Jurnal Ekonomi Perusahaan
Vol. 28, No. 01, March 2021

Research Article

Anticipated emotions of significant others as social influence: Can they predict students' smoking abstinence continuance intention?

Bilson Simamora1*

[1*] Department of Management, Kwik Kian Gie School of Business, Jakarta, Indonesia.
*Correspondence address: bilson.simamora@kwikkiangie.ac.id.

ABSTRACT

In the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), subjective norms (SN) represent social influence on an individual's behavior. This famous model of behavior postulates that an individual is under pressure or expectation of significant others to perform or not to perform a behavior. This study starts from the premise that an individual can take the initiative and regulate his or her behavior to generate anticipated emotion of significant others' (AESO). The question is, can the AESO function as the SN to represent the social factor in influencing student's smoking abstinence continuance intention? To answer this question, the author conducts the study upon 235 non-smoker students. The result is; first, negative AESO can carry out that function. However, positive AESO and SN fail to do so. Therefore, besides the SN, as shown by this study, the AESO, represented by negative AESO, can be regarded as a social influence component of an individual's behavioral intention. Other researchers are encouraged to validate this finding in different contexts of behavior.

Keywords: Anticipated emotions, significant others, subjective norms, social influence, emotional intelligence, smoking abstinence

INTRODUCTION

Social influence on one's behavior is represented by subjective norms (SN) (Ajzen, 1985; 1991; Armitage & Conner, 2001). The perception that significant persons in one's life (such as family members, friends, seniors, and instructors) want an individual to execute or not perform a behavior, as well as the individual's motivation to comply with that wish, make up this construct (Ajzen, 1985; 1991). The beginning point in this strategy is clear: significant others' attitudes, and the objective is individual behavior.

The question is can we reverse the approach by seeing an individual as starting point and significant others as the endpoint that are impacted by individual's initiatives? More specifically, can individuals regulate their behavior for the shake of significant others' well-being? Leading theories of behavior, such as Ajzen (1991)'s Theory of Planned Behavior

(TPB) and Perugini and Bagozzi (2001)'s Model-of-Goal Directed Behavior (MGB), have not touched this perspective.

In this study the author offers anticipated emotions of significant others (AESO) concept to fill this gap. Significant others are any party that care for and expect good fortune for an individual. They can be family or friend (Ajzen, 1991), teacher, parent, manager (Benabou & Tirole, 2003), or nuclear family and extended family (Chen, Wang, Wei, Fwu, & Hwang, 2009). An individual can regulate his or her behavior to make the significant others feel good or to avoid them from feeling bad (Simamora, 2016). This is because, with emotion intelligent (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), he or she can predict the emotions of significant others and then manage his or her behavior to generate or avoid certain AESO.

The interesting questions are, first, can AESO influence behavioral intention? Second, does the AESO take over the function of or accompany SN in predicting behavioral intention? This study aims to answer those questions in students' smoking abstinence continuance intention context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Anticipated Emotions of Significant Others

The author believes that an individual can perform or not perform a behavior with or without injunctive and descriptive norms consciousness as long as it has expected emotional consequences for the significant others. This notion is based on Mayer and Salovey (1997)'s emotion intelligent concept in which people are viewed as have capability to monitor his or her own and other's feelings and emotions then use this knowledge to guide his or her thinking and actions. For example, Dea (2016, February 8) said that she was ready to convert her religion, but she was afraid that this decision will hurt his parents' feeling. "I know that they have strong devotion to their religion. They are also highly respected couple in the town where we live (translated)", she said.

In this statement, Dea tries not to change her religion to avoid her parents from feeling bad. In short, people know the consequences of doing or not doing behaviors on significant others' emotions. Those emotions can be the goal of doing or not doing behavior. People can put expected anticipated emotions of others as goals then regulate their behavior to achieve that goals. In Dea's case, her parents' bad emotions are the goal to be avoided (avoidance goal) of Dea's decision to not change her religion.

The AESO can be also an approach goals or outcomes toward which ones' behavior is directed (Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard, & Hogg, 2016). For example, a drunk can stop his or her habit because he or she knows that the decision pleases people around him or her.

Besides to perform or not perform a behavior, emotional reactions of significant others can also be occurred in responding individuals' goal achievement, especially in Asian and Latin people (Fuligni et al., 1999; McNeal, 2014). Helliwell & Putnam (2004) stated that people who care on individual's achievement are not only the individual itself, but also significant others around him or her, especially if the achievement is considered as gift to the significant others. Success will be responded by significant others with positive

emotions (glad, pleased, like, released, joy, happy) and failure with negative emotions (sad, dissatisfied, disappointed, angry, regret, frustrate, dislike) (Simamora, 2016).

Subjective Norms as Social Influence in the TPB

People are influenced by their social environment in different ways. This social impact is represented by subjective norms (SN), which are people's perceptions of pressure from important others to do or not do something (White et al. 2009; Rivis & Sheeran, 2003; Silva & John, 2019). In the TPB, SN is defined as an individual's idea that key people in his or her life are advising him or her to do or not do something (Ajzen, 1991). It's made up of two variables: normative belief (NB) that important people in one's life (such as family members, friends, seniors, instructors, and so on) want him or her to do or not do something, and motivation to comply (MC) with that wish.

Because it is concerned with individuals' beliefs about perceived social pressure on them to perform or not execute a behavior, the SN is an injunctive social norm. Descriptive norms, on the other hand, pertain to people's assessments of their own attitudes and behaviors in a given domain (White et al., 2009; Silva & John, 2019; Rivis & Sheeran, 2003).

Besides the SN, in the TPB, other determinants of behavioral intention are attitude toward behavior (Ab) and perceived behavioral control (PBC). Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) stated that the Ab is constructed by the belief that a behavior has certain outcomes and the evaluation toward that outcomes. To operationalize this construct, we need to make sure that the outcomes of a behavior can be predicted (Bagozzi, 1992).

Perceived behavioral control (PBC) is the perception of how easy or difficult it is to carry out behavior as a result of the presence or lack of necessary resources and chances. Control beliefs (CB) and perception of facilitation make up this construct (PF). The CB is a subject evaluation of the presence or absence of resources required to carry out a behavior. The role of those resources in accomplishing behavior is a problem for the perception of facilitation.

AIMS AND HYPOTHESES

The author modifies the TPB to account for AESO's function in forecasting behavioral intent. It is a robust model that has been shown to accurately predict behavioral intention in numerous research (Ajzen, 1991, 2011; Armitage & Connor, 2001; Hasbullah et al., 2014; Sassen et al. 2015) and outperforms its predecessor (TRA) (Hagger, Chatzisarantis, & Biddle, 2002).

The TPB claims that behavioral intention can be used to predict behavior. Attitude toward behavior (Ab), subjective norms (SN), and behavioral control combine to produce behavioural (PBC) (Ajzen, 1985; 1991).

The dependent variable in this study is behavioral intention. It signifies that the TPB is used in part, rather than entirely, because the purpose of this study is not to evaluate that model. Aside from Ab and PBC, the SN and AESO are used as predictors of behavioral intention simultaneously and alternatively. With this method, the author may determine whether AESO is a replacement for or a supplement to SN in predicting behavioral intention.

Several research have confirmed the impact of anticipated emotions on behavioral intention. Kim, Njite, and Hancer (2013) used the TPB to predict consumers' acceptance of

and engagement in ecological behavior by incorporating negative predicted emotions (regret). Pelsmaeker et al. (2017) came to the same conclusion. They discovered that pleasant predicted emotions increase the desire to consume chocolate. The TPB's ability to predict behavioral intention and actual behavior is influenced by the presence of anticipated emotions.

In links between good and negative anticipated emotions of significant others, the same mechanism is likely to operate. However, the type of the conduct determines the direction of such interactions. Previous research (e.g., Perugini & Bagozzi, 2001; Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2002; Bagozzi et al. 2003; Taylor, Hunter, & Longfellow, 2006) has shown that positive and negative expected emotions influence behavior in different ways.

More specifically, the research discovered that only positive emotions had an effect on some behaviors and vice versa. This study hypothesizes that for non-smokers, the fear of negative emotional reactions from important others influences smoking abstinence behavior more than the potential for good emotions rewards from maintaining a non-smoking lifestyle. In other words, nonsmokers are more sensitive to their significant others' negative emotional reactions to smoking than to their significant others' positive emotional reactions to not smoking. As a result of this argument, the author is able to present the following hypotheses:

H_1: Negative anticipated emotions of significant others influence smoking abstinence continuance intention positively.

H_2: Positive anticipated emotions of significant others have non-significant influence on smoking abstinence behavior.

The influence of Ab, SN, and PBC on BI are not hypothesized. These paths have been confirmed by hundreds of studies that use the TPB model (Armitage & Conner, 2001).

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Context and Sample

The context of the behavior should be specific in studying the TPB (Ajzen, 2013). The author intentionally choses students smoking abstinence behavior because it is viewed as unethical behavior in Indonesia. Doing that behavior can be responded by negative emotions of significant others. Moreover, it is intensively studied using the TPB (e.g. Topa & Moriano, 2010; Karimy et al. 2015; Chiu et al., 2019).

The subjects of the study are non-smoker students. This segment is intentionally chosen because they generally have no financial freedom yet. With high financial dependency on their family, we can expect for the influence of family on student's smoking behavior.

The questionnaires were completed by a total of 235 non-smoking students (119 men and 116 females). They were from a variety of Indonesian universities, including Kwik Kian Gie School of Business and Information Technology (137 students), Maranatha Christian University (65 students), and universities in West Java and Jakarta (33 students). The average age of the population is 21.67 years. The data was obtained in June and July of this year.

Measurement and Instrument

Measurements and instruments are adapted from previous studies. Attitude is from Ajzen (2013), subjective norms from Solesvik et al. (2012), positive and negative anticipated emotions of significant others from Simamora (2016), perceived behavioral control from McCaul et al. (1993), and smoking abstinence continuance intention (BI) as dependent variable is taken from Karimy, Zareban, Araban, and Montazeri (2015). The instruments use five levels Likert-type scale. The order of the questions is intentionally randomized to reduce the risk of location bias.

Except for the PBC, all structures employ a multi-item method. According to Sheeran et al. (2003), the TPB in this form is more accurate in predicting the BI than the TPB in multi-item form. The instruments are displayed in Appendix.

The questionnaires are distributed on social media by emailing the link to them. There are no missing in the data because the system is set up as such, so that all questions must be answered before the response can be submitted.

RESULT

Validity and Reliability Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with LISREL is used in analyzing the validity of the constructs. Measurement model is good fit based on RMSEA=0.074 (RMSEA<0.08) (Hair et al. 2010). Other indicators show that measurement model are also good fit: Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 0.96, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 0.97 (NFI>0.90), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.98 (CFI>0.9), Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = 0.98, Relative Fit Index (RFI) = 0.95 (RFI>0.90), Root Mean Square Residual (RMR) = 0.042 (RMR<0.05).

All items with loading less than 0.5 or those that pull average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) down below their minimum threshold (AVE$\geq$0.05 and CR$\leq$0.6) are removed (Table 1). All the remaining constructs meet expected prerequisites: factor loading (FL)$\geq$0.5, average variance extracted (AVE)$\geq$0.6, and composite reliability (CR)$\geq$0.6. Special attention is required by Ab and BI whose CRs fall slightly below the standard. All constructs are also reliable (Cronbach Alpha$\geq$0.7) (Appendix).

Surrogate Variables

As suggested by Hair et al. (2010), to represent the items whose validity have been confirmed, we can use factor score as surrogate variables. In this study, factor scores are attracted using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal axis factoring as extraction technique. With this technique, the EFA counts only common variances of each items to get more accurate score of their own construct.

The average is used to describe the position occupied by each construct in Likert-type scale. Factor scores are used as surrogate variable to analysis the correlations among constructs as well as their structural relationships as described below.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

The average of each construct exceeds four on a five-level Likert scale. It means that each construct can be categorized as 'high' in the properties they describe. For example, with a score of 4.82, the attitude for non-smoking is considered high. All the correlations among constructs are significant [Sig. (1-tailed) < 0.01] (Table 1).

Table 1
Descriptive statistics and correlations

	Mean	S. Dev	Ab	SN	P-AESO	N-AESO	PBC
Ab	4.82	.41					
SN	4.66	.65	.40**				
P-AESO	4.34	.74	.35**	.32**			
N-AESO	4.47	.64	.41**	.33**	.77**		
PBC	4.68	.55	.39**	.22**	.32**	.38**	
BI	4.81	.42	.70**	.35**	.41**	.40**	.46**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
Note: Ab=attitude toward behavior, SN=subjective norms, P-AESO=positive anticipated emotions of significant others, N-AESO=negative anticipated emotions of significant others, PBC=perceived behavioral control

Structural Models

The author uses seven structural models of multiple regression as exhibited in Table 2. Model I simply follows the TPB. In model II, Model III, and model IV, P-AESO and N-AESO, simultaneously or individually, are used as substitute of SN. Whereas in Model V to VII, P-AESO and N-AESO, simultaneously or individually, are used as SN's companions.

In Model I, as specified in the TPB, independent variables for smoking abstinence continuance intention (BI) are attitude to smoking abstinence (Ab), subjective norms (SN) and perceived behavioral control (PBC). This model is statistically good fit (F=88.302, Sig.=0.000). It shows positive significant influence of Ab [β_1=0.586, t=11.249, sig.(1-tailed)=0.000] and PBC [β_3=0.222, t=4.535, sig.(1-tailed)=0.000], and non-significant influence of SN [β2=0.064, t=1.301, sig.(1-tailed)=0.485] on BI. Moreover, although their bivariate correlation isgnificant [r=344, sig. (1-tailed)<0.01], part correlation between SN and BI is low [r=0.058, sig. (1-tailed)>0.10]. It means that the major part of its bivariate correlation with BI is affected by two other variables with which SN has a significant correlation (Table 3). As shown by its part correlation, SN can only explained 0.058^2=0.33% the variance of BI. This is the reason its influence on BI is not significant.

In Model II, the role of SN is replaced by positive anticipated emotions of significant others (P-AESO) and negative anticipated emotions of significant others (N-AESO). The interesting question is whether this replacement is successful statistically. As expected, N-AESO influences BI positively and significantly [β3=0.172, t=2.538, sig.(1-tailed)=0.006] (H_1 is confirmed). On the other hand, P-AESO shows negative and non-significant influence on BI [β2=-0.043, t=-0.614, sig.(1-tailed)=0.270], as specified in Table 3 (H_2 is confirmed). It means that N-AESO is the only sub-dimension of AESO that influence BI.

Although P-AESO has significant bivariate (zero-order) correlation with BI [$r_{P\text{-}AESO\text{-}BI}$=0.398, sig. (1 tailed)<0.01], its partial correlation with BI when controlling Ab, N-AESO and PBC is low [$r_{P\text{-}AESO\text{-}BI.Ab.PBC}$=-0.040, sig.(1-tailed)>0.10]. It means that major part of its correlation with BI is explained by other independent variables as reflected by its significant correlation with N-AESO ($r_{P\text{-}AESO\text{-}N\text{-}AESO}$=0.77, sig. (1-tailed)<0.01), Ab ($r_{P\text{-}AESO\text{-}Ab}$=0.41, sig.(1-tailed)<0.01] and PBC [$r_{P\text{-}AESO\text{-}PBC}$=0.32, sig.(1-tailed)<0.01], as can be seen in Table 3. Part correlation shows that P-AESO's unique contribution to explain BI is only -0.027^2=0.07%.

Table 2

Models Comparison Summary

Model*	Independent Variables**	F-Statistic		Standardized Coefficient	T-Statistic		Correlation			Adj. R^2
		Value	Sig.		Value	Sig. (1-tailed)	Zero-order	Partial	Part	
Model I	Ab	88.302	0.00	0.586	11.249	0.000	0.698	0.595	0.505	0.528
	SN			0.064	1.301	0.485	0.344	0.085	0.058	
	PBC			0.222	4.535	0.000	0.465	0.286	0.204	
Model II	Ab	69.911	0.00	0.578	11.424	0.000	0.698	0.602	0.506	0.541
	P-AESO			-0.043	-0.614	0.270	0.398	-0.040	-0.027	
	N-AESO			0.172	2.538	0.006	0.401	0.165	0.112	
	PBC			0.201	4.023	0.000	0.465	0.256	0.178	
Model III	Ab	93.341	0.00	0.572	11.518	0.000	0.698	0.604	0.510	0.542
	N-AESO			0.143	2.963	0.002	0.401	0.191	0.131	
	PBC			0.196	3.981	0.000	0.465	0.253	0.176	
Model IV	Ab	88.973	0.00	0.584	11.430	0.000	0.698	0.601	0.512	0.530
	P-AESO			0.082	1.621	0.053	0.398	0.106	0.073	
	PBC			0.205	4.056	0.000	0.465	0.258	0.182	
Model V	Ab	55.948	0.00	0.566	10.721	0.000	0.698	0.578	0.475	0.540
	SN			0.038	0.769	0.221	0.344	0.051	0.034	
	N-AESO			0.167	2.445	0.008	0.401	0.160	0.108	
	P-AESO			-0.470	-0.665	0.254	0.398	-0.044	-0.029	
	PBC			0.200	4.007	0.000	0.465	0.256	0.178	
Model VI	Ab	69.994	0.00	0.561	10.759	0.000	0.698	0.579	0.476	0.541
	SN			0.036	0.726	0.235	0.344	0.048	0.032	
	N-AESO			0.135	2.747	0.003	0.401	0.178	0.122	
	PBC			0.195	3.956	0.000	0.465	0.252	0.175	
Model VII	Ab	66.991	0.00	0.569	10.653	0.000	0.698	0.575	0.477	0.530
	SN			0.050	1.010	0.157	0.344	0.066	0.045	
	P-AESO			0.072	1.396	0.082	0.398	0.092	0.063	
	PBC			0.204	4.037	0.000	0.465	0.257	0.181	

*Dependents variable for all models is smoking abstinence continuance intention (BI). Constant is included in all models.
**Ab=attitude toward smoking abstinence behavior, SN=subjective norms, P-AESO=positive anticipated emotions of significant others, N-AESO=negative anticipated emotions of significant others, PBC=perceived behavioral control

In Model III, N-AESO is the only dimension of AESO that represent other's oriented consideration. N-AESO remains as significant predictor of BI [$\beta 2$=0.143, t=2.963, sig.(1-tailed)=0.002]. This model shows its highest fit according to F statistic (value=93.341, sig.=0.000) as well as the high determination to explain the variance of BI (R^2=0.542).

Model IV uses P-AESO as the only component of social influence. Once again, at 5% of confidence level, this dimension shows non-significant influence [$\beta 2$=0.082, t=1.621, sig. (1-tailed)=0.053].

Model V uses SN, N-AESO and P-AESO simultaneously as social influence components -of BI. The model shows that among those three variables, N-AESO is the only variable that has significant influence on BI [β_3=0.167, t=2.445, sig.(1-tailed)=0.008], together with Ab [β_1=0.566, t=10.721, sig.(1-tailed)=0.000] and PBC [β_5=0.200, t=4.007, sig.(1-tailed)=0.000]. The SN and P-AESO show non-significant influence BI.

Model VI uses N-AESO and SN as social influence components. N-AESO once again proves its efficacy [β3=0.135, t=2.747, sig.(1-tailed)=0.003]. On the other hand, SN has non-significant influence [β2=0.036, t=0.726, sig.(1-tailed)=0.235] on BI.

Model VII investigates whether SN and P-AESO can be used simultaneously as social-related predictors of BI. Again, in this model, both variables show non-significant influences on BI. On the other hand, Ab and PBC show significant effect on BI, as in the other models.

As a whole, among the seven models, N-AESO shows positive and significant influence on BI (H_1 is confirmed). Meanwhile, not in any model P-AESO shows significant effect on BI (H_2 is not confirmed).

Based on statistic F and R^2, the best model is Model III. The highest F-value (F=93.341) means that Model III is the most fit model. Meanwhile, the highest determinant coefficient (adjusted R^2=0.542) shows that this model is the most powerful one to explain BI. Therefore, social influence is represented best by N-AESO.

DISCUSSION

This study reveals that negative AESO influence students' smoking abstinence continuance behavior positively and significantly, while positive AESO fail to do so. This result is consistent with Perugini and Bagozzi (2001), Bagozzi and Dholakia (2002), Bagozzi, Dholakia, and Basuroy (2003) as well as Taylor, Hunter, and Longfellow (2006) who found the exclusive nature of the influence of positive and negative anticipated emotions on behavioral intention.

In this study, subjective norms have no effect on behavioral intention. This possibility has been predicted by Fishbein and Ajzen (2010). They reminded that the relative influence of the SN can be varied across behaviors and population. A number of studies also revealed that the predictive ability of the subjective norms is limited (Chang, 1998; Armitage and Conner, 2001; White, Smith, Terry, Greenslade, and McKimmie, 2009).

Subjective norms represent the social pressure on individuals to do or not to do a behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Armitage and Connor, 2001; White et al., 2009). On the other hand, smoking abstinence behavioral intention can be viewed as volitional in nature. Armitage and Conner (2001) stated that in such behavior, subjective norms is not required to predict behavioral intention and attitude toward behavior is the dominant predictor of behavioral intention.

In addition, non-significant influence of the SN on students' smoking abstinence continuance intention can be viewed from cultural norms point of view. In Indonesia, smoking is widely practiced. This country has the highest percentage of smoking people among South-East Asian countries. Although be viewed as unethical behavior, smoking cigarettes behavior gets weak sanction from social environment. It means that descriptive norms that describe what people generally do (Silva and John, 2017; White et al., 2009; Rivis and Sheran, 2003), in this case can be out of consideration and the threat of social sanction for breaking smoking-related social norms doesn't function.

The unstable influence of SN on BI stimulates speculation if there's a room for another social-related factor besides SN (Passafaro, Livi, and Kosic, 2019). This study confirms that the room exists and inhabited by the AESO.

The difference between the AESO and the SN is as follows. In subjective norms, the initiative is at the hand of significant persons. It is reflected in the word ”suggest” and ”pressure” found in its definition. It means that significant persons are the party that ”want” an individual to perform or not perform a behavior.

In the AESO concept, the initiatives are in the hand of the individuals. The intention to do or not to do a behavior is not caused by possible reward or punishment from social environment as specified in subjective norms (Armitage and Connor, 2001; White et al. 2009), but by individuals' willingness to prevent proponent from feeling negative emotions or to condition them to experience positive emotions.

The explanation for why negative and positive AESO function exclusively may also be regarded from its status as social motivation, in which P-AESO represents approach motivation and N-AESO explains avoidance motivation. According to Gable (2005), approach and avoidance social incentives work independently. Approach social motivation is produced by Gray's Behavioral Activation System (BAS) and avoidance social motivation is generated by Gray's Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS) (BIS). The BAS/BIS is a personality attribute that classifies persons as either aversive (BIS) or appetitive (BIS) (BAS). People with a high BAS score will have a low BIS score, and vice versa.

Grant and Wrzesniewski offer a the same perspective (2010). They defined others-oriented personality as a two-dimensional notion that includes both expected guilt and expected appreciation. People can be high on one or both dimensions, according to them. Because the students in this study are still financially and emotionally dependent on their families, which is a common trait in Asian countries (Chen et al. 2009), the author assumes that in terms of smoking behavior, the students' anticipated guilt for smoking is more active than their anticipated reward for not smoking. As a result, the N-AESO, rather than the P-AESO, is the AESO dimension that influences students' smoking abstinence intention.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms that negative anticipated emotions of significant others influence smoking abstinence continuance intention positively. These influences occurred amid the absence of subjective norms influence. Therefore, negative anticipated emotions of significant others represent the social influence on individuals' behavior.

The author views several limitations of this study. First, it only uses injunctive norms to represent subjective norms. White et al. (2009) stated that in its operationalization, subjective norms should include descriptive norms, i.e. the description about how normal people do or perform in relation to the focal behavior. Other researchers are encouraged to take this approach.

Second, the respondents in this study majorly are from two universities. Fishbein and Ajzen (2010) stated that subjective norms influence on behavioral intention can be varied for different populations. Although there's no statistical evidence for the moderation of the university origin to the result of the study, other researchers are encouraged to take this consideration.

This study is the first to confirm the influence of negative AESO on behavioral intention. It is viewed as original contribution to academic world. Practically, negative AESO can be used to promote smoking abstinence behavior among students.

This study has just proved the effect of negative AESO on behavioral intention. Other researchers are encouraged to look for the possibility for positive AESO to take that role in different contexts of behavior.

ACKNOWLEDMENT

This study is fully financed by Institute of Research and Community Service of Kwik Kian Gie School of Business and Information Technology. There is no conflict of interest on the results of this study.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In: Kuhl, J. and Beckmann, J. (Ed.). *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg, South Africa: Springer.

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

Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology & Health*, 26(9), 1113-1127. doi: 10.1080/08870446.2011.613995.

Ajzen, I. (2013) . Theory of planned behaviour questionnaire. *Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science*. Retrieved from www.midss.ie.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Armitage, C.J., & Conner, M. (2001). The efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 471–499. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164939.

Bagozzi, R.P. (1992). The Self-regulation of attitudes, intentions, and behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55(2), 178-204. doi: 10.2307/2786945.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. M. (1999). Goal setting and goal striving in consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 19-32.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. M. (2002). Intentional social action in virtual communities. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 16(2), 2-21. doi: 10.1002/ dir.10006.

Bagozzi, R.P., Gopinath, M., & Basuroy, S. (2003). How effortful decisions get enacted: The motivating role of decision processes, desires, and anticipated emotions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 16(4), 273-295. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.446.

Bagozzi, R.P, Gopinath, M., & Nyer, P.U. (1999). The role of emotions in marketing**.** *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(2), 184-206.

Baumeister, R.F., Vosh, K.D., Dewall, C.N, & Zhang, L. (2007). How emotions shapes behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*, 167-203.

Baumgartner, H., Pieters, R., & Bagozzi, R.P. (2007). Future-oriented emotions: Conceptualization and behavioral effects. E*uropean Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(4), 685-696. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.467.

Benabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Review of Economic Studies, 70* (3), 489-520. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-937X.00253.

Chang, M.K. (1998). Predicting unethical behavior: A comparison of the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17 (16), 1825-1834. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/25074021.

Chen, S.W., Wang, H.H., Wei, C.F., Fwu, B.J., & Hwang, K.K. (2009). Taiwanese students' self-attributions for two types of achievement goals. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 2009, 149 (2), 179–193. doi: 10.3200/socp.149.2.179-194.

Chiu, Y-.L., Chou, Y-.C., Chang, Y-.W., Chu, C-.M., Lin, F-.G., Lai, C-.H., Hwang, S-.L., and Senyong, K. (2019). Using an extended theory of planned behaviour to predict smoking cessation counsellors' intentions to offer smoking cessation support in the Taiwanese military: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*, 9 (5), 1-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026203.

Dea (2016, February 8). Cinta beda agama [Consultation rubric]. *Pressreader*. Retrieved from https://www.pressreader.com/indonesia/nova/20160208/282140700424608.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Fuligni, A. J., Tseng, V., & Lam, M. (1999). Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Development, 70*(4), 1030-1044. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00075.

Gable, S.L. (2005). Approach and avoidance social motives and goals. *Journal of Personality*, 74 (1), 176-222. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00373.x.

Grant, A.M., & Wrzeniewski, A. (2010). I won't let you down ... or will I? Core self-evaluations, other-orientation, anticipated guilt and gratitude, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1):108-21, doi: 10.1037/a0017974.

Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L.D., & Biddle, S. J.H. (2002). A meta-analytic review of the theories of reasoned action and planned behavior in physical activity: Predictive validity and the contribution of additional variables. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 24*(1), 3–32. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.24.1.3.

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Helliwell, J. F., & Putnam, R. D. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society*, 359, 1435-1446. doi:10.1098/rstb.2004.1522.

Hasbullah, N., Mahajar, A.J., & Saleeh, M.I. (2014). Extending the theory of planned behavior: Evidence of the arguments of its sufficiency. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science,* 4 (14), 101-105. Retrieved from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_14_December_2014/11.pdf.

Higgins, E. T. (2002). How self-regulation creates distinct values: The case of promotion and prevention decision making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12, 177-191. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1203_01.

Karimy, M., Zareban, I., Araban, M., & Montazeri, A.(2015). An extended theory of planned behavior (TPB) used to predict smoking behavior among a sample of Iranian medical students. *International Journal of High Risk Behavior & Addiction*, 4(3), 1-7. https://dx.doi.org/10.5812%2Fijhrba.24715.

Kim, Y.J., Njite, D., & Hancer, M. (2013). Anticipated emotion in consumers' intentions to select eco-friendly restaurants: Augmenting the theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 255-262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.04.004.

Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligent? In Salovey, P., & Sluyter, D.J. (Ed.). *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligent Educational Implications*. New York, NY: Basic Book.

McCaul, K. D., Sandgren, A. K., O'Neill, H. K., & Hinsz, V. B. (1993). The value of the theory of planned behavior, perceived control, and self-efficacy for predicting health-protective behaviors. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 14(2), 231-252. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1402_7.

McNeal, R.B. (2014). Parent Involvement, academic achievement and the role of student attitudes and behaviors as mediators. *Universal Journal of Educational Research,* 2(8): 564-576. doi: 10.13189/ujer.2014.020805.

Mellers, B.A., & McGraw, A.P. (2001). Anticipated emotions as guides to choice. *Current Direction in Psychological Science*, 10 (6), 210-214. https://doi.org/10.1111%2F1467-8721.00151.

Passafaro, P., Livi, S., & Kosic, A. (2019). Local norms and the theory of planned behavior: Understanding the effects of spatial proximity on recycling intentions and self-reported behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00744.

Pelsmaeker,S.D., Schouten, J.J., Gellynck, X., Delbaere, C., De Clerck, N., Heggy, A., Kuti, T., Depypere, T., & Dewettinck, K. (2017). Do anticipated emotions influence behavioural intention and behaviour to consume filled chocolates? *British Journal of Food*, 119 (9), 1983-1998. doi: 10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0006.

Perugini, M. & Bagozzi, R.P. (2001). The role of desires and anticipated emotions in goal-directed behaviours: Broadening and deepening the theory of planned behavior. *The British Journal of Social Psychology,* 40, 79-98. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164704.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). A manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). Retrieved from http:// files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED338122.pdf.

Rivis, A., & Sheeran, P. (2003). Descriptive norms as an additional predictor in the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, and Social,* **22 (3),** 218–233 (2003). doi:10.1007/s12144-003-1018-2.

Sassen, B., Kok, G., Schepers, J., & Vanhees, L. (2015). Stability of and associations between social-cognitive determinants over time. *SAGE Open*, 5(3), 1–10. doi: 10.1177/2158244015592453.

Sheeran, P., Trafimow, D., & Armitage, C.J. (2003). Predicting behaviour from perceived behavioural control: Tests of the accuracy assumption of the theory of planned behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(3), 393-410. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603322438224.

Silva, A., & John, P. (2017). Social norms don't always work: An experiment to encourage more efficient fees collection for students. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177354.

Simamora, B. (2016). Achievement as gift and prestige: Formulating anticipated emotions of others as new determinant of consumers' motivation. *Asean Marketing Journal*, 8 (1), 29-53. https://doi.org/10.21002/amj.v8i1.9258.

Solesvik, M.Z., Westhead, P., Kolvereid, L. and Matlay, H. (2012). Student intentions to become self-employed: The Ukrainian context. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 19 (3), 441-460. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626001211250153.

Solomon, M., Bamossy, G. J., Askegaard, S. & Hogg, M.K. (2006). *Consumer behavior: A European perspective* (3rd Edition). London, United Kingdom: Prentice Hall.

Taylor, S. A., Hunter, G. L., & Longfellow, T. A. (2006). Testing an expanded attitude model of goal-directed behavior in a loyalty context. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 19(1), 18-39.

Topa, G., & Moriano, J.A. (2010). Theory of planned behavior and smoking: meta-analysis and SEM model. *Substance Abuse and Rehabilitation*, 1: 23–33. https://dx.doi.org/10.2147%2FSAR.S15168.

White, K. M., Smith, J.K, Terry, D.J., Greenslade, J., & McKimmie, B. M. (2009). Social influence in the theory of planned behaviour: The role of descriptive, injunctive, and ingroup norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(1), 135-158. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X295207.

APPENDIX

The Validity and Reliability of The Measurements

	Statements	Mean	S. Dev	FL	AVE	CR	Alpha
Attitude							
1	"No smoking is fun"	4.69	0.68	Removed			
2	"It is good for me if I don't smoke"	4.83	0.48	0.71	0.56	0.58	0.71
3	"No smoking is useful for me"	4.82	0.46	0.78			
Subjective norms							
1	"Important people in my life (parents, relatives, close friends, friends) generally stated that I should avoid smoking"	4.69	0.65	0.85	0.65	0.71	0.78
2	"Important people in my life (parents, relatives, close friends, friends) generally disagree if I smoke"	4.64	0.77	0.76			
3	"I feel pressure from important people in my life (eg parents, relatives, close friends, friends) so that I don't smoke"	3.17	1.41	Removed			
Negative Anticipated Emotions of Significant others							
1	"If I become a smoker, important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel sad"	4.35	.82	0.80			
2	"If I become a smoker, important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel dislike"	4.40	.80	0.90			
3	"If I become a smoker, important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel disappointed"	4.38	.85	0.89	0.71	0.90	0.92
4	"If I smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel restless"	4.26	.87	0.79			
5	"If I smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally be angry"	4.32	.87	0.82			
Positive Anticipated Emotions							
1	"If I don't smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel satisfied"	4.47	.72	0.80			
2	"If I don't smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel happy"	4.45	.72	0.81			
3	"If I don't smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel pleased"	4.50	.68	0.90	0.77	0.93	0.94
4	"If I don't smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel calm"	4.47	0.69	0.95			
5	"If I don't smoke important people in my life (such as parents, relatives, close friends and friends) will generally feel relieved"	4.45	0.71	0.92			
Perceived Behavioral Control							
1	"I am sure that can avoid smoking if I decide to do so"	4.68	0.55	-	-	-	-
Behavioral Intention							
1	"How likely are you to live by not smoking?"	4.49	1.11	Removed			
2	"I intend to avoid smoking"	4.79	0.50	0.72	0.56	0.59	0.71
3	"I plan to not smoke"	4.84	0.44	0.78			