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**ASTRACT**

In the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), subjective norms (SN) represent social influence on individuals behavior. In this famous model of behavior, it’s believed that an individual is under pressure or expectation of significant others to perform or not to perform a behavior. This study is based on the premise that an individual can take the initiative and regulate his or her behavior to generate anticipated emotions 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? Using 235 non-smoker students as respondents, this study reveals that negative AESO can carry out that function, while positive AESO and the SN fail to do so. Therefore, besides the SN, as shown by this study, the AESO, represented by negative AESO, can be regarded as social influence component of individual’s behavioral intention. Other researchers are encouraged to validate this finding in different contexts of behavior.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Subjective norms (SN) represent social influence on one’s behavior (Ajzen, 1985; 1991; Armitage & Conner, 2001). This construct consists of two components, i.e. the belief that significant others in one’s life (such as family members, friends, seniors, teachers) want an individual to perform or not to perform a behavior and the individual’s motivation to comply that desire (Ajzen, 1985; 1991). In this approach, it’s clear that the starting point is significant others’ attitude and the endpoint is individual’s 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, Tseng, & Lam, 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**

In many behaviors, people are not free from social influence. Subjective norms (SN), conceptualized as people perceived pressure from significant others to do or not to do a behavior represent this social influence (White et al. 2009; Rivis & Sheeran, 2003; Silva & John, 2019). In the TPB, SN is conceptualised as individual’s belief that important persons in one’s life suggest him or her to do or not to do a behavior (Ajzen, 1991). More specifically, it’s formed by two variables, i.e. normative belief (NB) that prominent persons in one’s life (such as family members, friends, seniors, teachers, etc.) want he or she to do or to not to do a behavior and the motivation to comply (MC) that desire.

The SN is an injunctive social norm because it concerns with individuals’ belief about perceived social pressure on individuals to perform or not to perform a behavior. Descriptive norms, on the other hand, refer to perceptions of significant others' own attitudes and behaviors in the 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 defined as the perception about the easiness or difficulties to conduct behavior caused by the existence or the absence of required resources and opportunities. This construct is composed by control beliefs (CB) and perception of facilitation (PF). The CB is the subject assessment about the existence or the absence of resources needed to execute a behavior. The PF concerns with the role of that resources in achieving behavior.

**AIMS AND HYPOTHESES**

The author adapts the TPB to accommodate the role of AESO in predicting behavioral intention. It is a robust model and has proved its efficacy to predict behavioral intention in abundant studies (Ajzen, 1991, 2011; Armitage & Connor, 2001; Hasbullah, Mahajar, & Saleeh, 2014; Sassen, Kok, Schepers, & Vanhees, 2015) and significantly better than its predecessor (TRA) in predicting behavior (Hagger, Chatzisarantis, & Biddle, 2002).

The TPB asserts that behavior can be predicted through behavioral intention. This intention is influenced by attitude toward behavior (Ab), subjective norms (SN) and behavioural control create behavioural (PBC) (Ajzen, 1985; 1991).

This study uses behavioral intention as the dependent variable. It means that the TPB is not utilized wholly, but partly, because this study is not aimed to test that model. The SN and AESO are used simultaneously and alternately, besides Ab and PBC, as determinants of behavioral intention. With this approach, the author is enabled to verify whether AESO is a replacement or companion of SN to predict behavioral intention.

The influence of anticipated emotions on behavioral intention confirmed by several studies. Kim, Njite, & Hancer (2013) incorporated negative anticipated emotions (regret) into the TPB to predict consumers’ acceptance of and engagement in ecological behavior. Pelsmaeker et al. (2017) also found the same result. More specifically, they revealed that positive anticipated emotions influence intention to consume chocolate. The involvement of anticipated emotions influences the efficacy of the TPB to predict behavioral intention and actual behavior.

The same mechanism is expected to work in the relationships between positive and negative anticipated emotions of significant others. But, the direction of those relationships depends on the nature of the behavior. Previous studies (e.g., Perugini & Bagozzi, 2001; Bagozzi & Dholakia 2002; Bagozzi, Dholakia, & Basuroy, 2003; Taylor, Hunter, & Longfellow, 2006) revealed that positive and negative anticipated emotions function separately in influencing behavior. More specifically, those studies found that for some behaviors only positive emotions had an effect and vice versa. This study presumes that for non-smokers, smoking abstinence behavior is mostly influenced by fear of significant others’ negative emotional reaction and less influenced by possible positive emotions reward obtained from continuing non-smoking lifestyle. In other word, non-smoker people are more sensitive to potential negative emotional reactions from their significant others for smoking rather than significant others’ positive emotional reactions for not smoking. This argument enables the author to propose following hypotheses:

H1: Negative anticipated emotions of significant others influence smoking abstinence continuance intention positively.

H2: 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, Zareban, Araban, & Montazeri, 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.

As many 235 non-smoker students (119 males and 116 females) filled the questionnaires. They come from several universities in Indonesia, i.e. Kwik Kian Gie School of Business and Information Technology (137 students), Maranatha Christian University (65 students) and various universities in West Java and Jakarta (33 students). The average of age is 21.67 years. The data are collected in June-July 2019.

**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, Sandgren, O’Neill, and Hinsz (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.

All constructs use multi-items approach, except the PBC. This construct uses single-item approach because, according to Sheeran, Trafimow, and Armitage (2003), the TPB in this form is more accurate to predict the BI than multi-items form.

The questionnaires are distributed online by sending its link through social media. There’s no missing data because the system intentionally arranged so that all question must be answered before submitting the response.

**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).

Table 1

*Validity and reliability analysis*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Items | | 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 | 0.71 | 0.90 | 0.92 |
| 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 |
| 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 | 0.77 | 0.93 | 0.94 |
| 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 |
| 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 |

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>0.05 and CR<0.6) are removed (Table 1). All the remaining constructs meet expected prerequisites: factor loading (FL)>0.5, average variance extracted (AVE)>0.6, and composite reliability (CR)>0.6. Special attention is required by Ab and BI whose CRs fall slightly below the standard. All constructs are also reliable (Cronbach Alpha>0.7) (Table 1).

**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 2).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2  *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 3. 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.

Table 3

*Structural models*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model\* | Independent Variables\*\* | F-Statistic | | Standardized Coefficient | T-Statistic | |  | Correlation | | | Adj. R2 |
| 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 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 [β1=0.586, t=11.249, sig.(1-tailed)=0.000] and PBC [β3=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 0.0582=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] (H1 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 (H2 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 [rP-AESO-BI=0.398, sig. (1 tailed)<0.01], its partial correlation with BI when controlling Ab, N-AESO and PBC is low [rP-AESO-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 (rP-AESO-N-AESO=0.77, sig. (1-tailed)<0.01), Ab (rP-AESO-Ab=0.41, sig.(1-tailed)<0.01] and PBC [rP-AESO-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 -0.0272=0.07%.

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 [β2=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 (R2=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 [β2=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 [β3=0.167, t=2.445, sig.(1-tailed)=0.008], together with Ab [β1=0.566, t=10.721, sig.(1-tailed)=0.000] and PBC [β5=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 (H1 is confirmed). Meanwhile, not in any model P-AESO shows significant effect on BI (H2 is not confirmed).

Based on statistic F and R2, 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 R2=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 reason for why negative and positive AESO function exclusively can also be viewed from its status as social motivation, in which P-AESO represents approach motivation and N-AESO describes avoidance motivation. Gable (2005) stated that approach and avoidance social motivations function separately. 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). The BAS/BIS is a trait that categorizes people as being aversive oriented (BIS) or appetitive oriented (BAS). People that high in BAS will low in BIS and vice versa.

Coherent view comes from Grant and Wrzesniewski (2010). They described others-oriented personality as bi-dimensional concept that consists of anticipated guilt and anticipated gratitude. They said that people can be high on certain or both dimensions. In this study, because the students still depend financially and emotionally on their family, a general trait found in Asian countries (Chen et al. 2009), the author presumes that in relation to smoking behavior, the students anticipated guilt for smoking is more active than anticipated reward for not smoking. That’s why the N-AESO, not the P-AESO, as the dimension of AESO that influence students’ smoking abstinence continuance 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.
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