VOLUME 9, ISSUE 1, 2014

ISSN 2045-3345

ISSN 2045-3345

DEMOGRAPHIC DETERMINANTS OF TANZANIAN GRADUATES' ENTREPRENEURIAL ENTRY INTENTIONS: THE CASE OF UNIVERSITY OF DAR-ES-SALAAM

Mangasini Atanasi Katundu[I], Damian Mulokozi Gabagambi[II]

[1] Moshi University College of Co-operative and Business Studies, Moshi, Tanzania

[2] Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies the demographic determinants of entrepreneurial entry decisions amongst Tanzanian graduates. A cross-sectional design was used in gathering information, whereby structured questionnaire was applied. Systematic random sampling was employed to get the required sample size. Cross tabulation was used to compare the entrepreneurial entry intention between graduates who had studied entrepreneurship and those who had not studied entrepreneurship. Logistic regression analysis was applied to assess the impact of demographic factors on entrepreneurial entry. It was found that graduates' sex, age, birth order position and marital status significantly contributed to predicting graduates' entrepreneurial entry decisions. It was further found that marital status had greatest contribution than all four significant factors implying that married graduates had stronger aspiration of becoming entrepreneurs than singles. The results were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. Organizations intending to make any intervention on graduate entrepreneurship in Tanzania are urged to focus on married graduates. A study on joint venture creation among graduates is required. Researchers should focus on the contribution of joint venture in counterbalancing negative effects of age differences as well as the harmful effects of birth order positions due to their inborn or upbringings weaknesses.

JEL CLASSIFICATION & KEYWORDS

■ A23 ■ L26 ■ O15 ■ AGE ■ MARITAL STATUS ■ BIRTH ORDER POSITION ■ ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTION ■ GRADUATES ■ TANZANIA

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurial entry is an important contributor to new venture creation which leads to increased productivity, intensified market competition, improved economic growth and reduced unemployment in an economy. Unemployment is a serious developmental problem in Tanzania especially among graduates. Unemployment in the country is accelerated by the imbalance between the supply and demand of labour in the labour market, increasing of urban employment pressures with outflow of rural surplus labour to non-agricultural sectors and the increased number of new entrants in the labour market. For example, Mcha (2012) estimates new entrants into the labour market each year from colleges and universities countrywide to be 800,000 to 1,000,000 whereas, URT (2010) estimates annual new job vacancies from both public and private sector to be 630,000 with the private sector being the main contributor. Consequently, from 2001 until 2011, Tanzania unemployment rate averaged 11.9 % reaching an all time high of 12.9 % in December of 2001 and a record low of 10.7 % in October of 2011 (URT, 2011). Deloitte (2013) reports that, the Tanzania's unemployment rate stood at 11.7% in 2012. According to Rweyemamu (2013) unemployment rate in Tanzania is higher than Uganda which in 2012 stood at 4.6% but lower than Kenya's (40%), Burundi's (35%) and Rwanda's (30%). Regardless of this, unemployment in Tanzania remains a constant threat to socio-economic development as it is higher than the tolerable rate of 4-6% (Prachowny, 2002).

Entrepreneurial entry at an individual level has been defined as a process by which individuals create and start new businesses (Cantner and Stützer, 2010). According to Davidsson (1995) primary determinant of individuals' entrepreneurial entry, is a person's conviction that starting and running one's own firm is a suitable alternative for him/her. He argues further that, this conviction is in its turn based on certain general attitudes and domain attitudes. Domain specific attitudes refer to attitudes that relate directly to a particular act, in this context, becoming an entrepreneur. These include a person's beliefs about the feasibility and desirability of entrepreneurship, as well as beliefs about how the important people in a person's life might view such a career decision (Frazier and Niehm, 2006).

While there has been significant research on the causes of entrepreneurial propensity, only a limited number of studies have focused on the entrepreneurial intent (Deh et al., 2013). Those that exist tend to focus on US, UK and Asia cases and are mainly restricted to students using small samples of business related majors (Sahinidis and Vassiliou, 2013; Ahmad and Xavier, 2012; Sandhu et al., 2011; Nabi and Linan, 2011; Sandhu et al., 2011; Smith and Beasley, 2011; Wang et al., 2011; Al-Ariss, 2010; Lan and Wu, 2010; Fini et al., 2009; Nabi and Holden, 2008; Teixeira, 2008; Martínez et al., 2007; Klapper and Léger-Jarniou, 2006; Lüthje and Franke; 2003; Autio et al., 2001). Consequently, empirical researches on entrepreneurial entry intention of university graduates in Africa and more specifically Tanzania are scanty. Available few studies focus on graduates who are already entrepreneurs and assesses mostly contextual enablers and hindrances (Mwasalwiba et al., 2012). Generally speaking, studies on demographic determinants of Tanzanian graduates' entrepreneurial entry intentions are in short supply; as such, this paper fills in the literature gap. The issue addressed in this paper is an important one, considering the problem of graduates' unemployment in Tanzania and the fact that majority of the jobs are created by new businesses.

According to Davidsson (1995) the study of entrepreneurial intentions has some distinctive advantages over comparisons between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Firstly, new firm formation is always a minority phenomenon, and the factors that influence this choice can also manifest themselves in other behavior. Therefore, no distal variables can ever be expected to predict (narrowly defined) entrepreneurial behavior with high accuracy. In contrast, the intentions-based approach offers

[I] atanasi.mangasini@gmail.com

[II] gabagambi@yahoo.com

RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, BUSINESS AND ICT

RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, BUSINESS AND ICT

testable, theory-driven models of how exogenous factors (demographics, traits, current situation) affect intentions, and behavior. Secondly, the approach avoids the fallacy of identifying determinants of entrepreneurial behavior such as individual characteristics that in fact develop as a consequence of running one's own business. This paper is an attempt to answer the following questions: What demographic variables determine university graduates' entrepreneurial entry intentions in Tanzania? In order to address this question entrepreneurial intention of graduates is assessed. The hypothesis underlying the paper is that demographic variables influence graduates' entrepreneurial intention.

The paper is framed into six key sections. Section one presents the introduction while section two and three discusses the theoretical and literature review respectively. The methodology is discussed in section four while section five presents a discussion on key findings. The conclusions and recommendations are discussed in section six. It is expected that by identifying demographic variables influencing entrepreneurial entry intention among graduates this study will help policy makers in the country to make policy decisions aimed at stimulating new firm formation; since, it is more useful to know what kind of individuals do and do not consider going into business for themselves, than to learn about the characteristics of those who already in business.

A Theoretical Review

This paper is anchored on Ajzen (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). TPB suggests three conceptually independent antecedents of intention. Ajzen (1991) explains intentions by means of attitudes, perceived behavioural control, and subjective norms. Attitudes refer to the degree to which a person has a favourable appraisal of the behaviour. The second predictor of intention is subjective norm. This refers to the perceived social pressure to perform the behaviour. The third antecedent of intention is the degree of perceived behavioural control. This refers to the perceived ease of performing the behaviour and to the perceived control over the outcome of it.

The theory of planned behaviour assumes that rational considerations govern the choices and behaviours of individuals (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen and Fishbein, 2005). Specifically, according to a precursor of this theory, called the theory of reasoned action, behaviour is determined by the intentions of individuals, their explicit plans or motivations to commit a specific act. For example, intention to quit unemployment in order to become an entrepreneur depends to an explicit commitment to this abstinence. These intentions partly, but not entirely, reflect the personal attitudes of individuals, which is the extent to which they perceive this act as desirable or favorable. These attitudes reflect both cognitive beliefs about the act, such as whether they believe that unemployment is harmful, as well as affective evaluations, such as whether they feel that unemployment is unsuitable.

Demographics also affect whether attitudes, social norms, or perceived behavioural control are most likely to affect intentions and behaviour. For example, in a study conducted by Conner et al. (2003), social norms to speed were more likely to affect the intentions of males, rather than females, to exceed the speed limit while driving alone. In addition, the degree to which significant individuals, such as parents, spouse, relatives, friends, or colleagues, condone this act, called subjective norms, also affects intentions (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen and Fishbein, 2005). The perceived importance or relevance of these parents, spouse, relatives, friends, or colleagues affects the extent to which their approval will shape intentions. Furthermore, these weightings might vary across contexts. For example, the beliefs of relatives are likely to shape the intentions to engage in behaviours that relate to family life. In contrast, the beliefs of managers might be more likely to shape the intention to engage in behaviours that relate to work life.

Finally, according to the theory of planned behaviour, which represented a refinement to the theory of reasoned action, the extent to which individuals feel they can engage in these behaviours, called perceived behavioural control also impinges on their intentions and behaviours (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived behavioural control comprises two main facets. First, perceived behavioural control depends on the degree to which individuals conceptualize themselves as sufficiently knowledgeable, skillful, disciplined, and able to perform some act, called internal control (Kraft et al., 2005), which overlaps with the concept of self efficacy. This individuals' based conceptualization of the ability to perform an act may vary depending on demographic attributes such as age and ethnicity. Second, perceived behavioural control depends on the extent to which individuals feel that other factors, such as the cooperation of colleagues, resources, or time constraints, could inhibit or facilitate the behaviour, called external control (Kraft et al., 2005).

Furthermore, intentions to perform some act do not always culminate in this behaviour. Perceived behavioural control is partly, but not absolutely, related to actual behavioural control (Armitage and Conner, 2001), which in turn affects the extent to which intentions are associated with the corresponding behaviours. Perceived and actual behavioural control can sometimes diverge, such as when individuals are oblivious to factors that obstruct or facilitate the intended behaviour.

Demographics and Entrepreneurial Intention

According to Deh et al. (2013) a debate exists in the literature concerning the influence of demographic variables on entrepreneurial entry intention. Bae et al. (2014) puts it clearer that, research on entrepreneurial intentions has yielded mixed results. Some studies report of significant influences (Stangler and Spulber, 2013; Oriarewo and Owocho, 2013; Sahinidis et al., 2012; Peake and Marshall, 2006; Verheul et al., 2005; Bosma et al., 2004; Carter, 2000;) whereas others report of no significant influence (Karimi et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2011, Arenius and Minniti, 2005, Reynolds et al., 2004). This calls for further studies to contribute to the debate.

However, a careful analysis of these prior studies has revealed that they do vary in design and context. Hence, these variations in results could be due to variations in designs and context. For instance, Stangler and Spulber (2013) studied demographic change and its impact on entrepreneurship in the United States of America. Demographic change analysis has obvious limitations, not only are long term population projections speculative, behavioral responses to demographic trends generally depend on economic incentives. For example, demographics is destiny in the sense that population age distribution is set decades before its effects occur. The effects of age on entrepreneurship are likely to change in response to economic incentives, which in turn will be affected by the age distribution of the population and other demographic effects.

Deh et al. (2013) studied the link between demographics and perceive barriers to entrepreneurship. The research

was based on cross-sectional, descriptive, quantitative design and the sample size was 136 students of the marketing department selected through convenient sampling and purposive sampling methods. The study was conducted in Ghana where self-designed questionnaire was used to collect primary data from the respondents during lecture hours. This study had several limitations: First, the sample was based on convenient sampling method. Hence, the finding might not be able to generalise to the larger population. Second, the findings are based on self-reported responses of the respondent. Hence, there may be respondent's bias which might affect the reliability of the results.

Others such as Lamottea and Colovic (2013) studied how demographics influence aggregate entrepreneurship. They designed an analysis of a cross-country panel of 53 countries among them Uganda, the UK, the USA, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Even if this study found that the age distribution of a population is related to entrepreneurial activity, it did not involve university graduates, and neither did it include Tanzania.

The mere fact that these studies involved either business students or people who are already entrepreneurs and were done in countries other than Tanzania justifies this current study. Furthermore, the fact that these studies differ in design and most of them did not study the impact of demographic variables from graduates' point of view on entrepreneurial intention justifies the choice of the variables under study.

Methodology

In this study graduates from the University of Dar-es-Salaam regardless of their location within the country were interviewed. The University of Dar-es-Salaam was selected for this study because of its long standing training in entrepreneurship which dates back to the years 2000. Other Universities started mainstreaming entrepreneurship courses into their syllabus just recently. A cross-sectional design was employed in gathering information, where a semi-structured questionnaire was applied.

The University of Dar-es-Salaam Business School (UDBS) former Faculty of Commerce and Management (FCM) and the College of Arts and Social Sciences (CASS) former Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS) were purposively selected. The UDBS was included in this study because it was among schools where entrepreneurship courses had been mainstreamed into the degree curriculum whereas in the CASS the entrepreneurship courses had not been mainstreamed into the curriculum.

The sampled population involved respondents who graduated from the academic year 2000/2001 to 2010/2011. The sample size was 308 graduates, out of which 119 graduates out of 2436 were selected among UDBS graduates and 189 out of 6889 were picked among the CASS graduates. A sample size is normally determined by three things, that is, the confidence level, the margin of error and the skewness level (Dodhia, 2007; Naing et al., 2006). It was calculated using the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator (RSSC) which among other things determines confidence level, margin of error and skewness level. The sample size was considered adequate at 95% confidence level, 5.5% margin of error and 50% skewness level. It is important to note as well that this sample size represents 64.2% response rate, because 400 was the initial sample size out of which 92 were non-response cases.

Systematic random sampling (SRS) was used to get the required sample size. First, a list of graduates was obtained from the UDBS and CASS. Then, the sampling interval or the k^{th} element was determined in each list using the formula k = (population size/sample size). From the UDBS list the k^{th} element was obtained by dividing 2436 by 119 which is approximately equal to 20, and from the CASS it was obtained by dividing 6889 by 189 which produced 36. Thereafter, the first element from each list was randomly chosen from within the first to the k^{th} element, that is, from UDBS the first element was chosen among the first 19 elements and from CASS it was picked from among the first 35 elements. This was made possible by writing the serial numbers of the graduates (1 to 19 for UDBS and 1 to 35 for CASS) on a separate piece of paper and then folded. The folded papers were then mixed up and then one picked from each cluster. The remaining 306 (118 UDBS and 188 CASS) were picked systematically after each 20^{th} and 36^{th} element respectively.

Graduates' contacts were obtained from the University of Dar-es-Salaam Alumni department. Sampled graduates whose contacts were missing in the alumni were dropped out of the sample and the systematic random sampling repeated. Fortunately, only 23 sampled graduates (9 from CASS and 14 from UDBS) had their contacts missing. Graduates were called before physically contacting them in order to ascertain their availability. Only graduates who were living within the country were involved in the study. The systematic random sampling was repeated in order to replace the sampled graduates who were not alive or were not living in the country at the time of this study. Luckily, none of them was deceased but seven of them (two from CASS and 5 from UDBS) were not living in the country.

The gathered data were then analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer package whereby descriptive statistics, cross tabulation and logistic regression were applied. Cross tabulation was used to compare the entrepreneurial entry decisions between graduates who had studied entrepreneurship and those who had not studied entrepreneurship. Logistic regression analysis was applied to test the extent to which demographic factors such as age, sex, number of children in the household, household size, birth order position, alien status, ethnic origin and marital status influences graduates' entrepreneurial entry decisions. Graduates' entrepreneurial entry intention was the binary dependent variable (measured as a dummy, 1 = if a graduate had intended to engage into entrepreneurship and 0 = if a graduate had not intended to engage into entrepreneurship). For definition of variables and their measurements see Table 1. The binary logistic regression is a generalized linear model used for binomial regression. In this study, the following binary logistic model was used:

$$Logit(p_i) = \alpha + \beta_1 x_{1,i} + \beta_2 x_{2,i} + \beta_3 x_{3,i} + ...\beta_p x_{P,i} + \varepsilon \qquad (1)$$

Where:

$Logit\ (p_i)$ = Y; is binary and represents the probability of entry into entrepreneurship, coded as 0/1 respectively

β_1 - β_0 = Regression coefficients

α = Intercept

$X_{1,i}$ - $x_{p,i}$ = Independent variables or predictor variables

ε_i = Error term

Table 1: Definition of model variables	
Variable	**Variable definitions and units of measurement**
Y (Dependent variable)	Entrepreneurial entry intention (dummy: 1= if a graduate had intended to engage into entrepreneurship and 1 = if a graduate not intended to engage into entrepreneurship)
X_1	Age of a respondent in years
X_2	Sex of a respondent (dummy, 1 = Mal, 0 = Female)
X_3	Number of children in the household (number of children relative to the number of adults)
X_4	Birth order position (the chronological order of sibling births in a family)
X_5	Ethnic origin of a respondent (dummy, 1 = if Mchagga/ Mhindi/ Mkinga; 0 = Otherwise);
X_6	Marital status of the respondent (1= married; 0 = Otherwise)
X_7	Household size measured as number of people in the household
X_8	Alien status (dummy, 1 = if native to the place, 0 = if Otherwise
Source: Authors	

The binary logistic regression was preferred in analyzing data because the dependent variable was dichotomous. Logistic regression is frequently used rather than discriminant analysis when there are only two categories of the dependent variable. Logistic regression is also easier to use with SPSS than discriminant analysis when there is a mixture of numerical and categorical independent variable, because it includes procedures for generating the necessary dummy variables automatically, requires fewer assumptions, and is more statistically robust (Katundu et al., 2014).

Findings and Discussion

This part presents key findings and their discussion. The section starts with a presentation of findings on entrepreneurial entry intention before presenting demographic determinants of the intention. In this study 27% of the interviewed graduates were females while 73% were males. Most respondents (54.5%) were married compared to those who lived single (42.5%) and widowed 2.3%.

Entrepreneurial entry intention of university graduates

Cross tabulation was used to assess the entrepreneurial entry intention between graduates who had studied entrepreneurship as compared to those who had not studied entrepreneurship. Among the graduates who had studied entrepreneurship course 87.4% had clear intention of becoming entrepreneurs whereas only 11.1% of graduates who had not studied entrepreneurship had intention of involving themselves into entrepreneurship (Table 2).

Table 2: University graduates' entrepreneurial entry intention			
Status of entrepreneurship study		Had no entrepreneurial intention	Had entrepreneurial intention
Had not studied Entrepreneurship	N	168	21
	%	88.9	11.1
Had Studied Entrepreneurship	N	15	104
	%	12.6	87.4
p – Value = 0.000; Lambda = 0.702; Goodman and Kruskal tau = 0.571			
Source: Authors			

Furthermore, the findings show that there is a positive association between studying entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial entry intention. The lambda value of 0.702 and Goodman and Kruskal tau (based on chi-square approximation) of 0.571 shows a strong relationship between studying entrepreneurship and intention to become an entrepreneur in future. The results are statistically significant at p – value < 0.05. The findings imply that, entrepreneurship study contributes significantly to improving graduates' entrepreneurial intention because majority of graduates who studied entrepreneurship during their undergraduate studies had clear ambitions of become entrepreneurs than those who did not study entrepreneurship.

Demographic determinants of graduates' entrepreneurial entry intention

The binary logistic regression model was estimated to identify demographic determinants of entrepreneurial entry intention of university graduates. The overall significance of the model was assessed using an Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients which produced the Chi-square of 50.478 and p-value of 0.000 as well as the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test with Chi-square equals to 3.886 and p-value equals to 0.867. The two measures together indicate that the model of entrepreneurial entry intention was more suitable to the data. Nagelkerke's R2 of 0.413 indicate a moderate relationship between prediction and grouping. The findings in Table 3 are discussed in details in the subsequent sections 6.2.1 to 6.2.4.

Table 3: Demographic determinants of Tanzanian graduates' entrepreneurial intention						
Variable	**B**	**S.E.**	**Wald**	**Df**	**Sig.**	**Exp(B)**
Sex	3.310	1.027	10.394	1	0.001	27.394
Alien Status	-0.614	0.510	1.452	1	0.228	0.541
Age	2.704	0.351	4.016	1	0.005	10.495
Number of Children in the Household	0.168	0.135	1.548	1	0.213	1.183
Birth Order Position	-1.761	0.356	4.579	1	0.032	0.467
Household Size	0.132	0.174	0.579	1	0.447	1.142
Ethnic Origin	0.231	0.341	0.458	1	0.499	1.260
Marital Status	3.344	1.026	10.620	1	0.001	28.326
Constant	3.816	1.225	9.708	1	0.002	0.022
Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients (Chi-square = 50.478; Sig. = 0.000); -2 Log likelihood = 284.965; Cox & Snell R Square = 0.341;						
Source: Author's Estimations						

The influence of sex on graduate's entrepreneurial entry intention

The Wald criterion demonstrated that sex made a significant contribution in predicting entrepreneurial entry intention of a graduate ($p < 0.05$; Wald =10.394; Exp (B) = 27.394). Exp (B) value indicates that males were 27 times more likely to have entrepreneurial intention than females. The possible explanation here may be female respondents are discouraged by household responsibilities such as cooking and taking care of children than males who by tradition are exempted of such duties. Another explanation may be the fact that in most African families a man is a head of household who is responsible for decision making, feeding the family members, paying school fees and meeting medical charges among other things. This forces a man to think on alternative sources of income including entrepreneurial activities.

The effects of age of a graduate on entrepreneurial entry intention

A logistic regression analysis was also conducted to predict how age of graduate impacted entrepreneurial entry intention. Results indicated that age was another strong predictor of entrepreneurial entry intention. The results were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$; with Wald criterion of 4.016 and Exp (B) = 10.495 implying that when age is increased by 1 year the odds ratio is 10.495 times meaning older graduates were 10 times more likely to intend to engage into entrepreneurship than younger graduates. This might be due to the fact that most of the older graduates were married and had multiple family responsibilities of which salary alone could not be sufficient to meet family demands. Hence, entrepreneurship is considered one of the viable alternative sources of income. Additionally, the difference may be also attributed to the time lag, because this study sampled both recent graduates and older graduates. The argument here is that, a respondent who graduated ten years ago had more opportunity to be exposed to entrepreneurship environment than someone who had just one year since graduation. Likewise, older people have on average a larger amount of several key resources that facilitate the transition to entrepreneurship. Namely, they have accumulated more general and specific human capital, financial capital and social capital, including a more diversified and dense network of contacts.

The influence of graduate's birth order position on entrepreneurial entry intention

Another strong predictor of entrepreneurial intention was graduate's birth order position. Logistic regression analysis for this variable produced a Wald of 4.579 and Exp (B) of 0.467. The results were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. However, the coefficient is negative indicating that entrepreneurial entry intention is best predicted with lower birth order positions, that is first and middle born individuals were 0.5 more likely to intend to become entrepreneurs than the later-borns say last born. These results may be attributed to the fact that first born children normally enjoy a very special relationship with their parents. They get to receive undivided attention and every accomplishment is treated special. First time parents often try very hard to make sure that their first born sons or daughters get to be self-reliant individuals. Contrary to a first born, the youngest born in the family grows up with experienced, more laid back parents, which in turn makes them more laid back as individuals. Generally speaking, last borns are more outgoing and engaging. They typically have fewer responsibilities and have more freedom to do things their own way, which makes them free-spirited and creative. However, birth order as birth order does not make an individual entrepreneur. It is the upbringing of the siblings which matters, because siblings develop in competition for parental favours, birth order fosters differences in personality which in turn correlate with differences in creative achievement. These results support that of Sulloway (1999).

The influence of graduate's marital status on entrepreneurial entry intention

This study has found that married respondents had high and clearer entrepreneurial intentions than singles. The results were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$, Wald of 10.620 and Exp (B) of 28.326 indicating that married graduates were 28 times more likely to intend to become entrepreneurs than singles. Unlike paid employment, profit from entrepreneurship activities is unpredictable. This is the reason why many people assess carefully their decisions to engage in any entrepreneurial activity. In most cases, entry into entrepreneurship involves exploiting an entrepreneurial opportunity which also entails assessing carefully on potential profit and loss. Because entrepreneurship is uncertain, people demand compensation or buffer for bearing this uncertainty. Marriage seems to provide such an important buffer because the adverse effects of failure are moderated by the income of a spouse. However, some people demand higher premiums for bearing uncertainty than others. In general, those people for whom uncertainty has a greater negative effect demand a greater uncertainty premium than those people for whom uncertainty has a lesser negative effect. These findings support that of Shane (2003); Fairlie (2011). According to Fairlie (2011) being married and having a working spouse increases likelihood of opportunity exploitation, presumably by reducing the person's expected uncertainty premium.

However, the study had some limitations. First, the findings are based on self-reported responses of the respondent. Hence, there may be respondent's bias which might affect the reliability of the results. Second, the study did not consider cultural variations of graduates as they were scattered all over the country and hence, culture might have some influence on the way they perceive entrepreneurship. The impacts of self-reported responses were minimized through triangulation of data where university records were gathered to verify data collected from respondents. To control the influence of culture, forced-choice items were applied. This technique generated questions that were equal in desirability to control responses in one direction or another.

Regardless of these limitations this study is still important because demographics are one of the most important factors affecting entrepreneurship, job creation, and innovation. Demographic change shapes all issues that occupy most economic discussions education, employment policy, taxes, technological changes, and more. Demographic analysis anticipates future trends, helping decision makers to prepare policy interventions accordingly.

Conclusion

This study concludes that demographic factors such as sex, age, birth order position and marital status significantly predicts graduates' entrepreneurial entry decisions. It was further found that sex and marital status had big contribution than all four significant factors. This implies that, males and married graduates had stronger desire of becoming entrepreneurs than females and those who stayed single. These findings suggest that demographic factors contribute in predicting entrepreneurial entry intention.

Even if some demographics cannot be altered by policy makers, having a clear knowledge on trends and potential effects of demographics in terms of innovation and new venture creation will allow policy makers to create proper frameworks. For example, understanding the demographic determinants of graduates' entrepreneurial entry decisions allows universities, consultants, advisors and policy makers to get a clearer picture of how intentions are formed and how new venture founders' beliefs, perceptions and motives impact the intent to start a business. Therefore, knowledge of the determinants of entrepreneurial intention can help entrepreneurial trainers find the right way to mold the intention and enhance the probability of the consequent behavior new venture creation. This paper recommends that:

1. Since marital status is a major contributor in predicting entrepreneurial entry intention, organizations intending to make any intervention on graduate entrepreneurship in the country are urged to focus on married graduates. This is because married graduates are more likely to become entrepreneurs than those staying single. It is also recommended that entrepreneurship trainers should design tailor made programmes for graduates who live single in order to help them increase their level of entrepreneurial tendencies and change their mindset.
2. A study on joint venture creation among graduates is required. Researchers should focus on the contribution of joint venture in counterbalancing negative effects of age differences as well as the harmful effects of birth order positions due to their inborn or upbringings weaknesses.

References

Ahmad, Z. S., & Xavier, S. R. (2012). "Entrepreneurial Environments and Growth: Evidence from Malaysia GEM Data". Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship, 4(1): 50 – 69.

Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behaviour. In D. Albarrac, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), The handbook of attitudes , Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 173-221.

Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behaviour", Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 50: 179-211.

Al Ariss, A. (2010). "Modes of Engagement: Migration, Self-Initiated Expatriation, and Career Development". Career Development International, 15(4): 338 –358.

Arenius, P., & Minniti, M. (2005). Perceptual Variables and Nascent Entrepreneurship. Small Business Economics, 24 (3): 233–247.

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. British Journal of Social Psychology, 40, 471-499.

Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C. & Fiet, J. O. (2014). The Relationship Between Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Meta-Analytic Review, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 217-254.

Bandura, A.(1986). The Social Foundations of Thought and Action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.

Bird, B. (1988). Implementing Entrepreneurial Ideas: The Case for Intention, Academy of Management Review, Vol. 13: 442-453.

Bird, B. (1993). Demographic Approaches to Entrepreneurship: the Role of Experience and Background, Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth, Vol. 1: 11-48.

Bosma, N., van Praag, M., Thurik, R., & de Wit, G. (2004). "The Value of Human and Social Capital Investments for the Business Performance of Start-ups." Small Business Economics 23: 227-236.

Boyd, N.G. & G.S. Vozikis (1994). The Influence of Self-Efficacy on the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions, Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Summer, 63-77.

Brockhaus R.H. Sr. & P.S. Horwitz (1986). The Psychology of Entrepreneurship. In: D.L. Sexton & R.W. Smilor (eds.) The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship, Cambridge, MA.: Ballinger.

Campbell, C.A. (1992). A Decision Theory Model for Entrepreneurial Acts, Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Fall, 21-27.

Carter, S. (2000). Gender and enterprise. In S. Carter & D. Jones-Evans (Eds.), Enterprise and Small Business. Principles, Practice and Policy, Harlow: Prentice Hall/Pearson Education Limited, 166–181.

Cantner, U., & Stützer, M. (2010). The Use and Effect of Social Capital in New Venture Creation-Solo Entrepreneurs vs. New Venture Teams. Jena Economic Research Papers, 2010–012.

Conner, M., Povey, R., Sparks, P., James, R., & Sheperd, R. (2003). Moderating role of attitudinal ambivalence within the theory of planned behaviour. British Journal of Social Psychology, 42, 75-94.

Damaraju, N. L., Barney, J. & Dess, G. (2010). Stigma and Entrepreneurial Risk Taking. A Paper Presented at the Summer Conference on "Opening Up Innovation: Strategy, Organization and Technology", at the Imperial College London Business School, June 16 - 18, 2010. [http://www2. druid.dk/conferences/viewpaper.php?id=502023&cf=43] accessed on 07/04/2014.

Davidsson, P. (1995). Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions. RENT IX Workshop in Entrepreneurship Research. Piacenza, Italy. November 23 - 24. [eprints. qut.edu. au/ 2076/ 1/ RENT_IX.pd] accessed on 01/04/2014.

Deh, I. Y., Asuamah, S. Y. & Agyemang, I. K. (2013). The Link between Demographics and Perceive Barriers to Entrepreneurship. Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Development 1(1): 42-50.

Deloitte (2013). East Africa Budget, Growing Steady Economic Outlook 2013. [https://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-Kenya/Local%20Assets/Documents/Budget% 202013/EconomicOutlook2013.pdf] accessed on 30/06/2014.

Dodhia, R. M. (2007). Sample Size Calculations. [http://www.ravenanalytics.com/Articles/Sample_Size_Calculations.htm] site accessed on 20/7/2012.

Drennan, J., Kennedy, J. & Renfrow, P. (2005). Impact of Childhood Experiences on the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions. International Journal of Entrepreneurship & Innovation, 6 (4): 231-238.

Ebrahim, M. & Schøtt, T. (2011). Entrepreneurial Intention Promoted by Perceived Capabilities, Risk Propensity and Opportunity Awareness: A Global Study. [https://www.academia.edu/ 948712 / Entrepreneurial Intention Promoted by Perceived Capabilities Risk Propensity and Opportunity Awareness A Global Study] accessed 14/05/2014.

Fairlie, R. W. (2011). Entrepreneurship, Economic Conditions, and the Great Recession. IZA DP. No. 5725 [http://ftp.iza.org/dp5725.pdf] accessed on 11/03/2014.

Fini R., Grimaldi, R., Marzocchi G. L. & Sobrero M., (2009). "The Foundation of Entrepreneurial Intention", Social Entrepreneurship & Entrepreneurship Research Study Group Meeting, 6th March 2009, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA.

Frazier, B. J. & Niehm, L. S. (2006). Predicting the Entrepreneurial Intentions of Non-Business Majors: A Preliminary Investigation. [http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download? doi= 10.1.1. 334. 2930 &rep=rep1&type=pdf] accessed on 02/04/2014.

Gupta, V. K., & York, A. S. (2008). Attitudes toward Entrepreneurship and Small Business: Findings from a Survey of Nebraska Residents and Small Business Owners. Journal of Enterprising Communities 2: 348–66.

Karimi, S., Biemans, H. J. A., Lans,T., Chizari,M., Mulder, M., Mahdei, K. N. (2013). Understanding role Models and Gender Influences on Entrepreneurial Intentions among College Students. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 93: 204–214.

Katundu, M. A. & Gabagambi, D. M. (2014). Determinants of Entrepreneurial Tendencies among Tanzanian University Graduates: A Case of University of Dar-es-Salaam. European Academic Research, Vol. II, (1): 835-869.

Katz, J. (1992). A Psychological Cognitive Model of Employment Status Choice, Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Fall, 29-37.

Klapper, R., & Léger-Jarniou, C. (2006), Entrepreneurial intention among French Grande École and university students: an application of Shapero's model, Industry and Higher Education, April, 97-110.

Klyver, K. & Grant, S. (2010). "Gender Differences in Entrepreneurial Networking and Participation". International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, Vol. 2 (3): 213 – 227.

Kraft, P., Rise, J., Sutton, S., & Roysamb, E. (2005). Perceived difficulty in the theory of planned behaviour: Perceived behavioural control or affective attitude. British Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 479-496.

Krueger, N. (1993). The Impact of Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure on Perceptions of New Venture Feasibility and Desirability, Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Fall, 5-21.

Krueger, N. (1994). "Strategic Optimism: Antecedents of Perceived Probabilities of New Venture Success", paper presented at the Academy of Management meeting, BPS Division.

Krueger, N. & D.V. Brazael (1994). Entrepreneurial Potential and Potential Entrepreneurs, Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Spring, 91-104.

Krueger, N. & A. Carsrud (1993). Entrepreneurial Intentions: Applying the Theory of Planned Behavior, Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 5: 315-330.

Lamottea, O. & Colovic, A. (2013). Do demographics influence aggregate entrepreneurship? Applied Economics Letters, Vol. 20, No. 13, 1206–1210.

Lan, Q., & Wu, S. (2010). "An Empirical Study of Entrepreneurial Orientation and Degree of Internationalization of Small and Medium-Sized Chinese Manufacturing Enterprises". Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship, 2(1): 53 – 75.

Lee, L., Wong, P. K. Foo, M. D. & Leung, A. (2011). Entrepreneurial Intentions: The Influence of Organizational and Individual Factors. Journal of Business Venturing, 26: 124–136.

Lindquist, M. J., Sol, J. & Van Praag, M. (2012). Why Do Entrepreneurial Parents Have Entrepreneurial Children? IZA DP No. 6740.[http://ftp.iza.org/dp6740.pdf] accessed on 07/04/2014.

Lüthje, C. & Franke, N. (2003), The 'Making' of an Entrepreneur: Testing a Model of Entrepreneurial Intent among Engineering Students at MIT, R&D Management, 33: 135-147.

Martínez, D., Mora, J.- G.& Vila, L. (2007), Entrepreneurs, the Self-employed and Employees amongst Young European Higher Education Graduates, European Journal of Education, 42 (1):137-158.

Mcha, M. Ch. 2012. Addressing Employment Challenges In Tanzania: Strategic Policy Options and Actions By Stakeholders Paper Presented at the Tanzania Country Level Knowledge Network, 15 February Dar es Salaam. [http://clknet.or.tz/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Presentation-Addressing-Employment-Challenges-3.pdf] accessed 23/02/2014.

Mwasalwiba, E., Dahles, H. & Wakkee, I. (2012). Graduate Entrepreneurship in Tanzania: Contextual Enablers and Hindrances, European Journal of Scientific Research, vol.76 (3): pp.386-402.

Nabi, G., & Liñán, F. (2011). "Graduate Entrepreneurship in the Developing World: Intentions, Education and Development". Education + Training, 53(5): 325 – 334.

Nabi, G. & Holden, R. (2008). Graduate Entrepreneurship: Intentions, Education and Training, Education & Training, vol. 50 (7): pp. 545-551. DOI 10.1108 /00400910810909018.

Naing, L., Winn, T. & Rusli, B. N. (2006). Practical Issues in Calculating the Sample Size for Prevalence Studies. Archives of Orofacial Sciences; 1: 9-14.

Oriarewo, G. O. & Owocho, M. (2013). Factors Influencing Entrepreneurial Intentions among Graduates of Nigerian Tertiary Institutions. International Journal of Business and Management Invention. Volume 2 (4): 36 – 44.

Parker, S. (2009). The Economics of entrepreneurship, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Peake, W. O. & Marshall, M. I. (2006). What Do We Really Know About Entrepreneurs? An Analysis of Nascent Entrepreneurs in Indiana, Working Paper # 06-14 [http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/28622/1/wp060014.pdf] accessed on 04/04/2014.

Peng, C. J., Lee, K. L., & Ingersoll, G. M. (2002). An Introduction to Logistic Regression Analysis and Reporting. Journal of Educational Research 96(1): 3-13.

Prachowny, M. F. J. (2002). The Goals of Macroeconomic Policy. Reprint, Taylor & Francis, 232 pp.

Reynolds, P.D., Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B. & Greene P.G. (2004). "The Prevalence of Nascent Entrepreneurs in the United States: Evidence from the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics." Small Business Economics 23: 263-284.

Rweyemamu, A. (2013). Unemployment: Youth Hit Hard. [http://www.ippmedia.com/frontend/? l=50537] accessed on 30/06/2014.

Sahinidis, A. G. & Vassiliou, E. E. (2013). Intention to Start a New Business, Using the Theory of Planned Behavior to Predict the Starting of a New Venture by Entrepreneurs and Self-Employed Individuals. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference: Quantitative and Qualitative Methodologies in the Economics and Administrative Sciences (Q.M.A.S. 2013): 324-332.

Sahinidis, A. G. Giovanis, A. N. & Sdrolias, L. (2012). The Role of Gender on Entrepreneurial Intention among Students: An Empirical Test of the Theory of Planned Behavior in a Greek University. International Journal on Integrated Information Management, volume 1 (1): 61-79.

Sandhu, M. S., Sidique, S. F., Riaz, S. (2011). "Entrepreneurship Barriers and Entrepreneurial Inclination among Malaysian Postgraduate Students", International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research, 17(4), 428 –449.

Shane, S.A. (2003). A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Smith, K. & Beasley, M. (2011). Graduate Entrepreneurs: Intentions, Barriers and Solutions Education & Training, Vol. 53 (8/9): pp. 722-740. DOI 10.1108 /00400911111185044.

Spicer, J. (2004). Making Sense of Multivariate Data Analysis. Sage Publications, California, 123-151.

Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S. & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do Entrepreneurship Programmes Raise Entrepreneurial Intention of Science and Engineering Students? The Effect of Learning, Inspiration and Resources. Journal of Business Venturing 22 (4): 566-591.

Stangler, D. & Spulber, D. (2013). The Age of the Entrepreneur: Demographics and Entrepreneurship. Demographics and Entrepreneurship Summit March 2013 [http://iiij.org/wpcontent/uploads/ 2013/05/i4j DaneStanglerDemographicsandEntrepreneurship-1.pdf] accessed on 04/04/2014.

Strömbergsson, S. (2009). Binary Logistic Regression and its Application to Data From a Study of Children's Recognition of their own Recorded Voices. [stp.lingfil. uu.se /~nivre / statmet/ strombergsson.pdf] accessed on 14/05/2014.

Sulloway, J.F. (1999). Birth Order. In Encyclopedia of Creativity Vol.1. pp.189-202.

Teixeira, A. A. C. (2008). Entrepreneurial potential in Chemistry and Pharmacy. Results from a large survey. Journal of Business Chemistry, 5, (2): 48-63.

URT–United Republic of Tanzania (2011). The Tanzania National Bureau of Statistics. Unemployment Estimates for the Year 2011. [http://www.nbs. go.tz/ index. php?option =com_content&view= article&id =186: unemploymen-estimates-for-the-year-2011 & catid=100: employment-and-earnings & Itemid=135] accessed on 23/02/2014.

URT (2010). United Republic of Tanzania National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II (NSGRP II). Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, Dar-es-salaam. [http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUImages/Tanzania/$file/NATIONAL-STRATEGY-FOR-GROWTH-AND-REDUCTION-OF-POVERTY-TANZANIA.PDF] accessed on 30/06/2014.

Verheul, I., Uhlaner, L. M., & Thurik, A. R. (2005). Business accomplishments, gender and entrepreneurial self-image. Journal of Business Venturing, 20 (4): 483–518.

Wang, W., Lu, W. & Millington, J. K. (2011). Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intention among College Students in China and USA. Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research, Winter & Spring, 2011, Vol.1, (1): 35-44.