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Figure 1. Theoretical model and research hypotheses

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lower Order Constructs****(LOCs)** | **Indicators** | **Convergent Validity** | **Internal Consistency Reliability** |
| **Loadings** | **Indicator Reliability** | **t-values** | **AVE** | **Composite Reliability** | **Cronbach’s Alpha**  |
| **>0.708** | **>0.5** | **>2.57** | **>0.5** | **>0.7** | **>0.7** |
| Regulatory Burden  | AR1 | 0.791 | 0.626 | 30.177 | 0.631 | 0.895 | 0.854 |
| AR2 | 0.774 | 0.599 | 25.972 |
| AR4 | 0.789 | 0.622 | 28.234 |
| AR5 | 0.818 | 0.669 | 30.920 |
| AR6 | 0.800 | 0.640 | 33.358 |
| Normative Burden  | AN1 | 0.840 | 0.706 | 28.491 | 0.726 | 0.888 | 0.810 |
| AN2 | 0.902 | 0.814 | 82.493 |
| AN3 | 0.810 | 0.656 | 31.152 |
| CognitiveBurden  | AC3 | 0.847 | 0.717 | 43.352 | 0.721 | 0.886 | 0.806 |
| AC4 | 0.827 | 0.684 | 33.989 |
| AC5 | 0.872 | 0.760 | 54.673 |
| Innovativity  | OEI1 | 0.908 | 0.824 | 93.358 | 0.819 | 0.900 | 0.779 |
| OEI3 | 0.902 | 0.814 | 76.447 |
| Proactivity  | OEP1 | 0.818 | 0.669 | 38.486 | 0.697 | 0.874 | 0.783 |
| OEP2 | 0.840 | 0.706 | 39.486 |
| OEP3 | 0.846 | 0.716 | 42.148 |
| Risk Taking  | OER2 | 0.897 | 0.805 | 66.337 | 0.787 | 0.881 | 0.730 |
| OER3 | 0.878 | 0.771 | 43.746 |
| **Higher Order Constructs****(HOCs)** | **Construct** | **Path Coefficients** | **t-values** | **AVE** | **Composite Reliability** | **Cronbach’s Alpha**  |
| InstitutionalBurdens  | Regulatory | 0.938 | 111.616 | 0.502 | 0.917 | 0.899 |
| Normative | 0.862 | 59.977 |
| Cognitive | 0.724 | 17.491 |
| Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation  | Innovativity | 0.808 | 33.493 | 0.503 | 0.876 | 0.833 |
| Proactivity | 0.890 | 54.599 |
| Risk Taking | 0.710 | 20.926 |

**Source: Own contribution from results obtained with Smart PLS 3. Ringle et al. (2015)**

**Table 2.** **Discriminant Validity for the Lower Order Constructs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lower Order Constructs | Regulatory Burden | Normative Burden | Cognitive Burden | Innovativity | Proactivity | Risk Taking |
| AVE= 0.631 | AVE= 0.726 | AVE= 0.721 | AVE= 0.819 | AVE= 0.697 | AVE= 0.787 |
| Regulatory Burden | **0.794** | 0.891 | 0.645 | 0.336 | 0.418 | 0.451 |
| Normative Burden | 0.748 | **0.852** | 0.533 | 0.334 | 0.383 | 0.495 |
| Cognitive Burden | 0.537 | 0.433 | **0.849** | 0.328 | 0.395 | 0.385 |
| Innovativity | 0.274 | 0.268 | 0.260 | **0.905** | 0.760 | 0.498 |
| Proactivity | 0.342 | 0.308 | 0.314 | 0.593 | **0.835** | 0.599 |
| Risk Taking | 0.355 | 0.381 | 0.294 | 0.378 | 0.454 | **0.887** |
| NOTE: The diagonal numbers (in bold) represent the square root of the AVE values (for reflective constructs). Above the diagonal the HTMT.90 correlations ratio Test is presented; below the diagonal, the Fornell-Larcker criterion test is presented. |

**Source: Own contribution from results obtained with Smart PLS 3. Ringle et al. (2015).**

**Table 3.** **Discriminant Validity for the Higher Order Constructs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Higher Order Constructs | Institutional Burdens | Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation |
| AVE= 0.502 | AVE= 0.503 |
| Institutional Burdens | **0.709** | 0.520 |
| Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation | 0.447 | **0.709** |
|  NOTE: The diagonal numbers (in bold) represent the square root of the AVE values (for reflective constructs). Above the diagonal the HTMT.85 correlations ratio Test is presented; below the diagonal, the Fornell-Larcker criterion test is presented. |

**Source: Own contribution from results obtained with Smart PLS 3. Ringle et al. (2015).**

**Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the constructs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Higher Order Construct****.** | **Variable**  | **Male** | **Female** |
| **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
| Institutional Burdens | Regulative burden | 3.14 | *0.83* | 2.87 | *0.89* |
| Normative burden | 3.95 | *0.67* | 3.64 | *0.72* |
| Cognitive burden | 3.30 | *0.66* | 3.13 | *0.65* |
| Entrepreneurial Orientation | Innovativity | 3.54 | *0.84* | 3.69 | *0.73* |
| Proactivity | 3.61 | *0.76* | 3.67 | *0.67* |
| Risk Taking | 3.71 | *0.69* | 3.74 | *0.59* |

**Table 5.** **PLS-SEM** **Results of the Structural Model**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hypotheses** | **Path** | **Standardized Coefficient β** | ***t-value***  | $$f^{2}$$ | ***R²*** |
| H1: The institutional burdens affect significantly the individual entrepreneurial orientation of Aguascalientes City’s micro and small business | Institutional Burdens → Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation | 0.447\*\*\* | 9.064 | 0.250 | 0.201 |
| H2: The institutional burdens affect significantly the individual entrepreneurial orientation of Aguascalientes City’s micro and small business created by man. | Institutional Burdens by man entrepreneur → Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation | 0.515\*\*\* | 8.596 | 0.361 | 0.265 |
| H3: The institutional burdens affect significantly the individual entrepreneurial orientation of Aguascalientes City’s micro and small business created by woman. | Institutional Burdens by woman entrepreneur → Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation | 0.340\*\*\* | 3.958 | 0.131 | 0.116 |
| Significance: \*\*\* = p<0.001; \*\* = p<0.05$f^{2}$ effect sizes: >0.02= Small effect; >0.15 = Medium effect; >0.35 Large effect (Cohen, 1988).R2 values: >0.20 = Weak; >0.33 Moderate; >0.67 = Substantial (Chin, 1998). |

**Source: Own contribution from results obtained with Smart PLS 3. Ringle et al. (2015).**

**Table 6.** **PLS-Multigroup Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Path** | **Path Coefficient****Group: Man** | **Path Coefficient****Group: Woman** | **Path Coefficient****Difference** | ***p-value*** **Man vs Woman**  |
| Institutional Burdens → Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation | 0.515\*\*\* | 0.340\*\*\* | 0.175\*\* | 0.046 |
| Significance: \*\*\* p<0.001; \*\*p<0.05 |

**Source: Own contribution from results obtained with Smart PLS 3. Ringle et al. (2015).**