

Outcomes of Triggers-&-Processes-of-Entrepreneurial Competency

Mirza Muhammad Umar
Government College University Lahore
Umarmirza9@gmail.com

Abstract

It is implied that all entrepreneurial activities are subjective to competencies gained with time. So therefore, entrepreneurial learning process is explored. This study examines the influence of our strong beliefs, goals that are set and how strengthful we are to create needs and ends to achieve that (Sarasvathy 2001). This process to develop the competencies has been examined in the theoretical perspective. So, three areas the contextual variable, the cognitive learning and best practices of entrepreneurs are in the due process of learning. An integrated model of entrepreneurial competence based on social cognitive theory and entrepreneurship theory have been investigated yet how preferred learning mode actions controlled by beliefs of a personal role identity and role models are interrelated. The findings that entrepreneurial competency gained expertise are associated with controlled actions and entrepreneurial individuality. Though functionality may vary because of different goals of entrepreneurs, it can be said that an entrepreneur develops within his own self. So in fact we are studying the mechanized controlled actions, processed learning and entrepreneurial competency.

1. Introduction

This study is an exploratory curtain raiser of triggers, processes, and consequences of their gained entrepreneurial competencies. Falling into introductory chapter is a background to the missing links in literature the upcoming research questions, the motivation into the study and subsequent dispositions of the thesis.

1.1 Curtain Raiser

Involvement in economic activity (Foss, Foss & Klein, 2007) complemented by their ability (Gustafson 2004; Michelle 1994; Sarasvathy 2008). This implicates that entrepreneurs can maneuver economic output to their advantage and that novice entrepreneurs gain expertise over time. Research has focused as to which skills take an entrepreneur a success and as Chandler and Jansen (1992) that opportunity recognition and its follow up is a core entrepreneurial competency. This competency is practiced in society. Erikson in 2002 added managerial capabilities and essentiality to opportunity recognition. In 1993, Johansson suggested that another competency is streamlining resources and create economic efficiency. This is driven by markets, customers, investors, and social relations (Pyysiäinen, Anderson, McElwee, & Vesala, 2006), so enterprising individuals are driven by these motivators (Fiske & Taylor, 1984). Researchers are agreed that entrepreneurial competency exists but how it is acquired is in the evolutionary stages. Krueger (2007) emphasizes to get an understanding of how these expertise are gained. It could be prior knowledge to generate business ideas (Ardichvili, Cardozo, & Ray, 2003; Gaglio & Katz, 2001; Shane, 2000), relevant knowledge (Choi & Shepherd, 2004; Shane, 2003), significance of the abilities to materialize beneficent outcome (Corbett, 2005, 2007). So it is established that entrepreneurial competence can be developed (Mitchell & Chesteen, 1995; Read & Sarasvathy, 2005; Sarasvathy, 2008), which instigates entrepreneurial actions.

It is proposed to effectively measure the process of competence development and incorporation of triggering factors (i.e. intentionality) and expected outcomes (i.e. forethought). Entrepreneurs' cognition is checked by contextual background, judgment power and subsequent decision making which develops overtime. So the model is based on different complex elements over and above uncertainty and this approach illustrates triggers and consequences of entrepreneurial competency and how it contributes to a substantial theory. It is maintained the literature produced to date on entrepreneurial competence development and entrepreneurial learning remains under-hypothesized. Existing literature has less focused approach on both contextual and learning processes. It has been suggested how goal orientation, access to role models and deeply held identity beliefs, and beliefs about action-control coincide with each other and influence the process. As competence development is a continuous process, the consequences of competence attainment how they affect the future aspirations and perception of an entrepreneur are to be discussed. Integrative model provides a contextualized understanding of the entrepreneurial competence development processing.

1.2 Research Questions

This study aims to explore and build a theory upon process of entrepreneurial competence development by investigating the entrepreneurial learning process and the role identity, action-control beliefs, role orientation and role models functional in the process as well as identification of consequences of the competencies.

Driven both theoretically and empirically that how entrepreneurs develop their entrepreneurial competencies and whether these competencies lead to success or otherwise. Entrepreneurial learning has been studied in context to

developing opportunities (Busenitz, 1996; Sarasvathy, Simon & Lave, 1998) creativity (Hills, Shrader, & Lumpkin, 1999), motivation (Kuratko, Hornsby, & Naffziger, 1997), financial gains (Shepherd & DeTienne, 2005), cognition (Baron, 2004) and human capital (Davidsson & Honig, 2003) and many aspects remain undiscovered. The entrepreneurial development process is contradicted by empirical evidence, example if past experience could be a strong predictor of better performance or that social network help gain entrepreneurial success. This research has adopted abductive logic within the domain of empirics and theory in an attempt to incorporate advances to entrepreneurship as a study and due understanding of the role of entrepreneurs in the process entrepreneurship. This is aimed to explore how entrepreneurs develop their entrepreneurial competence over a span of time as a derivative from inherited assumptions in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). Such formulations of the purpose indicate that:

- Competency can be acquired by entrepreneurs (Glaser, 1984; Mitchell, 1994)
- They are agents of their action (Bandura, 1986, 2001)
- Their cognitive characteristics are essential to be understood (Corbett, 2002, 2005; Gustafsson, 2004)
- Entrepreneurs' performance could be in context to a social domain (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986; Cope, 2010; Lave & Wenger, 1991)
- Despite sharing from others entrepreneurial process is learnt over time (Rae, 2000)

The entrepreneurial learning process is experimental in nature as to how to utilize the relevant knowledge and skills (Politis, 2005; Starr & Bygrave, 1992) and which method is more preferred (Corbett, 2005). So, significance of entrepreneurial knowledge is established yet what is learnt in the entrepreneurial process needs to be understood.

RQ1 what and how is learnt in entrepreneurial process?

Though experience is necessary but is a weak predictor of entrepreneurial success. (Chandler & Hanks, 1994). Novice and expert entrepreneurs think in different approaches (Dew, et al., 2009; Gustafsson, 2004; Mitchell, 1994; Sarasvathy, 2008) thus it appears that some deduction from this experience bifurcates these two groups so competencies can be domain specific (Glaser, 1984). So it's a basic knowledge structuring that encompasses the deliberate actions of all the entrepreneurs (Corbett, 2007; Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Roemer, 1993b; Mitchell & Chesteen, 1995; Mitchell, Mitchell, & Mitchell, 2009). So in these researches, the process or mechanism to become an expert from novice remains unexplored. This leads to the second question what entrepreneurial process leads to acquisition of skills, expertise which can be transformed into productive knowledge.

RQ2 - How do entrepreneurs develop their entrepreneurial expertise?

So willingness to act is driven by influenced choices of set goals and strategies. Literature identifies two types of competence goals; a learning goal in which individual aims to enhanced their competence and performance goals in which individuals want a favorable judgment of their competence (Dweck & Elliott, 1983). So the two roles develop two different cognitive frames different practices to achieve desired outcomes. (Locke, Latham, & Erez, 1988). So the impact of goal orientation on competence becomes an interesting valid question which is to be explored in the entrepreneurial context. The third research question studies this relationship.

RQ3 - How does goal orientation affect the acquisition of entrepreneurial competence?

Certain actions are exerted better by partronizing role models (Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002; Scherer, Adams, & Wiebe, 1989). Davidsson and Honig (2003) found that proximity of thickness with enterprising individuals increases the likelihood to be an entrepreneur. Ravasi and Turati (2005) found that people gain from their missing competencies by penetrating into their social networks. A literature also supports the development of such expertise (Mitchell & Chesteen, 1995). So the next research question aims to find out the relationship of the role models.

RQ4 – How do role models /social networks facilitate the learning process?

How embedded you are in your social structure develops an individual's perception of what they are (Burke, 1991b; Stryker, 1980). Mingling in different roles leads to different role identities (Pratt & Foreman, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1985) and that leads to different roles, values, norms and beliefs guiding entrepreneurs' behavior (Sarasvathy, 2001). Conflicts of roles can occur as member of the family, member of a workplace (Shepherd & Haynie, 2009; Watson, 2009). This cognitive conflict results in impacting entrepreneurs' intentions, actions and outcomes. Therefore, just to be explored how entrepreneurs experience and deal in different identities, their preferred motivations and choices.

RQ5 - How do entrepreneurs experience and resolve conflicts between multiple role identities?

This is assumed that entrepreneurs have different identities then it is also viable that entrepreneurs have different outcomes into different roles of the entrepreneurial actions. Research suggests that assuming most preferred role identity and adopting the other eventually can be done. (cf. Pratt & Foreman, 2000). So assuming if the individual is professional or entrepreneur, it is important to understand that how role identity conflicts are resolved by entrepreneurs

RQ6 - How do the methods entrepreneurs employ to resolve conflicts between their Multiple role identities affect entrepreneurial outcomes?

Whether these entrepreneurial outcomes are lead to a success or failure it needs to be investigated.

Research Methodology

Qualitative & quantitative study pattern by serving a structured questionnaire to the a sample of 7-100 successful Entrepreneurs .Findings can comprehended and narrated as to what competency they have develop and how these competencies help to survive and manage different roles and responsibilities. Research settings can be adjusted according to the sample and population.

Significance of the study

Studies on entrepreneurship are scattered and synergetic key ideas are a need to be developed .The study in this thesis is a construct building attempt as to how entrepreneurs develop their entrepreneurial competency in a particular context. A model has been tried to develop that specifies the influence of beliefs, role model,goal orientation and ability to successfully adopt a problem solvent approach.entrepreneurial competency and their outcome sso the research holds a valid significance. Competence developed by control beliefs and gives us better review as to what aspects to be most touched when educating prospective entrepreneurs. As to developing beliefs that service delivery leads to revenue optimization and in case the business is fading out alternatives need to be determined. In all the significance of creating /achieving entrepreneurial identity is emphasized. A process based approach is advocated, and studies its dynamics over time. This leads to diversified behavioral patterns and how an individual emerges with entrepreneurial competency out of the conflicting role patterns.

The implications of the research are significant to the following groups.

Researchers: This study emphasizes the impact of entrepreneurial process on their cognition, an attempt to provide further advances to researchers to study the situational factors in detail.

Practitioners: learning would help entrepreneurs improve their thinking & working capacity. As to how the rate of failure can be minimized by adopting best practices. It provides them a better sense of entrepreneurial operations.

Policy Maker: The governmental intuitions & donors can devise their funding policy & programmes in the manner that entrepreneurial process is emphasized. The impact can be measured on locality of any entrepreneurial activity.

References:

- Aldrich, H., & Zimmer, C. (1986). Entrepreneurship through social networks. In D. Sexton & R. Smilor (Eds.), *The art and science of entrepreneurship* (pp.3-23). Cambridge, UK: Ballinger.
- Anderson, A. R. (2000). Paradox in the periphery: an entrepreneurial reconstruction? *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 12*, 91-109.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Baron, R. (2004). The cognitive perspective: a valuable tool for answering entrepreneurship's basic "why" questions. *Journal of Business Venturing, 19*(2), 221-239.
- Burke, P. J. (1991a). Attitudes, Behavior, and the Self. In J. A. Howard & P. L. Callero (Eds.), *The Self Society Interface: Cognition, Emotion and Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Busenitz, L. (1996). Research in entrepreneurial alertness. *Journal of Small Business Management, 35*, 35-44.
- Chandler, G., & Hanks, S. (1994). Founder Competence, the Environmnet, and Venture Performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 18*(3), 77-89.
- Chandler, G., & Jansen, E. (1992). The founder's self-assessed competence and venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing, 7*(3), 223-236.
- Chandler, G., & Lyon, D. (2001). Issues of research design and construct measurement in entrepreneurship research: The past decade. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 2005*(4), 101-113.
- Choi, Y. R., & Shepherd, D. (2004). Entrepreneurs' Decisions to Exploit Opportunities. [Article]. *Journal of Management, 30*(3), 377-395. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2003.04.002
- Cope, J. (2010). Entrepreneurial learning from failure: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing, In Press*, DOI:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.06.002. doi: DOI:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.06.002
- Corbett, A. (2002). Recognizing high-tech opportunities: A learning and cognitive approach *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 49-61).
- Corbett, A. (2005). Experiential Learning Within the Process of Opportunity Identification and Exploitation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29*(4), 473-491. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00094.x
- Corbett, A. (2007). Learning assymetries and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing, 22*(1), 97-118.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal*

- of Business Venturing*, 18, 301 – 331
- Dew, N., Read, S., Sarasvathy, S., & Wiltbank, R. (2009). Effectual versus predictive logics in entrepreneurial decision-making: Differences between experts and novices. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(4), 287-309.
- Dweck, C., & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In E. Hetgerington (Ed.), *Socialization, personality, and social development*. New York: Wiley.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R., & Tesch-Roemer, C. (1993b). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100, 363-406.
- Erikson, T. (2002). Entrepreneurial capital: the emerging venture's most important asset and competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17, 275–290.
- Foss, K., Foss, N. J., & Klein, P. G. (2007). Original and Derived Judgment: An Entrepreneurial Theory of Economic Organization. *Organization Studies*, 28(12), 1893-1912. doi: 10.1177/0170840606076179
- Gaglio, C., & Katz, J. (2001). The psychological basis of opportunity identification: entrepreneurial alertness. *Small Business Economics*, 16, 95-111.
- Glaser, R. (1984). Education and Thinking. *American Psychologist*, 39, 93-104.
- Gustafsson, V. (2004). *Entrepreneurial decision-making. Individuals, tasks and cognitions* (Vol. 22). Jönköping: Jönköping International Business School.
- Hills, G. E., Shrader, R. C., & Lumpkin, G. T. (1999). Opportunity recognition as a creative process *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research* (pp. 217-227). Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Johannisson, B. (1993). Entrepreneurial Competence and Learning Strategies. In R. Larsson, L. Bengtsson, K. Eneroth & A. Malm (Eds.), *Research in Strategic Change* (pp. 77-99). Lund: Lund University Press.
- Kuratko, D., Hornsby, J., & Naffziger, D. (1997). An examination of owners' goals in sustaining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(1), 24-33.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locke, E., Latham, G., & Erez, M. (1988). The Determinants of Goal Commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 23-39.
- Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by Positive or Negative Role Models: Regulatory Focus Determines Who Will Best Inspire Us. [doi:]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854-864.
- Mitchell, R. K., & Chesteen, S. (1995). Enhancing Entrepreneurial Expertise: Experiential Pedagogy and the Entrepreneurial Expert Script. *Simulation & Gaming*, 26(3), 288-306.
- Mitchell, R. K., Mitchell, B. T., & Mitchell, J. R. (2009). Entrepreneurial Scripts and Entrepreneurial Expertise: The Information Processing Perspective. In A. Carsrud & M. Brännback (Eds.), *Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mind. Opening the Black Box* (pp. 97-137). London: Springer.
- Politis, D. (2008). Does prior start-up experience matter for entrepreneurs' learning?: A comparison between novice and habitual entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15, 472-489.
- Pratt, M. G., & Foreman, P. O. (2000). Classifying Managerial Responses to Multiple Organizational Identities. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 18-42.
- Pyysiäinen, J., Anderson, A., McElwee, G., & Vesala, K. (2006). Developing the entrepreneurial skills of farmers: some myths explored. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 12(1), 21-39.
- Rae, D. (2000). Understanding entrepreneurial learning: a question of how? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 6(3), 145-159.
- Ravasi, D., & Turati, C. (2005). Exploring entrepreneurial learning: A comparative study of technology development projects. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 137–164.
- Read, S., & Sarasvathy, S. (2005). Knowing what to do and doing what you know: effectuation as a form of entrepreneurial expertise. *The Journal of Private Equity*, 9(1), 45-62.
- Sarasvathy, S. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 243-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. (2008). *Effectuation. Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Sarasvathy, S., Simon, H., & Lave, L. (1998). Perceiving and managing business risks: differences between entrepreneurs and bankers. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 33(2), 207-225.
- Scherer, R., Adams, J., & Wiebe, F. (1989). Developing Entrepreneurial Behaviours: A Social Learning Theory Perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 2(3), 16 – 27
- Starr, J., & Bygrave, W. D. (1992). The Second Time around: Assets and liabilities of prior start-up

- experience. In I. Birley, C. MacMillan & S. Subramony (Eds.), *International Perspectives on entrepreneurship research* (pp. 340-363). New York: Elsevier Science Publications.
- Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Menlo Park: Benjamin Cummings.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, I. C. (Eds.). (1985). *The social identity theory of intergroup behavior* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Watson, T. J. (2009). Entrepreneurial Action, Identity Work and the Use of Multiple Discursive Resources: The Case of a Rapidly Changing Family Business. *International Small Business Journal*, 27(3), 251-271.
- Vesala, H. T., & Vesala, K. M. (2010). Entrepreneurs and producers: Identities of Finnish farmers in 2001 and 2006. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(1), 21-30. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2009.06.00

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

