human values into four value dimensions. This may increase consistency and reliability of the results, but possibly at the expense of losing detailed relationships. Are certain individual basic values relevant in themselves to explain EIs and subsequently behaviour? Or are there specific combinations of basic values that are more promising in this respect? In particular, hedonism (seeking satisfaction and pleasure) is frequently ignored (since it is not included in the four value dimensions). Neither Fernandes et al. (2018) nor Yang et al. (2018) find any effect of hedonism on intentions. Nevertheless, the combination of hedonism with additional basic values might be relevant.

The same reflections may apply to the four value dimensions. Is a high level of openness to change sufficient to develop the entrepreneurial intention? Or is this the case for self-enhancement? Or are high levels of both individualistic-like dimensions necessary? Much research is needed to fully understand the roles of each dimension in explaining the development of EIs and action. Adjacent dimensions may reinforce each other, as could be the case of openness to change and self-enhancement for general EI

(Liñán et al., 2016), or of openness to change and self-transcendence for social EI (Kruse et al., 2019). Additionally, opposing dimensions may cancel each other out, and hence a high level of one dimension may be insufficient if the opposing dimension is also prioritized. The indirect effects of value dimensions on EI, through the TPB antecedents, also deserve attention. Hueso et al. (2020) and Gorgievski et al. (2018) find certain dimensions to affect one antecedent positively and another negatively. Predicting the aggregate effect of these dimensions on EIs would be complex, and even if no such total effect is found, this does not necessarily mean that the value dimensions are irrelevant.

The intention to start up a (general) venture is by far the most common intention analysed, with the TPB (Ajzen, 1991) as the predominant theoretical framework. Nevertheless, several papers consider alternative intentions, such as social entrepreneurship (Bacq and Alt, 2018; Kruse et al., 2019; Kunttu et al., 2017; Sastre‐Castillo et al., 2015), internationalisation (Bolzani and Foo, 2018), green entrepreneurship (Ye et al., 2020), and quitting (Sihombing, 2018) intentions. In this respect, Table II, which compares SEI vs. EI, is based on only a few studies. There are still several relationships for which no comparison is yet available. Much more work is needed to confirm or refute these results.

Additionally, the role of PVs may differ depending on which specific intention (to perform a certain behaviour) is under consideration. Therefore, the potential entrepreneur’s personal-value structure may have substantial implications for the type of venture being created and its future evolution.

The use of alternative theoretical frameworks should also be explored. A number of competing intention models exist, such as the entrepreneurial event model. However, Schlaegel and Koenig (2014) find a substantial overlap between this model and the TPB. Another interesting avenue for further research could involve other such theories. Nevertheless, this research should be able to demonstrate an improvement over the TPB in order to be of any value. In the case of PVs, BHV is the most commonly used framework for their conceptualisation, either directly or indirectly (Hirschi and Fischer, 2013;

Lechner et al., 2018). Work values, in turn, have been defined differently in several of these papers (e.g., Farrington et al., 2011; Geldhof et al., 2014; Tipu and Ryan, 2016). There seems to be much less consensus concerning the most suitable approach for the identification of work values that affect entrepreneurship.

The vast majority of the papers analysed use student samples. There is considerable debate regarding the representativeness of these samples. The comparison of these results with those from comparable studies with alternative samples of adults is therefore of major interest. Additionally, the priorities of an individual’s personal values are likely to evolve as they advance through their different life stages

(Schwartz, 1992). Thus, the role of PVs in the formation of EIs may differ in younger vs. older people. Similarly, immigrants tend to exhibit higher start-up rates than is the case for natives. This may be a consequence of differing cultural values which, to a great extent, are reflected in prioritized PVs.

The role of cultural values is also relevant. Liñán et al. (2016) argue that the influence of PVs on intention is stronger for individuals who prioritize different values from those in the society where they live. This could explain why immigrants are more prone to starting up new businesses, and why, in multicultural societies, certain ethnic groups are more entrepreneurial than others. Do individuals with different priorities respond differently to the same situation? And do individuals with the same priorities respond differently due to their different situations (such as dependence on family circumstances)?

Personal values remain relatively stable over time (Bardi et al., 2009). Therefore, the relevance of understanding their influence may be questioned. However, research has found that these values may be modified, for example, via education (Myyry et al., 2013). This may happen through purposeful actions taken by teachers, but may also take place unintentionally through peer interaction and similar socialisation practices (Racko et al., 2017). There is, therefore, an obvious opportunity to develop and implement entrepreneurship education initiatives that include specific value-transmitting and valuechanging components. Training activities, therefore, may be devised to contribute towards modifying the value structure of the participants. Future research could help not only in the search for the most promising combination of values to promote entry into entrepreneurship, but also to foster responsible and sustainable behaviour as an entrepreneur. The evaluation of education initiatives in this respect should be a long-term exercise. Longitudinal studies are called for to achieve this aim. Hitherto, they have been the exception: only one of the 22 papers analysed here carries out a longitudinal study (Lechner et al., 2018).

The PV structure may stimulate learning and skill development in value-congruent domains (Caprara and Steca, 2007). This could help explain why certain individuals exhibit higher entrepreneurial selfefficacy, once experience and other background variables are controlled for. Similarly, PVs could also influence the recognition of business opportunities (Shepherd et al., 2013), or the entrepreneurs’ choices for the firm’s strategic priorities (Gorgievski et al., 2011). Entrepreneurial identity is also likely to be related to PVs. In this regard, the concept of “authenticity” has been linked to individuals behaving in accordance with their values (Gecas and Burke, 1995). Thus, PVs could reflect an activation of one’s own personal identity (Hitlin, 2003). Therefore, specific combinations of PVs could promote the formation of an entrepreneurial identity. There is an obvious gap to be filled by testing the model by using similar sample characteristics, the operationalisation of measures, and by controlling either for other variables in the model or for contextual factors.

# Conclusions

This is the first systematic review of the literature which, to the best of our knowledge, jointly analyses PVs and EIs. Judging by the publication dates, this is a rapidly growing area of research. The present study will be useful for other researchers entering into this area of analysis, since it provides not only a comprehensive mapping of the theories and methods used to date, but also the results that they report. Furthermore, this review provides an integrative conceptual framework to synthetize knowledge to date, and identifies a number of knowledge gaps and opportunities that remain open for future research.

Despite being a very recent field of research, it is already opening up into several different streams. The core of the field is the consideration of PVs (typically conceptualised under the BHV theory) as antecedents in the formation of EIs (most often considered from the perspective of the TPB). Alternative lines of analysis, however, have already been found. In particular, alternative entrepreneurship-related intentions are being considered, with SEIs as the most frequent. Evidence has already been provided that PVs differ in their effect on the formation of either social or general EIs.

Finally, this study, as for any literature review, is not without its limitations. First, certain relevant contributions may not have been analysed. This may have happened either because they were not initially detected (our keywords may not have been sufficiently comprehensive), or because they have been inadequately excluded. Nevertheless, the authors have been as systematic and rigorous as possible to prevent this from happening. Second, there is always an element of subjectivity in the classification of papers, despite every precaution taken. For this reason, all doubts were discussed between all the authors before any decision was made. Despite any limitations, researchers in the field will find this contribution to be relevant and helpful.
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# Appendix

*Table A1 -* Papers included in the systematic literature review

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author**  | **Type** |  **Sample Variables Theory**  | **Result**  |
| Farrington et al. (2011)  | Quant.  | 739 students and  14 work values compiled Work value and career choice (Cennamo business owners from the literature. and Gardner, 2008). TPB (Ajzen, 1991). (South Africa)  | The article compares the work values the respondents associate with entrepreneurship for both commerce students and actual business owners. The results indicate that students are more idealistic regarding time (life-work balance), financial benefits, challenges, prestige possibilities for personal growth and development. Intention is referred to, but relation to work values is not tested. |
| Hirschi and Fischer (2013)  | Quant.  | 218 university Work values. Entrepreneurial Based on Basic Human Values students  intention (EI). (Schwartz, 1992). (Germany)  | Self-enhancement (pay and prestige) and openness to change values (variety and autonomy) are positively related to the level of EI. Conservation (security and authority) is negatively related to the level of EI. The interaction with gender is related to the change in EI (self-enhancement related to increase in EI for women, while conservation related to increase in EI for men). |
| Watchravesringkan et al. (2013)  | Quant.  |  Self-actualisation and social Value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy 345 undergraduate affiliation values. Attitudes to (Homer and Kahle, 1988). students (USA) entrepreneurship. EI. TPB (Ajzen, 1991).  | Self-actualisation values (self-fulfilment, a sense of accomplishment, self-respect, being well-respected) positively related to the attitude towards entrepreneurship, which in turn is related to the entrepreneurial career intentions. The influence of self-actualisation values on attitudes is moderated by the level of entrepreneurial knowledge (the relationship is stronger for students with more knowledge).  |
| Fayolle et al. (2014)  | Theor.  | Personal values. Motivations. Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). -  EI. TPB (Ajzen, 1991).  | Personal values proposed as helping to explain the formation of EI antecedents and also moderate their effect on the EI. Personal values could play an important role in the intention-action link. |
| Geldhof et al. (2014) | Quant. / Qualit.  | 3461 respondents, 48 interviews. University students (USA)  | Job Values Scale. EI.  | Relational Developmental Systems Theories (RDSTs; Overton, 2010, 2013). | Direct relationship between work-related values and intention is not tested. Both used as predictors of entrepreneurship-related behaviours. Work-related values (Entrepreneurial Career Values, ECV) can predict some specific entrepreneurial behaviours (particularly innovation-related ones). There are no significant differences in the importance attached to the ECV between individuals with (high, moderate or low) levels of EI. |
| Espiritu-Olmos and Sastre-Castillo (2015)  | 1210 business Quant. students (Spain)  | Personal values. Personality traits. EI.  | Based on Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992).  | Self-enhancement is the only higher-order personal value to exert a significant (positive) effect on the EI. Personal values do not seem to be better direct predictors of EI than is the case for personality traits.  |
| Sastre‐Castillo et al. (2015)  | 384 workers and Quant. students (Spain)  | Personal values. Social entrepreneurial orientation.  | Adapted from basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992).  | The personal-value dimensions of openness to change, self-enhancement and selftranscendence are positively related to entrepreneurial attitudes. In turn, conservation is negatively related to these attitudes. Additionally, the study also measures the social (as opposed to classical/commercial) entrepreneurial orientation (SEO). In this case, Self-enhancement is the most significant variable (negatively) affecting the SEO. In turn, Self-transcendence and Conservation (conformity and tradition, excluding security) both have a significantly positive effect on the SEO.  |
| Yang et al. (2015)  | 276 MBA students Personal Values. Quant.  (Taiwan) Entrepreneurial Attitude.  | Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). TPB (Ajzen, 1991).  | The personal values of self-direction, stimulation, achievement, and universalism are positively correlated with entrepreneurial attitude (EA). The values of benevolence, tradition, conformity, security, and power negatively correlated with EA. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Liñán et al. (2016) Quant.  | 2069 adults with The interaction between cultural and personal values is relevant in the formation of EIs.Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). an university Personal values. EI. Personal values directly affect EIs, but also an outlier effect (those who are more individualistTPB (Ajzen, 1991). degree (Spain) than average in their culture will exhibit a higher EI). |
| Schmidt and Tatarko Quant. (2016)  | Personal values are distal predictors of EI. Effect on EI and implementation intention fully Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992; 2061 respondents Personal Values. mediated by TPB antecedents. 2012). (Russia) Implementation Intention. Tests the role of Self-direction (positively on ATT, SN and PBC) and Security (negativelyTPB (Ajzen, 1991). on ATT) and they are both related to the TPB antecedents. |
| Tipu and Ryan Quant. (2016)  | 309 students in senior classes (the United Arab Emirates)  | Self-reliance, leisure and wasted time all positively predict entrepreneurial intention. Work Ethics: Self-reliance. Hard Work is an important component in the prediction of EI, however, the direction of the Morality-ethics. Leisure.  Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile relationship is negative. Hard work. Centrality of  (Miller et al., 2002) Centrality of work is unrelated to EI. work. Wasted time. Delay of Unfortunately, Morality/Ethics and Delay of Gratification could not be tested due to poorgratification. EI. scale reliabilities. |
| Kunttu et al. (2017) Quant.  | 338 university students (Liechtenstein, Austria and Finland).  | Work values. Social entrepreneurial goals. Self- Eclectic model of work values (Lyons et Efficacy. EI. Socially al. 2010; Ryan and Deci, 2000; Twenge Oriented Entrepreneurial et al. 2010) Intention.  | EI and Social entrepreneurial goal (SEG) as the dependent variables. Additionally, the Socially Oriented Entrepreneurial Intention (SOEI) is computed as the product EI\*SEG. The Altruism work value has no effect on EI, but a positive and significant one on SEG and SOEI. In turn, Security has a significant negative effect on EI and SOEI, but a non-significant (negative) coefficient for SEG. Intrinsic reward positively predicts EI, but negatively so for SEG. No significant effect in the case of SOEI. |
| Bacq and Alt (2018) Quant.  | 281 university students (USA and South Africa)  | Empathy (Perspective taking, Combined model of SEI (Mair and emphatic concern). Social Noboa, 2006). Prosocial motives worth. Social entrepreneurial approach (Shepherd, 2015). Individual self-efficacy. Social agency and communion motives (Grant Entrepreneurial Intentions and Gino, 2010). (SEI) | Support for a fully mediated relationship between empathy and SEI. In order to channel their empathy into SE intentions, individuals must experience SE self-efficacy and social worth. Empathy composed of empathic concern (affecting SEI through SE self-efficacy, an agentic element) and perspective-taking (affecting SEI through social worth, a communion motive).  |
| Bolzani and Foo (2018)  | Qualit.  | 140 new technology-based firms (Italy)  | Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). Personal goals. Laddering theory (Reynolds and Internationalisation intention.Gutman, 1988).  | Identification of goals motivating internationalisation. More abstract values (five of Schwartz’s values: power, achievement, self-direction, security and benevolence) motivate intermediate goals, which, in-turn, stimulate more specific aims/results expected from internationalisation. Self-enhancement values (power, achievement) most frequently mentioned, followed by self-direction and security. No differences by group, except for Security (preferred by non-portfolio entrepreneurs, those with an entrepreneurial family background, those with past international experience, and push-entrepreneurs). |
| Fernandes et al. (2018)  | Quant.  | 293 university students (Portugal and Spain)  | Entrepreneurial orientation questionnaire (including personal values and EI).  | Aims at explaining the entrepreneurial intention based on psychological traits, motivationsAd hoc integrative psychological model, and personal values in a university student sample. Only collectivistic values (tradition in theincluding Basic Human Values Portuguese sample, conformity in the Spanish sample) have a significant positive influence (Schwartz, 1992). on intention. |
| Gorgievski et al. (2018)  | Quant.  | 823 students (Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain)  | Personal values. Entrepreneurial intention.  | Openness and self-enhancement values relate positively to entrepreneurial career intentions. Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). The relationship is mediated by attitudes towards entrepreneurship and self-efficacy. TPB (Ajzen, 1991). Additionally, self-enhancement is negatively related to subjective norms, causing a small indirect negative effect on EIs. |
| Lechner et al. (2018) Quant.  | Longitudinal study measuring work values at T1 (2008/09) and EI and leadership aspirationsVocational development theory at T2 (2013/14). The work values of extrinsic rewards and autonomy are positively relatedWork values. Entrepreneurial (Holland, 1997; Super, 1980). Work 862 young adults to EI. Higher importance placed on security and on social/interpersonal aspects is associated aspirations (EI). Leadership values as a reflection of personal values (Finland) with lower EI.  aspirations. (Hirschi and Fischer, 2013; Schwartz, Personality traits included as control, but none were significant after including work values. 1992) Work values account for nearly all of the gender gap in EI. |
| Sihombing (2018)  | Quant.  | 462 microentrepreneurs (Indonesia)  | Terminal and Instrumental Values. Entrepreneurial attitude. Intention to Quit.  | Values (Rokeach, 1973). Value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy (Homer and Kahle, 1988).  | Terminal values (i.e., success, being an honest person, happiness of life, responsible, and having a good future) are significantly and positively related to the entrepreneurial attitude. Instrumental values (i.e., honesty, hard work, success, and work with diligence) do not affect the entrepreneurial attitude. Attitude towards entrepreneurship is not related to intention to quit as an entrepreneur.  |
| Kruse et al. (2019)  | Quant.  | 1326 students (Germany)  | Personal values. Social entrepreneurial intention (SEI).  | Work Motivation Framework Positive direct effects for self-transcendence and openness to change values on SEI. Negative (Diefendorff and Chandler, 2011). Basic effects for self-enhancement and conservation values. Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). TPB Positive indirect effects of self-transcendence and self-enhancement dimensions on SEI(Ajzen, 1991). (through TPB antecedents). |
| Muhammad et al. (2019)  | Qualit.  | 20 Muslim married women entrepreneurs (Pakistan)  | Qualitative interview on the motives and reasons to startup.  | Retrospective account on the reasons/motives to start-up of women entrepreneurs with either forced, arranged or love marriages. In forced marriages, the need for independence is aTPB (Ajzen, 1991) as a reference. common psychological factor influencing the decision to start-up a business. In arrangedmarriages, a need for stimulation is commonly cited. In the case of love marriages, the need to contribute to the familial wealth and success is mentioned. |
| Hueso et al. (2020) Quant.  | 413 students (United Kingdom and Spain)  | Personal values. Entrepreneurial intention.  | Collectivistic personal values (universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security) Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 1992). have an indirect effect on EIs: negative through personal attitude and perceived behavioural TPB (Ajzen, 1991). control, but also positive through subjective norms. |
| Ye et al. (2020) Quant.  | 1562 adults (China)  | Altruistic value. Green entrepreneurial intention.  | Warm glow (altruistic personal value) is included as a push factor influencing the green Push-Pull-Mooring model (Moon, entrepreneurship switching intention. 1995). The Altruistic value exhibits a positive a significant effect on the green entrepreneurshipswitching intentions of individuals. |

Type: Quant. = quantitative; Qualit. = qualitative; Theor. = theoretical