

LANGUAGE FUNCTION AS A PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT TO ENTREPRENEURS

Kadek Adyatna Wedananta
Universitas Pendidikan Nasional
adyatnawedananta@undiknas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship is a combination of creativity, innovation, and the willingness to take risks necessary for the development and management of new businesses, whereas language is a critical component of human life, and it is believed that humans cannot communicate without language. Thus, language and entrepreneurship must be connected in some way. This study aimed to determine how language functions as professional support for entrepreneurs and its relation with industry 4.0. This study took a qualitative approach, employing observation, interviews, and documentation and focusing on Denpasar and Badung entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs employed the following language functions: 40 phatic functions (40%), 20 referential functions (20%), 15 conative functions (15%), 15 emotive functions (15%), 5 metalingual functions (5%) and 5 poetic functions (5%). As a result, the most frequently occurring language function was the phatic function, in which language was primarily used to facilitate communication between entrepreneurs and partners, coworkers, or clients, ensuring that conversations and discussions run smoothly and social relationships are maintained. In addition, language has the following functions for entrepreneurship 4.0, such as language functions to enable us to know and understand the information provided on the Internet and social media; language functions to facilitate the operation of all technologies required for entrepreneurial 4.0; and language functions to effectively disseminate any information when selling or conducting business using social media. This study concludes that language really functions in the professionalism of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship 4.0. It is hoped that future researchers will be able to utilize additional samples and studies.

Keywords: Language Function, Professionalism, Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurship in Industry 4.0

INTRODUCTION

The term entrepreneur is derived from the French *entreprendre*, which meaning "trying" and has been in use since the 17th century. In terms of business, I recommend starting your own. An entrepreneur is defined by Merriam-Webster as "someone who organizes and assumes the risk of a business or activity."

According to Thomas W. Zimmerer (2008), entrepreneurship (entrepreneurship) applies creativity and innovation to solve issues and capitalize on opportunities that people

face daily. According to Andrew J. Dubrin (2008), An entrepreneur is someone who develops and operates an innovative business. Entrepreneurship is a discipline that explores a person's ideas, abilities, and conduct in the face of life's problems to achieve possibilities by overcoming various risks. Entrepreneurship encompasses all of the attitudes, activities, and procedures entrepreneurs employ in founding, running, and developing their businesses.

Entrepreneurship is a combination of creativity, innovation, and the confidence to take risks in order to develop and manage new businesses. According to experts, entrepreneurship is the ability to think creatively and innovatively, which is used as the foundation, resources, driving force, strategy goals, recommendations, and processes in dealing with life's issues. Language is a critical component of human life. It is thought that without language, humans cannot communicate. According to Richard and Schmidt (2010), language is a system of human communication that comprises an organized organization of sounds into bigger units such as morphemes, words, sentences, and utterances. In other terms, language is a tool that people use to communicate ideas and information.

However, other functions of language appear to constitute the bedrock of professionalism in any employment. Language must be examined in all of its manifestations. When individuals discuss the purpose of the speech, they are referring to the reasons for its use. Essentially, the function of language is communication, or what is generally referred to as the function of speech; individuals use language to send and receive messages. It is difficult to grasp the function of language fully since it is so ingrained in all human activity that it can be assumed that there are few functional aspects of our conscious behavior that do not involve language (Newmeyer, 2000).

Roundy and Asllani (2018) reported that the data demonstrate that entrepreneurs' language is complicated and fluid. The most often used terms alluded to emerging entrepreneurial tendencies. The findings and methodological techniques contributed to entrepreneurial research and, more particularly, to work on entrepreneurial discourse, language use, and new venture communication. Entrepreneurs and governments should also take note of the findings.

Therefore, how are the functions of the language as professional support to entrepreneurs? how does language functions in entrepreneurship 4.0?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Entrepreneurship

The term entrepreneur is derived from the French *entreprendre*, which means "to attempt," and dates all the way back to the 17th century. In terms of business, I strongly advise you to establish your own. According to Merriam-Webster, an entrepreneur is "someone who organizes and assumes the risk of a business or activity."

Entrepreneurship, according to Thomas W. Zimmerer (2008), is the application of creativity and invention to resolve problems and profit from possibilities that people experience on a daily basis. An entrepreneur, according to Andrew J. Dubrin (2008), is someone who creates and operates an innovative firm. Entrepreneurship is a field of study that examines a person's ideas, abilities, and behavior in the face of life's challenges in order to reach potential through risk mitigation. Entrepreneurship comprises all of the attitudes, behaviors, and processes that entrepreneurs use to start, operate, and build their businesses. Entrepreneurship is a skill set that combines creativity, invention, and the willingness to take calculated risks in order to create and run new businesses. Entrepreneurship, according to experts, is the capacity for creative and inventive thinking that serves as the foundation, resources, driving force, strategic goals, recommendations, and processes for resolving life's difficulties.

Entrepreneurship is a multifaceted phenomenon that encompasses both the formation of new businesses (start-up entrepreneurship) and the implementation of new strategic initiatives within established businesses (corporate entrepreneurship).

The difficulty in studying the subject stems not only from this factor, but also from the uncertainty surrounding what entrepreneurship is (Davidsson, Low and Wright, 2001). This ambiguity may be a result of the presence in the literature of definitions of entrepreneurship that focus on distinct facets of the phenomenon (Davidsson, 2003) and originate from diverse disciplines. Despite Low and MacMillan's (1988) efforts to clarify the field of research and define possible future directions, Shane and Venkataraman (2000) used the term "hodgepodge" to describe the current state of entrepreneurship research more than ten years later. Among the reasons for the inability to address the studies in a unified manner are the scholars' divergent views on the nature of entrepreneurship, which creates a "fear that research based on these divergent views would result in a cacophony of results and ideas" (Gartner, 2001). Another issue is that the term "entrepreneurship" has multiple definitions, and thus it is necessary to distinguish between its use to define a social phenomenon and its use to define a scholarly domain or a teaching subject (Davidsson, 2003).

However, the need for clarity regarding the concept of entrepreneurship is growing; indeed, there appears to be a surge of interest in entrepreneurship nowadays, as evidenced by the proliferation of journals, professional associations, conferences, and academic appointments devoted to the subject (Kuratko, 2003). Entrepreneurship is widely recognized as the engine that propels the economies and societies of the majority of nations (Brock and Evans, 1989; Acs, 1992; Carree and Thurik, 2000). Despite the fact that entrepreneurship is not a new concept, it has garnered increased interest and research attention over the last 15 years: it is now viewed as a critical lever for navigating the new competitive landscape (Hitt and Reed, 2000). Today's businesses must operate in an environment marked by increased risk, diminished forecasting capability, and fluid firm and industry boundaries; the new competitive landscape is dominated by forces of change, complexity, chaos, and contradiction (Hitt and Reed 2000).

The rate of change is accelerating as a result of globalization, technological revolution, and deregulation processes. These factors, when combined, create a climate that could be described as "hypercompetitive" (D'Aveni and Gunther, 1994), in which businesses are forced to compete on price, quality, and availability of know-how at the same time, and where gaining the first mover advantage is critical. Growing in an environment with these characteristics is a challenge made more difficult by the developed countries' economies' maturity (Zook and Allen, 2001).

Entrepreneurship, with its emphasis on the pursuit of new opportunities, is recognized as the research domain capable of providing methods and instruments for coping with this new type of environment. To ensure that entrepreneurial studies benefit other disciplines, it is necessary for entrepreneurship to develop a distinctive conceptual framework (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000).

Until recently, the field of entrepreneurship experienced disjointed growth as a result of the strong presence of articles written by "transitory contributors" (Landström, 2001): this trend cannot be sustained. Leaving entrepreneurship to other disciplines would preclude the development of a community of scholars capable of effectively comprehending entrepreneurial phenomena, as well as the creation of some gaps, where aspects of interest to entrepreneurship scholars would go unexplored by other researchers (Davidsson, 2003).

To advocate for the recognition of entrepreneurship as a distinct field of inquiry does not mean erecting barriers and isolating researchers within a self-referential community: entrepreneurial phenomena are so broad (Low, 2001) that they require multidisciplinary approaches; thus, dialogue and confrontation with other disciplines are necessary ways to enrich the studies.

Given this perspective, a review of the literature in the field could serve as a starting point for defining the relationships between entrepreneurship and other disciplines, identifying areas where interdisciplinary communication can result in cross-fertilization processes.

Economic origins

For many years, entrepreneurship research was conducted within the context of economics: entrepreneurship was viewed as the heart of economic development, with the individual serving as the primary unit of analysis.

Cantillon provided the first definition of an entrepreneur in 1755 in his "Essai sur la nature du commerce en général," and Smith addressed the issue in 1776 in his "An inquiry into the wealth of nations."

What initially connected economic activity and the entrepreneur's role was his proclivity for risk and ability to manage uncertain situations.

Indeed, Cantillon asserts that the entrepreneur is a speculator seeking profit through arbitrage, or buying at a fixed price and selling at an uncertain price. As a result, the entrepreneur is distinct from the rentier, Cantillon's other identified subject of the economic system, in that his income cannot be predicted. Knight (1921) distinguished risk from uncertainty on the basis of this seminal work, arguing that the former can be reduced through the creation of pools of risks that are not perfectly correlated, whereas the latter is never quantifiable because it is not based on rational choice but on opinion.

The association between the entrepreneur and the arbitrage opportunity is also evident in Baudeau's (1730–1792) descriptions. The French economist presents an image of the entrepreneur as an innovator capable of lowering his costs and thus increasing his profits through the implementation of various innovations.

Kihlstrom and Laffont developed a more formal model that corresponded to Cantillon and Knight's ideas (1979). According to the two scholars' research, the income distribution of entrepreneurs is influenced by a variety of factors, including risk aversion.

Additionally, Say (1971) popularized the term "entrepreneur" in the early 1800s with his "Traite d'économie politique." Say identifies entrepreneurial activity as the "art of supervision and administration" in his depiction of the economic system. According to Baumol (1993), the entrepreneur in Say's theory could also be viewed as a speculator attempting to resell various products. What distinguishes this contribution from previous ones is that the entrepreneurial function is no longer centered on risk, but on managerial abilities and other moral qualities such as judgment and perseverance (Say, 1971).

While French scholars have made significant contributions, they pale in comparison to what was accomplished in 18th-century Britain. Smith depicts the entrepreneur in his seminal 1776 work, "The Wealth of Nations," as an adventurer, because he seeks danger; a projector, because he is able to project and make plans anticipating the future; and an undertaker, because he takes prudent risks and is available for investment if properly compensated.

The entrepreneur's role was conflated with that of the capitalist, and profit was primarily viewed as a reward for capital risk. The role of the entrepreneur as innovator was largely ignored in Ricardo's subsequent work and neoclassical models, because the market was assumed to be permanently close to equilibrium and thus, in the event of exogenous changes, the entrepreneur is required to make new calculations for profit maximization.

Nonetheless, Mill (1848) identified the role of the entrepreneur as a supervisory activity following the Industrial Revolution. To lead an enterprise, certain characteristics are required: "...individuals with a degree of acquired and cultivated intelligence... Their superior perspicuity enables them [...] to perceive probabilities of advantage that would never occur to the average man through sustained exertion of their entire faculties [...]" (1848, Mill). The economist emphasizes "superior knowledge" and "habitual rectitude of perception and judgment" as two of these characteristics.

Other British economists contributed to the development of an entrepreneurial theory: Marshall, Pigou, and Edgeworth, in contrast to later neoclassical economists, studied the entrepreneurial phenomenon. Marshall (1930) defined the entrepreneurial function in 1890 as the provision of innovations and, thus, progress. It is critical to emphasize that not all businessmen can be considered entrepreneurs in the sense just expressed in Marshall's formulation. Indeed, some business owners are unable to avoid taking risks, while others "stick to the tried and true" (Lynskey, 2002). To qualify for the first group, superintendence alone is insufficient; forecasting and leadership skills are also required (Marshall, 1930). In

any case, Marshall's entrepreneur is innovative in operational terms, which means that he innovates for efficiency rather than efficacy, allowing Schumpeter to expand on his ideas.

Von Thünen (1783–1850) made a contribution that encompasses both the vision of the entrepreneur as innovator and risk taker: he distinguishes the entrepreneur from the manager by emphasizing that the first take an unavoidable risk. Von Mangoldt developed a more specific model based on Von Thünen's work to describe the risk taken by entrepreneurs, distinguishing between production to order and production for the market, where prices and durations of economic transactions are uncertain: entrepreneurship is more closely related to the latter.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, significant advances in research on these subjects came from the Austrian School, courtesy of authors such as Menger, Von Mises, and Von Wieser. Von Hayek and Kirzner revitalized the Austrian School tradition in the 1930s. It is critical to compare these studies to neo-classical ones, as they approach the subject from diametrically opposed perspectives. Indeed, the Austrian perspective maintains that the market is far from equilibrium due to the effect of ignorance and asymmetric information, factors that have never been considered in classical or neoclassical research.

Following this path, Menger (1950), whose theories were further developed by Von Hayek (1937), identified the entrepreneurial function as the acquisition of new information about economic situations, most notably about the market value assigned to resources. Market exchange occurs as a result of individuals' subjective valuations of identical products. Given this, the entrepreneur must possess awareness and a superior capacity for comprehending diverse phenomena, rather than a proclivity for risk taking. Von Mises (1949) on the other hand, reaffirmed the conviction that "the entrepreneur is always a speculator" and emphasized the fact that entrepreneurial activity is defined by decision-making. Additionally, because "every action is entangled in the flux of time and thus involves speculation," he regarded every man as an entrepreneur.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Knight (1921) was the pioneer of American entrepreneurship theory. His entrepreneur is one who accepts all uncertainty and takes responsibility for his actions. His task is remunerated with a wage or rent commensurate with his abilities and compensation for bearing uncertainty.

All of the contributions above convey an image of the entrepreneur as the first person in the market capable of seizing an arbitrage opportunity. There is no discussion of the relationship between this asymmetry and the entrepreneur's role. Schumpeter (1883 – 1950) was the first author to identify the entrepreneur's role in generating market changes and disequilibrium through innovation and proactiveness.

Schumpeter's contribution

According to Schumpeter (1934), the entrepreneur is the primary agent of economic development, defined as "carrying out new combinations," which entails "competitive elimination of the old." Economic development encompasses the following five scenarios:

- a) the introduction of a novel product or a novel quality of an existing product;
- b) the introduction of a novel manufacturing technique;
- c) the inauguration of a new market;
- d) the discovery of a new source of raw materials or partially manufactured goods;
- e) any industry's transport organization.

Schumpeter views the market as an equilibrium system and entrepreneurship as a means of disrupting that equilibrium, of moving the market away from it.

To appreciate Schumpeter's contribution to the field of research, it is necessary to emphasize that this type of innovation is based on resources that already exist on the market and are under the entrepreneur's control. In this sense, innovation does not follow from invention. In fact, invention acts as an exogenous factor in economic dynamics. Of course, inventions have the potential to alter the perceived value of some resources, but only after

they are integrated into the firms' routine operations. While entrepreneurs may be inventors, innovation does not require invention.

Thus, the entrepreneur is not an inventor, nor is he a general capitalist: "[...] we refer to entrepreneurs not only as 'independent' businessmen in an exchange economy, as they are commonly designated, but also to all who actually perform the function for which the concept is defined, even if they are, as is increasingly the case, 'dependent' employees of a company, such as managers, members of boards of directors, and so forth [...]" (Schumpeter, 1934). Even if this statement represents an attempt to broaden the traditional definition of entrepreneur, the definition of entrepreneurial activity as "the carrying out of new combinations" implies that many managers are excluded from the entrepreneurial category: "our concept [...] does not include all heads of firms, managers, or industrialists who merely operate within an established business, but only those who actually perform that function" (Schumpeter, 1934).

At this point, it is necessary to clarify the reasons for entrepreneurs constituting a "small fraction of the population" (Schumpeter, 1942). Why do a small number of people pursue these profit opportunities when all the necessary resources are available on the market? The reason for this dearth of entrepreneurs in the economic system is related to the effects of innovation: upsetting the status quo necessitates the removal of social and institutional barriers embedded in economic systems. As a result, the entrepreneur must possess "a peculiar and by nature rare mental freedom" (Schumpeter, 1934).

Due to the breadth and duration of Schumpeter's work, scholars who have studied it tend to identify two distinct stages in his theories. These are referred to as the "Schumpeter Mark I" and "Schumpeter Mark II" periods. This distinction is maintained in this paper as well, as it allows for the development of interesting considerations about the evolution of the scholar's perspective.

Mark I Schumpeter

Two distinct worlds emerge from Schumpeter's early ideas. The first is a market's stationary equilibrium, which is defined by symmetric information, economic rationality, and the absence of uncertainty. Routines and experience are critical in orienting the behaviors of various actors in such a system. The second world is the one created by the entrepreneur, in which the circular flow of the economy is altered. These changes are the means by which the entrepreneur identifies profit opportunities.

Given that changing the status quo would imply altering existing market relations and destroying incumbent firms' pre-existing sources of advantage (hence the concept of "creative destruction"), innovations are typically carried out by new firms. It is critical to quote Schumpeter on this point: "[...] new combinations are generally embodied, as it were, in new firms that do not emerge from the old ones but begin producing alongside them [...]" (1934; Schumpeter). However, as previously stated, the resources necessary for the emergence of new firms exist: "[...] the new combinations must draw the necessary means of production from some existing combinations [...]" Thus, implementing new combinations entails simply repurposing the economic system's existing supply of productive means [...]" (1934 Schumpeter).

Thus, entrepreneurs appear as new agents utilizing existing resources; they are "deviant," individuals who are never satisfied with the results obtained within the existing framework, but are constantly on the lookout for new growth opportunities (Elster, 1983; Santarelli and Pesciarelli, 1990).

By conducting a longitudinal analysis of entrepreneurs and the evolution of the broader economic system, it becomes clear that the entrepreneur status is transitory. Once the function of establishing new combinations is complete, the entrepreneur's role will expire. However, the process of creative destruction is perpetually operating and shaping the economic environment, forcing the various firms to compete "against the new commodity, the new technology, the new source of supply, and the new type of organization [...], competition that strikes not at the margins of profits and outputs of existing firms but at their very foundations and very lives" (Schumpeter, 1942).

In this sense, creative destruction processes are identified as the market's and, more broadly, economic development's driving forces.

Mark II Schumpeter

Schumpeter's later contributions diminished the entrepreneur's role as an agent of economic development. With the growing importance of large companies, the origins of innovation have been traced back to these integrated firms. Indeed, they could benefit from increased financial resources and shared knowledge, which are critical inputs to innovation processes.

Uncertainties and potential discoveries have diminished as a result of the growing commitment of large companies to research. "This social function [entrepreneurship] is already dwindling in importance and is certain to continue to do so at an accelerating rate in the future, even if the economic process driving it continues unabated. For one thing, it is much easier now than in the past to do things that are out of the ordinary - innovation itself is being reduced to the mundane. Technological advancement is increasingly becoming the domain of teams of skilled specialists who produce what is required and ensure that it operates predictably. The romance of earlier commercial adventure is eroding rapidly, as so many more things can now be precisely calculated that previously required a flash of genius" (Schumpeter, 1942).

The scholar's shifting position is not indicative of incongruence, as it reflected the changes that occurred in the economic landscape during the twentieth century. By combining Schumpeter's various perspectives, it is possible to highlight some peculiar characteristics of the entrepreneur: he is the one who transforms inventions into innovations, regardless of his or her position in particular organizations or in the broader social context, and regardless of social values or beliefs. His portrayal as a deviant is solely motivated by a strong desire for achievement. Entrepreneurship is neither a profession nor a permanent state of being. Entrepreneurs are more than risk takers and capital providers; they are agents of economic development.

Economic studies in the post-Schumpeterian era Kirzner's contribution

Kirzner has also conducted other pertinent studies on entrepreneurship (1973). According to the Austrian economist, entrepreneurship is the result of innovations aimed at capitalizing on the opportunities created by economic disequilibrium. Thus, he inverts the Schumpeterian view, conceiving of the entrepreneur as an equilibrator agent exploiting disequilibrium.

Kirzner's work was heavily influenced by Von Mises's theories. Kirzner's dissertation is founded on the concept of "alertness." This is the only characteristic that adequately captures the essence of entrepreneurship. It is a particular kind of knowledge: "the 'knowledge' required for entrepreneurship is 'knowledge about where to find knowledge.' The word that most accurately describes this type of 'knowledge' appears to be alertness. [...]. Entrepreneurial knowledge can be defined as the 'highest order of knowledge,' the ultimate knowledge required to harness already-possessed (or discoverable) information." 1973 (Kirzner).

According to Kirzner, the entrepreneur's role becomes the identification of untapped opportunities. The social function of this individual is also critical: capitalizing on unseen opportunities entails more efficiently allocating market resources. In this way, the entrepreneur contributes to the reduction of "social waste."

However, both Schumpeter and Kirzner's perspectives can be accepted if one considers that there are two distinct types of entrepreneurial processes: the first, Kirznerian, results in incremental-continuous innovation, whereas the second, Schumpeterian, results in any type of innovation, including radical-discontinuous innovation.

On the other hand, the Kirznerian view of entrepreneurs is incompatible with the view of those scholars who regard the entrepreneur as an arbitrageur. In fact, alertness is a form of creative knowledge that does not require the accumulation of knowledge through

experience. Entrepreneurial knowledge entails creativity. This factor influences the characteristics of entrepreneurial opportunities that, even if they exist objectively in the market, cannot be identified through systematic search (Kirzner, 1997; Salvato, 2003). It is incorrect to refer to entrepreneurial opportunities as "successful search," when the term "discovery," a phenomenon that generates a sense of "surprise," seems more appropriate (Kirzner, 1997).

Without the ability to accurately identify what to search for, the entrepreneur "is constantly scanning the horizon, as it were, looking for opportunities to make discoveries" (Kirzner, 1997). This may be the essence of "alertness," which "does not consist simply in 'seeing' the unfolding of the future tapestry in the sense of a predetermined flow of events." Importantly, alertness must include an awareness of the ways in which the human agent can actually create the future for which his present actions are intended through imaginative, bold leaps of faith, and determination (Kirzner 1982).

Kirzner's studies extended beyond these considerations, providing a distinct definition of the firm and distancing it from the entrepreneur: "The firm, then, is not at all synonymous with the pure entrepreneur. It is what occurs as a result of the entrepreneur's entrepreneurial decision-making, specifically the acquisition of certain resources" (Kirzner, 1973).

Innovation studies

Innovation studies have made significant contributions to our general understanding of entrepreneurial processes. Abernathy and Clark (1985) classify entrepreneurs into various categories based on the type of innovation they introduce. They differentiate between "architectural," "revolutionary," "niche creation," and "regular" innovations, which are conducted by "entrepreneurial," "technologist," "marketer," and "administrator" entrepreneurs.

Neo-Schumpeterian studies provide critical concepts for examining the entry of new firms into the market, such as the concept of "dominant design," which connects innovation to the product life cycle.

Nelson and Winter (1982) made a seminal contribution to this perspective when they introduced the concept of "technological regime" as the primary determinant of market competition intensity in "An evolutionary theory of economic change." Three characteristics characterize technological regimes: opportunities, accessibility, and cumulateness. Thus, innovation is presented as a catalyst for new firms to enter the market and compete with incumbent firms, but these growth opportunities are constrained by the market's dominant technology. This notion is also supported by Sutton's (1998) recent contributions to the field of industrial organization.

Nelson and Winter (1982) emphasize the role of technological opportunities rather than profit opportunities, distinguishing between the "entrepreneurial regime," which promotes innovative entry into the market, and the "routinized regime," in which incumbents generally carry out innovation (Winter, 1984). They viewed firms as knowledge repositories whose storage is facilitated by organizational routines, which they defined as consistent and predictable behavior patterns. Innovation occurs when the "search" activity modifies routines: if routines are viewed metaphorically as "genes," search activities are "mutation" procedures.

Recent contributions emphasize the critical role that knowledge plays in enhancing or impeding entrepreneurial opportunities. Malerba and Orsenigo (2002) emphasize the importance of transcending the critical but straightforward distinction between tacit and codified knowledge. Apart from the concept of technological regimes, the scholars' research focuses on elucidating the domains of knowledge and their complementarities in order to comprehend innovation phenomena. Marsili (2002) discusses how various types of knowledge can serve as a catalyst or impediment to entrepreneurship. The entrepreneurial process is influenced by the technological scenario and the complexity of the knowledge required to cope with it, not by the characteristics of the individuals or the presence of imperfections in the market system. "The extent to which technologies foster entrepreneurship – as opposed to enhancing incumbents' growth opportunities – is determined by the nature of the underlying knowledge" (Marsili, 2002).

Entrepreneurship studies that are not economic in nature

Apart from the contributions of economic history and anthropology, which will not be discussed in this paper, much research on entrepreneurship has been conducted in the fields of sociology and psychology, with each field searching for the essential characteristics of the entrepreneur. Within the former, we recall Weber's (1947), Gerschenkron's (1965), and Granovetter's (1995) studies; within the latter, we recall McClelland's (1961), Hornaday and Aboud's (1971), Timmons' (1978), and Sexton's (1995) studies (1980).

Weber's perspective on entrepreneurship is extremely complex (Swedberg, 2000). The first significant concept in his research is the concept of "charismatic authority," which is viewed as the driving force behind evolutionary processes due to its proclivity to transcend routines and standards. "Charismatic authority exists beyond the realms of daily routine and the profane. In this regard, it stands in stark contrast to rational authority, particularly bureaucratic authority, as well as to traditional authority, whether patriarchal, patrimonial, or any other. Both rational and traditional authority are distinct styles of daily routine action control, whereas the charismatic style is the polar opposite. Bureaucratic authority is uniquely rational in the sense that it is constrained by intellectually definable rules, whereas charismatic authority is uniquely irrational in the sense that it is indifferent to all rules. Traditional authority is bound by precedents handed down through the generations and is thus oriented toward rules. Within the confines of its claims, charismatic authority renounces the past, making it a uniquely revolutionary force" (Weber 1947). From these sentences, it is clear how the entrepreneur described in economic literature, particularly in the Schumpeterian view, is similar to this actor.

This first assumption began to lose significance with the advent of the capitalist economy, in which "economic change is primarily the result of enterprises being oriented toward market profit opportunities" (Swedberg, 2000). Weber's subsequent contributions demonstrated how this profit orientation can be rooted in a society's social values. He has made a special reference to religion, citing Calvinism and certain Christian sects' shifts in attitude toward business and industry. According to Weber, religious beliefs initially had a greater effect on the believer and then spread to the entire community. Once absorbed by the entire society, the connection between religion and economy gradually loses its vigor. This vision may be criticized: how do we account for the fact that not everyone in the same community is an entrepreneur? While social and religious beliefs are likely to have an effect on entrepreneurial orientation, explaining economic development solely on these dimensions may be reductive.

Similarly, Hofstede's (1980, 1991), Trompenaars' (1994), and Whitley's (1992,1999) work has aided in the comprehension of sociocultural comparisons of business behavior and different business systems in contemporary settings.

According to Gerschenkron (1965), industrialization phenomena are historical processes that serve as the foundation for contemporary entrepreneurship. From this vantage point, it is clear how critical social evolution is in determining the development of entrepreneurship.

While this perspective appears to situate the entrepreneurial phenomenon within the culture and tradition of specific communities, some scholars focus on entrepreneurs as deviants in anti-entrepreneurial cultures. Numerous studies have demonstrated that in countries where the dominant values are "anti-entrepreneurial," someone who is relatively outside the social system may have an advantage when entering an entrepreneurial activity. The network's restraints on entrepreneurial activity would be less effective against such a person. Thus, an immigrant may be free to engage in entrepreneurial activity because he or she is not a part of many of the nation's networks" (Kriesberg, stated in Lipset, 1988).

Numerous empirical studies corroborate the preceding considerations. Vernon (1963) discovered that 26 of the 109 major executives have foreign paternal grandfathers, while 14 of the 32 "outstanding leaders" have a foreign paternal grandfather. Furthermore, half of Argentina's "premium entrepreneurs" are foreign-born. Briones (1963) examined 46 of the

113 establishments in Santiago (Chile) and discovered that immigrants or sons of immigrants worked at the highest levels of these factories. Other less developed regions, such as Sub-Saharan Africa and India, exhibit similar patterns.

This creative role of the so-called "deviant" laid the groundwork for the concept of "marginal men," individuals "who are not as committed to the established values of the larger order." As a result, men of this type are more receptive to the possibility of change" (Lipset, 1988).

The role of networks is another critical area of study for sociological studies of entrepreneurship. Granovetter (1995) argues that while a profit-generating environment is necessary for firm survival, it is also necessary to consider the social structure within which individuals and groups attempt to construct it. More precisely, he assumes that social phenomena such as trust and solidarity are unavoidable prerequisites for the establishment of small businesses. Burt (1992) established a link between networks and entrepreneurship by conceptualizing entrepreneurship as a process of connecting two networks. Waldinger's perspective can be viewed as a bridge between the role of deviants and the network concept. In his 1986 article "Theory of immigrant enterprise," he identifies strong and close social ties as a critical entrepreneurial resource for minority groups.

It is possible to situate McClelland's work between sociological and psychological studies (1961). The eminent scholar sought to understand why certain societies appear to produce a disproportionate number of entrepreneurs. In an attempt to address this question, he focused on childhood experiences that could reinforce "the individual's need for achievement." Hagan (1962) concluded that entrepreneurs tend to come from groups that experience status withdrawal, which corresponds to certain aspects of the "marginal man" interpretation.

Numerous attempts have also been made to conceptualize entrepreneurship using psychological models. Sutton (1954) identified a desire for responsibility as the entrepreneur's defining characteristic; Davids (1963) emphasized ambition, a desire for independence, responsibility, and self-confidence; Palmer (1971) coined the term "risk assessment"; Hornaday and Aboud (1971) emphasized the importance of accomplishment, autonomy, aggression, power, recognition, and innovation in defining an entrepreneurial profile. Winter (1973) emphasized entrepreneurs' need for power, while Borland (1974) used the term "internal locus of control"; Gasse (1977) denotes an individual's value orientation; Timmons (1978) defines an entrepreneur as 1) self-assured, 2) goal-oriented, 3) prudent risk taker, 4) creative and innovative, and 5) possessing an internal locus of control. Sexton (1980) used the adjectives energizing and ambitious to emphasize the entrepreneur's positive reaction to setbacks; Welsh and White (1981) identified a need for control, a desire for responsibility, and a willingness to take risks; Dunkelberg and Cooper (1982) view the entrepreneur as growth-oriented and self-sufficient.

Entrepreneurship management studies

Entrepreneurship and management

Vesper founded the entrepreneurship field as we know it today in 1974, when he organized a special entrepreneurship interest group within the Academy of Management's Business Policy Division. Entrepreneurship research has evolved from an examination of individual characteristics to an examination of the characteristics of the entrepreneurial organization, with the goal of conceptualizing entrepreneurship as a managerial style (Morris & Kuratko, 2002).

For many years, it appeared as though entrepreneurship and organizations had no connection with their respective fields of study: organizations are "typically slow to change and risk averse" (Stevenson and Gumpert, 1985), whereas entrepreneurship is about change and can emerge from uncertain situations. Until recent years, the relationship between the entrepreneur and the firm was never clear: for a long period of time, entrepreneurial theories failed to distinguish the two concepts (Casson, 1982).

Indeed, Austrian economists obfuscate this issue entirely, while those who define supervision as the entrepreneurial function implicitly conceive of the firm as a single-person

organization. Another issue raised in the literature was the prevalent assumption of a single entrepreneur for each firm (Casson, 1982). All of these visions appear to be incomplete in light of the rise of large integrated companies and multinational corporations, whose operations have become complex and uncontrollable by a single individual.

Recent literature, however, has begun to propose an integrative conceptualization that encompasses both entrepreneurship and organization. There is a dichotomy in the literature on this subject: entrepreneurship is viewed as either an individual trait or an organizational quality (Lynskey, 2002).

In the first case, entrepreneurial processes can be traced back to managers' actions to seize new opportunities. In this sense, it is possible to accept the concept of "corporate entrepreneurship" (Burgelman, 1983), which may have sounded like a "oxymoron" a few years ago (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990). Additionally, the following definitions from the literature confirm the possibility of integrating managerial and entrepreneurial aspects: "intrapreneurship" (Pinchot, 1985), "entrepreneurial management" (Stevenson, Jarillo, 1990; Micheal, Storey, Thomas, 2002), "entrepreneurial strategy" (Murray, 1984), and "strategic entrepreneurship" (Hitt, Ireland, Camp and Sexton, 2002).

When attempting to define entrepreneurship as an organizational characteristic, it becomes clear that the entrepreneurial organization is in stark contrast to the bureaucratic and mechanistic firm, being flexible and adaptable (Birch, 1987).

We concur with Lynskey (2002) in asserting that the aforementioned positions are not mutually exclusive. Each of the dimensions presented has the potential to influence the others. Entrepreneurship at the firm level cannot be divorced from individual characteristics, as certain aspects of the organization can enlarge or revitalize an individual's commitment to innovation and growth. Simultaneously, cross-cultural studies (McGrath and MacMillan, 1992) demonstrate the existence of a shared set of beliefs that characterize entrepreneurs' perceptions of others in society, even across cultural divides: these personal viewpoints can serve as the foundation for entrepreneurial activity, confirming the importance of individual characteristics.

Rather than that, a more pertinent issue is the optimal firm size for inducing entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial firms are frequently portrayed as small, resulting in the so-called "entrepreneurial paradox": entrepreneurship propels small firms to growth and high performance, but once established, their management systems choke entrepreneurship, negatively impacting performance.

However, the literature has consistently emphasized the existence of a trade-off between the firm's dimensions and entrepreneurial orientation. Already, the evolution of Schumpeterian thought demonstrates an economic trend toward depersonalization and bureaucratization. The growth of large corporations pushed the entrepreneur to the periphery of economic activity, reducing his or her opportunities to effect change in the market. Weber (1930) also identified bureaucratization as a major factor in the economy's flattening, while Chandler (1962) stated that "clearly, wherever entrepreneurs behave like managers, wherever they focus exclusively on short-term activities to the exclusion or detriment of long-range planning, appraisal, and coordination, they have failed to effectively perform their roles in the economy and in their enterprise" (Chandler, 1962). McGrath and MacMillan (2000) make a similar distinction between entrepreneurs and managers: "What distinguishes [entrepreneurial] leaders capable of sustained and significant business revitalization from other managers is their personal work practices." These practices can be classified into three broad categories: [1] practices that establish the work climate, [2] practices that orchestrate the process of identifying and realizing opportunities for business growth, and [3] hands-on practices that involve problem solving with the people working on a particular venture".

The majority of the literature understood the decline of the entrepreneurial function as a result of firm growth. This is why entrepreneurship is frequently viewed as a phenomenon that occurs exclusively in start-up businesses. The objectives of managers at various stages of a firm's evolution are distinct: leaders of dawning enterprises must concentrate their efforts on opportunity seeking (Drucker, 1985) and thus embody the Weberian "charismatic leader," whereas the managerial role in established firms is oriented around maintaining existing

conditions (Smith et al, 1985). Kanter (1983) emphasizes the absence of "defined structures" in innovative organization.

Regardless, the entrepreneurial phenomenon has recently been studied in relation to not only emerging ventures (Ucbasaran, Westhead, and Wright, 2001), but also corporate ventures (McGrath, Venkataraman, and MacMillan, 1994), franchising (Shane, 1996), and the growth of family firms (Shane, 1996). (Church, 1993). As a result, numerous scholars have conducted additional research on the relationship between organizational characteristics and firm-level entrepreneurship (Covin and Slevin, 1991; Zahra, 1993).

Numerous studies confirm the existence of a strong correlation between the type of organization and its entrepreneurial orientation. Daft distinguished structural and contextual factors that can influence entrepreneurial processes in established firms (1992). Within the first group, he identifies all characteristics indicative of an organization's mechanistic functioning, such as centralization, specialization, formalization, and hierarchy. He mentions culture, strategy, technology, and the environment as pertinent contextual dimensions.

While specialization appears to be positively correlated with entrepreneurial processes (Thompson, 1965; Hage and Aiken, 1970), because it implies shared expertise within an organization (Daft, 1992; Hall, 1996), other structural factors appear to have a different effect on entrepreneurship. While some degree of formalization, hierarchy, and centralization is necessary to stimulate entrepreneurial processes, when these characteristics become pervasive, they can work against creativity and free thought.

The environment has received considerable attention as a contextual factor influencing entrepreneurship at the firm level. Scholars generally concur that environmental hostility is positively associated with the pursuit of innovation. Dess and Beard (1984) define environmental hostility in four dimensions: 1) a high level of competition; 2) a scarcity of readily exploitable market opportunities; 3) a high level of uncertainty; and 4) vulnerability to exogenous factors beyond the firm's control. Stopford and Baden-Fuller (1994) establish a link between environmental threats and the emergence of new opportunities; Covin and Slevin (1989) establish a link between firm performance in hostile environments and entrepreneurial orientation. Miller and Friesen (1983) identify market heterogeneity as a factor affecting market opportunities, and Zahra and Covin (1995) demonstrate the critical role of entrepreneurship in these types of environments. Another critical factor in fostering entrepreneurial processes is organizational culture, as several of its components influence innovation. We will discuss mission (Drucker, 1985; Hall, 1996), ethics (Daft, 1992), and social capital (Daft, 1992). (Coleman, 1988). Rather than that, eminent studies (Shane, Venkataraman, and MacMillan, 1995) examined how national culture can influence a country's preference for innovation-promoting strategies by determining the intensity and power of routines and norms.

According to the aforementioned studies, entrepreneurship cannot be equated with individual characteristics alone; rather, organizations can play a critical role in the process of discovering new opportunities, as Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) confirm: "Entrepreneurship is a process by which individuals – whether on their own or within organizations – pursue opportunities regardless of the resources they currently control" (Stevenson and Jarillo 1990).

If this definition does not place a premium on firm size, neither does the definition widely regarded as the best for entrepreneurship: "A scholarly examination of how, by whom, and with what effect future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited." As a result, the field entails the examination of sources of opportunity as well as the process of opportunity discovery, evaluation, and exploitation. Additionally, it encompasses the group of people who discover, evaluate, and exploit them" (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). Eliminating what has been dubbed the "entrepreneurial paradox" in the literature may contribute to the creation of a space for communication between entrepreneurship and management. Accepting the notion that entrepreneurship is a phenomenon that extends beyond the individual, producing results at the organizational level and even in a broader social context, reveals that the two disciplines share several dimensions of interest.

Management and entrepreneurship

Since Schumpeter's work, managers have been described as distinct from entrepreneurs. "As we have seen, the modern businessman, whether entrepreneur or merely managing administrator, is typically an executive. He gains an understanding of the psychology of the salaried employee working in a bureaucratic organization through the logic of his position" (Schumpeter, 1942). Chandler also made a clear distinction between the two roles: "The executives who actually allocate available resources are the enterprise's key men." Due to their critical role in the modern economy, they will be referred to as entrepreneurs in this study. Managers, on the other hand, are those who coordinate, appraise, and plan within the constraints of their resources. Thus, entrepreneurial decisions and actions refer to those that affect the allocation or reallocation of resources for the enterprise as a whole, whereas operating decisions and actions refer to those that are carried out using already allocated resources" (Chandler, 1962).

Numerous studies have been conducted on the basis of these distinctions in order to elucidate the psychological factors that distinguish the two categories. Apart from varying degrees of risk aversion (McGrath et al., 1992; Amihud and Lev, 1981), social behavioral factors have been considered (Pettigrew, 1973; Shapero, 1975; Ginsberg and Buchholtz, 1989). Despite these analyses, psychological differences are now regarded as minor or nonexistent (Brockhaus and Horwitz, 1986; Low and MacMillan, 1988). Despite these evidences, the proclivity for risk-taking is still considered critical to understanding entrepreneurial processes (Lynskey, 2002).

In any case, the failures of these studies reinforced the need for alternative explanations of entrepreneurial phenomena and accelerated the process of overcoming the division between management and entrepreneurship. Strategic management appears to be one of the fields that is more likely to generate cross-fertilization processes in the study of entrepreneurship. The increasing presence of entrepreneurship studies in Strategy journals and among management researchers demonstrates the growing connection between the two disciplines (Meyer and Heppard, 2000; Zahra and Dess, 2001).

Of course, we must keep in mind that theories derived from strategic management research are unlikely to provide a comprehensive theory of entrepreneurship. At the same time, the domain of strategic management does not encompass all of the subjects that entrepreneurship scholars are interested in (Sandberg, 1992).

Classifying entrepreneurial phenomena according to the role that an existing organization plays demonstrates how the relationship with the strategic management field can exhibit varying degrees of intensity. Independent entrepreneurship encompasses new venture creation, whereas within the field of corporate entrepreneurship (the common research domain for the discipline), it is possible to distinguish between "venturing" (internal and external) and "strategic renewal" (Sharma and Chrisman, 1999). Schendel and Hofer (1979) established a stronger link between the two fields by defining strategic management as "a process concerned with the organization's entrepreneurial activities."

Sandberg (1992) identifies areas where entrepreneurship could benefit from strategic management studies by comparing the definitions of entrepreneurship gathered by Gartner's (1990) panel to Mintzberg's (1998) taxonomy of strategic management's major contributions. These include the following: 1) new business creation; 2) innovation; 3) opportunity seeking; 4) risk assumption; 5) top management teams; and 6) group decision-making processes in strategic decision-making.

The concept of "Strategic Entrepreneurship" (Hitt, Ireland, Camp, and Sexton, 2002) also serves as a useful jumping-off point for establishing connections between the two subjects. Long-term survival for a business requires two actions: "strategic action" aimed at enhancing the current competitive advantage, and "entrepreneurial action" aimed at continuous research of new opportunities (Hitt, Ireland, Camp, Sexton, 2001).

Entrepreneurship's independence from particular organizational forms and contexts is also evident in Drucker's thought (1985). The author identifies seven sources of business innovation: unexpected events, incongruities, process requirements, industry and market changes, demographic changes, perception changes, and new knowledge. It is plain to see

how entrepreneurship can emerge at various levels, from the individual to the broadest sense of social competition.

Davidsson (2003) identifies three areas in which management research can contribute to the scholarly domain of entrepreneurship: 1) the organizational characteristics and managerial practices that facilitate the discovery and exploitation of opportunities; 2) the management of innovation, which overlaps with entrepreneurship (Van de Ven et al., 1989; Van de Ven, Polley, Garud, and Venkataraman, 1999); and 3) the relationship between venturing and firm performance. The scholar also discusses potential barriers to such cross-fertilization due to differences in perspective with management studies: organizations are assumed to be established rather than emerging; there is less emphasis on social level outcomes; and there may be a bias against failure.

Other significant perceived connections between entrepreneurship and strategic management can be deduced from the various definitions of entrepreneurship at the firm level that exist in the literature, as reviewed by Sharma and Chrisman (1999). The theme of organizational learning, which is gaining increasing importance in strategic management, appears to lie right in the middle of these two fields of study. Corporate entrepreneurship, according to Chung and Gibbons (1997), is a "organizational process for transforming individual ideas into collective actions through the management of uncertainties." According to Covin and Slevin (1991), "corporate entrepreneurship entails expanding the firm's domain of competence and associated opportunity set through internally generated new resource combinations." Zahra (1995, 1996) states that "renewal also entails developing or acquiring new capabilities and then creatively leveraging them to create value for shareholders"; additionally, he states that "renewal encompasses a variety of activities, including redefining the business concept, reorganizing, and introducing system-wide changes for innovation."

Culture is the final factor that emerges as a critical link between entrepreneurship and strategic management. In this regard, Stevenson and Gumpert's (1985) work is significant because it views corporate entrepreneurship as something that transcends both individuals and organizations and is rooted in firm culture. Thus, scholars distinguish between "administrative" and "entrepreneurial" cultures based on the following characteristics: strategic orientation; commitment to seize opportunities; resource commitment; resource control; management structure.

As stated above, even if strategic management could offer relevant contributes to the field of entrepreneurship, it cannot satisfy all the need of the research. The same argument holds true for the other disciplines that have taken an interest in the subject. Thus, it is critical for the advancement of research that entrepreneurship be recognized as a legitimate field of study.

Entrepreneurship and its subfields

We believe that establishing a clear definition of entrepreneurship is the first step toward legitimizing the field's research. Once a common definition of entrepreneurship has been established and it has been established that entrepreneurship can be a distinct domain of research, it is necessary to establish the discipline's position among the others.

Low (2001) identifies four distinct future research strategies for entrepreneurship. The first relegates entrepreneurship research to the role of facilitating new enterprise functions through educational support, rather than attempting to explain the phenomenon. This would imply abandoning the goal of academic legitimization in favor of simply integrating the results of other fields of research and transferring them to the community.

The second approach that entrepreneurs can take is to view the subject as a "potpourri," which entails leaving the situation as-is. Even if this situation attracts a large number of contributors, it will imply a reduction in the legitimacy of the research, which will continue to lack direction. A third option would be to classify entrepreneurship research as "discipline-specific." There is no need for a theory of entrepreneurship, as it should be investigated from multiple perspectives, but there is a need for theory in economics, marketing, and strategic management to address the various aspects of entrepreneurship. Even if this concept is intriguing and consistent with the multidisciplinary nature of the entrepreneurial phenomenon,

it cannot be accepted entirely. It is possible that such a research method would leave some gaps in our understanding of entrepreneurial processes that are unaccounted for by any discipline as being irrelevant to them. Adopting this strategy will result in a lack of community, preventing dialogues necessary for the growth of the research. The final strategy is to establish entrepreneurship as a distinct field of study.

Even though we have identified this final methodological option as the most appropriate for scholars' needs in this paper, we concur with Low (2001) and Davidsson (2003) when they state that it is not a viable solution in isolation. Entrepreneurship can and should seek connections with other disciplines, which should foster entrepreneurial research. Adhering to this agenda would legitimize entrepreneurship and benefit other disciplines by providing a clear definition of the major dimensions of entrepreneurship.

As previously stated, numerous contributions could be made by strategic management research, which, like entrepreneurship, is interested in the micro level and is familiar with heterogeneity. It can contribute to entrepreneurship in a variety of ways: by examining the organizational characteristics and management practices that facilitate the discovery and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities; by managing innovation; and by examining the relationship between a firm's quantity/quality of new ventures and its performance.

Economists can explain how opportunities arise and how reward structures influence entrepreneurial efforts (Baumol, 1990, 1993); an economic approach is well-suited for investigating the environmental aspects of entrepreneurship and the micro-to-macro relationships affecting entrepreneurial outcomes. (Vennekers, Thurik, and Buis, 1997; Acs, Carlsson, and Karlsson, 1999; Vennekers, Thurik, and Karlsson, 1999). Additionally, entrepreneurship can benefit from economics' theory-driven approach, hypothesis deductive ability, stringency of concepts, insistence on internal consistency, and clarity of exposition.

Psychology (particularly the rapidly growing cognitive branch of the discipline) may help explain why some people pursue opportunities and others do not, by elucidating critical dimensions of both the opportunity discovery and evaluation phases. Of course, psychological analysis will focus on the entrepreneur, while other aspects of the process may be better explained from this perspective.

Sociology can provide valuable tools for understanding entrepreneurship because it focuses on aggregated macro-level phenomena and is the best lens through which to study ethnic and cultural aspects of phenomena. Geography, like sociology, can enlighten entrepreneurial research.

While history can aid in identifying opportunities (Shane and Venkataraman, 2001), the retrospective analysis that is frequently used in historical research does not fit the needs of entrepreneurship research.

All of the considerations raised thus far serve as the basis for future research. Only after a coherent conceptualization of a common study perspective for entrepreneurial phenomena is possible, can topics of interest and research efforts be identified.

Significant issues for future research

The field's evolution has been extremely complicated. It was demonstrated how entrepreneurship has been conceptualized in a variety of ways and from a variety of perspectives. While the discipline is advancing toward academic legitimacy, the time has come to assess the studies' progress. After resolving the entrepreneurial paradox and establishing a clear definition, it was possible to identify all of the field's relevant themes. Thus, the analyses conducted by Ucbasaran, Westhead, and Wright are critical (2001). The scholars identify the critical issues in entrepreneurship and advocate for further research into the processes that occur between them.

Entrepreneurship's Challenges in Industry 4.0

According to Meenu (2017), the fourth industrial revolution will continue to alter the manner in which we interact with the world around us, leading to the emergence of new difficulties. Thus, numerous obstacles exist.

1. Algorithms for machine learning: The machine learning period is frequently confused with artificial intelligence, despite the fact that machine learning is a subfield of AI. Frequently, machine learning is also referred to as pre-estimated analysis or prediction modeling. Machine learning algorithms are used to predict output values that are within the hunting range based on input data and analysis. Due to the fact that these data are fed to new data, they are able to learn and optimize their operations in order to boost their intelligence over time.
2. Cloud computing: Amazon.com's release of its elastic compute cloud product in 2006 made the term cloud computing well-known. The phase corresponds to the beginning of 1996, when cloud computing was first mentioned in a Compaq internal document alongside the first moon. Cloud computing has been used to represent the network of computer devices in the original. The primary objective of cloud computing is to enable users to take advantage of all available technologies without requiring them to possess expert-level understanding of how they work. The primary objective of cloud computing is to reduce costs and assist users in concentrating on their core business as purchasing obstacles. Virtualization is the primary technology used in cloud computing. This virtualization software helps to provide the time necessary to accelerate its operations and reduce expenses by maximizing infrastructure utilization.
3. Adopt a new business model. A business model is comprised of the business processes and policies adopted by an industry. Thus, a business model is a logical description of our industry that demonstrates how it delivers both value to customers and value to itself. The widespread use of business model came in to being with the advent of a personnel computer, which allows the people to test and model different components of the business. Prior to that, the majority of successful business models were the result of chance, not design. There are only two business models in industries; the first focuses on product design and manufacturing, while the second focuses on finding the right customers to sell the product.
4. Communicate with your target market: As part of the fourth industrial revolution, one of the most significant challenges facing small business owners is informing them that they are communicating with their target market. With a small funding pool, it is critical that you speak with the right people about your prospects. It may seem obvious that there are numerous industry owners who do not consider who will purchase their products or services prior to distributing them, but how can you grow a business successfully in the market without some key information and knowledge?
5. Finance their business venture: putting all of their eggs in one basket in the future is not a good business strategy. Thus, the primary truth comes into play when it comes to finance in your business. While presenting your industry's accounting history and financial data. Industry finance will help you to manage your money and to make your operation more useful.
6. Entrepreneurs can exploit new digital technologies to enter developing markets: Social, mobile, analytics, cloud, cyber system, etc. are the main phenomena which can be helpful to leveraging the new digitalization technologies in such a way. In the era of digitalization, these factors all contribute to the production of goods and services. Digitalization entrepreneurship can be defined as the adoption, in order to improve business operations, of new business models that accelerate business intelligence with the use of new digital technologies and connect with customers and stakeholders via new channels.
7. Better manage the administrative burden Business owners desire to generate more work. Although they are attempting to forget the amount of time they spend interacting with administrative staff, there is a direct effect on productivity. In actuality, there is a

crucial circumstance in which reducing paper work more effectively helps to alleviate administrative burden. With the assistance of the fourth industrial revolution, many industries hope to achieve a simpler and more effective administration that reduces workload and contributes positively to the quality of each customer relationship.

8. Labor market transformation through digitalization: Significant changes in India's labor market have occurred recently, and much has been said about them appropriately. In recent years, the so-called fourth industrial revolution has been rendered ineffective. Unquestionably, this digital transformation will be a challenging and stimulating process for organizations seeking to increase their productivity and performance in order to meet their business models or objectives. Cultural change and its consequences are the primary drivers of labor market transformation. Digital transformation is the main which is entering in a new era vision they have influenced by labor or customer trends and daily life. Future industries, economies, and societies will be significantly impacted by the digital transformation, which is stronger than ever today. Many industries have adopted new business practices as a result of digital transformation in order to track the needs, wants, and preferences of their customers more effectively.
9. Increased data availability: The term "data availability" is used by computer storage manufacturers and storage service providers (SSPs) to refer to products and services that ensure that data is consistently available at an expected level of performance under a variety of conditions, from normal to disaster. The primary five pillars of data availability are confidentiality, non-reproduction, integrity, and confidentiality information assurance. However, information assurance is one of the most important aspects of availability. Information assurance is impacted by the storage location, which can be an official facility or a private one.
10. Open up enormous opportunities for entrepreneurship and business in the digital age. The internet is the main component of the digital era, which made many tools and techniques available to traditional entrepreneurs and also helped open up new places to conduct business. An important aspect of the digital environment is entrepreneurial activity. No minimum or initial investment is necessary. Numerous independent contractors use the internet to build portfolio careers. There are numerous opportunities to hire skills, search for new markets, export, and work from home on the internet, which aids in attracting people and allowing them to make a variety of decisions pertaining to how they work. The digital age has contributed to the rapid growth of entrepreneurs.

Language

Language must perform a variety of roles. When individuals discuss the purpose of language, they are referring to the reasons for its use. Essentially, the function of language is communication, or what is generally referred to as the function of speech; individuals use language to send and receive messages. It's tough to fulfill the role of language adequately since it is so embedded in all human beings that it's worth remembering that there is a small functional aspect of our conscious behavior that we cannot participate in (Newmeyer, 2000). Roman Jakobson (1960) established six language functions that influential verbal communication leadership acts could be used to characterize. Each of these functions is coupled with a set of variables.

Phatic Function

The phatic function is concerned with the speaker-to-speaker interaction. Its principal objective is to withdraw/build, extend, check, confirm, or terminate this relationship. It may consist of a set of culturally or linguistically bound terms such as well, I won't keep you; wow!

; and truly. Along with enhancing the link between the speakers, the phatic function enhances the listener's sense of the speaker's proficiency (Manoliu, 2017).

The phatic function entails demonstrating sympathy and empathy for others. It aids in contact establishment and refers to communication routes. It establishes a channel or verifies that it is operational for social purposes. This is a social function. As a result, vernacular terms are occasionally utilized in this function. It is primarily expressed through speech; however, it can also be observed in specific types of writing, such as letters, where the beginning of Dear Sir/Madam and the end of Yours Faithfully also serve that purpose (Zegarac and Clark cited in Hassan & Jabbar, 2018). Coupland (2000) asserts that, despite increasing the number of publications on phatic communication, this mode of social contact requires additional research on several difficulties, three of which are briefly discussed here. First, phatic communication analysis is frequently expressed in terms of the distinction between cognitive (propositional) and social information.

Poetic Function

According to Jakobson, the poetic function is "attitude toward the message, centered on the message." The poetic function cannot be limited to only poetry or the message's poetic purpose. It stresses language's concrete side signs, highlighting the fundamental contradiction between what is intelligible and understood linguistic signs as a means of intelligible knowledge and objects of reference reality (Manoliu, 2017).

Poetic function, also known as aesthetics' function, is to deal with a language whose primary concern is the beauty of language itself. The depth of sound, texture, and balance elevate it to the level of auditory art and poetic expression." Other functions do not have to be omitted from the poetry text. They serve a secondary function; as with different language genres, the poetry function is not absent but emerges in a secondary capacity (in political slogans, commercials, and commemorative speeches, for example) (Holenstein cited in Hassan & Jabbar, 2018).

Metalingual Function

When the sender and receiver need to verify that they are using the same code and when language is used to discuss language, the metalingual function is utilized. For instance, "How do you define "krill"?" In language acquisition, considerable metalingual actions are required; for example, aphasia might be defined as a loss of capacity resulting from metalingual activities (Tribus, 2017).

Metalinguistics, the language of grammar, is the most explicit representation of the metalinguistic function. However, the metalingual function is currently present in everyday conversation to exert control over the interlocutor's use of the same language code (Manoliu, 2017).

Emotive Function

Additionally, this is referred to as the "expressive or emotive function." The emotive function is centered on the act of 'greeting.' This function activates when we wish to express our feelings in the absence of spoken communication. For instance, an interjection is a word or phrase used to indicate surprise, joy, or annoyance in an instant, such as "Bah!", "Oh!", "Yuck!", "Ouch!", or "Aie". They are not components but rather analogs of sentences (Tribus, 2017).

Conative Function

The conative function is based around the concept of the receiver.' This function identifies the most straightforward grammatical terms in vocative and imperative sentences and assists us in persuading people to act, including directives. For instance, "Drink!" or

"Leave!" (Ibid.). This is updated by the portions of the message that are conveyed directly to the recipient, indicating that the speaker wishes to affect the listener by including him in the message's reception. The most often used grammatical expressions for this function are direct forms of greeting the listener in the imperative form. The conative function is frequently expressed through the receiver's spontaneous intervention at various points during message transmission utilizing formulations such as "you know", "no violation", and so on (Manoliu, 2017).

The Referential function

Referential function: relates to contextual aspects and provides information about a situation, item, or mental state. A descriptive statement with a referential function may include both actual and deictic words, such as "All of the autumn leaves have fallen now." Similarly, referential functions are associated with elements whose true values are in doubt, much more so when the true values in the natural and supposed universes are similar (Tritsman cited in Hassan & Jabbar, 2018).

Each term's referential role is to provide a positive answer to the question: Which individual is being discussed? or to establish a reference. What enables a single word to accomplish this role is the term's 'specifier.' Demonstrations are not determinants of deictic terms because they can fulfill their referential role by appealing to the utterance's relative distinctiveness or by advancing a candidacy in light of the surrounding discourse or perceptual environment (Jakobson, 1960).

Critical Discourse Analysis

According to Van Dijk (1993), critical discourse analysis can only contribute significantly and uniquely to critical social or political analyses if it is able to account for the role of language, language use, discourse, or communicative events in the (re)production of dominance and inequality. We have attempted to demonstrate that discourse is involved in dominance on two major dimensions: directly through the enactment of dominance in text and speech in specific contexts, and more indirectly through the influence of discourse on the minds of others. In the first case, dominant speakers can effectively restrict others' communicative rights, for example, by limiting (free access to) communicative events, speech acts, discourse genres, participants, topics, or style. In the second case, dominant speakers exert control over public discourse and thus have the ability to manage the public mind indirectly. They may do so by utilizing structures and strategies that manipulate the audience's mental models in such a way that preferred social cognitions (attitudes, ideologies, norms, and values) are developed, that is, social cognitions (attitudes, ideologies, norms, and values) that are ultimately in the dominant group's interest. Both cases demonstrate the importance of a socio-cognitive interface between discourse and dominance: it is theoretically necessary to recognize that there is no other way to connect macro-level concepts such as group dominance and inequality with micro-level concepts such as text, talk, meaning, and comprehension. Indeed, the critical concept of reproduction, which is required to explain how discourse contributes to the reproduction of dominance, presupposes a relationship between discourse structures and social cognitions, and between social cognitions and social structures. We illustrated our point with a brief examination of how racism is reproduced in western societies via parliamentary discourse. While such more or less moderate discourse is rarely overtly racist, it can nonetheless enact white group power, for example through the authority of MPs, while manipulating the public mind in such a way that ethnocentric or racist policies can be legitimized. This critical analysis is primarily concerned with demystifying the elites' self-proclaimed ethnic and racial tolerance and with confronting their widespread denial of racism. To conclude, a word of caution and reservation is appropriate. We have emphasized that, when confronted with the real issues and problems of today's world, discourse analysis, whether critical or not, may be ineffective unless we can contribute to the development of a critical perspective among our students or colleagues. To accomplish this, we must convince them not only of our views or arguments, but also of our expertise. While

numerous studies in critical discourse analysis have demonstrated that our findings thus far are encouraging, our expertise remains extremely limited.

Salma (2018) stated that CDA frequently focuses on manipulative, legitimizing, and fabricating consent strategies, as well as other discursive means of influencing the minds (indirect actions) of people in the interests of the powerful. Additionally, CDA does not define a school, a subdivision, or a field of discourse analysis; rather, it categorizes an explicit critical approach, position, or corner of studying talk and text. It (may) consider all dimensions of discourse, including grammar (phonology, syntax, and semantics), schematic organization, pragmatic strategies, speech acts, and interaction. On the other hand, it pays attention to other dimensions of communicative events, such as semiotic (sound, music, image, film, video, gesture, etc.).

Previous Studies

Several previous studies that discussed language and entrepreneurship were research by Roundy and Asllani (2018), where research aimed to identify the words that comprise entrepreneurship discourse and describe how word usage has changed over time. To examine the language of entrepreneurship, the authors constructed a longitudinal corpus of approximately 2.5 million words using modified MapReduce algorithms in conjunction with text mining techniques. The authors identified the most frequently used terms in the entrepreneurship lexicon and then use content analysis to chart their evolution. Further research from Suhariyanti (2018) The research or writing was intended to establish the presence of language in entrepreneurship. This study used qualitative with a literature review method to discuss the topic under study.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach. As mentioned in Brikci (2007), Patton explains that qualitative research is defined by its objectives, which are concerned with comprehending certain aspects of social life, and methodologies that (in general) generate words, rather than numbers, as data to be evaluated. As a result, this study's objective was not to collect data but to ascertain and comprehend the function of the language employed by entrepreneurs. The research was conducted in Denpasar and Badung, Bali. Entrepreneurs that are relatively experienced to their careers serve as research subjects.

This study collected data using observation, interviews, and documentation. Participant observation was the first technique. Before the data in this study could be evaluated, they were transcribed into transcripts. Interviews were employed as the second mode of data collection in this study, emphasizing in-depth interviews. This interview form was used to corroborate the data gathered from observations and delve deeply into the participants' perspectives and motivations regarding the study problem. Finally, the documentation approach was used, in which the researcher collected articles and information about language functions to be compared to the results of observations and interviews.

Researcher was used extensively in this study as the primary instrument of research. However, the researcher collected the relevant data using an observation checklist, notebook, and interview guide based on the previously established data collection approach. The triangulation technique and source triangulation were employed in this study. The data collected through observations and interviews were evaluated qualitatively using Miles and Huberman's interactive data analysis approach (1987). Three processes comprised the data analysis method: data reduction, data visualization, and conclusion.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The following findings were derived from participant observation, in which the researcher, who is intimately acquainted with the research subjects, could become involved

in the activities of these entrepreneurs, observed the activities directly, and observed how they use their language as entrepreneurs: There were 100 utterances with a variety of functions, including 40 phatic, 20 referential, 15 conative, 15 emotive, 5 metalingual, and 5 poetic.

To begin, the phatic function was the most prevalent here because language as a social function was also an integral part of an entrepreneur's personality. Entrepreneurs did not want their communication with the relationship to deteriorate, which was why the conversation must be maintained.

Excerpt 1 :

Partner : Yes, I am currently opening a restaurant business in Ubud

Entrepreneur : What are the prospects for restaurants around Ubud at the moment?

According to his partner's statement, the entrepreneur maintained communication by continuing to chat about restaurants in Ubud. As a result of this, it can be concluded that language's socialization and interaction function, dubbed the phatic function, is critical for entrepreneurs because it enables the maintenance of relationships with partners, coworkers, and clients.

The second was the function of language as a referential function; namely, the language focused on context; it means about the reference or subject matter and what it refers to. The referential function's purpose was to convey information. Thus, an entrepreneur undoubtedly performed this function when presenting innovations or conveying critical information to partners, coworkers, or clients.

Excerpt 2 :

Entrepreneur : Sushi is a Japanese food consisting of rice formed with side dishes
in the form of seafood, meat, raw or cooked vegetables

From this excerpt, the entrepreneur conveyed information related to sushi because, at that time, the entrepreneur was convincing his partner to cooperate in certain events. As a result, it can be seen that the purpose of language is to communicate a topic, subject, or piece of information. And this referential function is critical for entrepreneurs when partners, coworkers, or clients require precise information about a topic, and language, of course, serves as a means of communication.

The third was the conative function, which sought to elicit a specific response from the other person. This function used vocative and imperative sentences and enables someone to compel another person to act, including commands. Entrepreneurs also performed this function to instruct something to their co-workers or subordinates.

Excerpt 3 :

Entrepreneur : Please schedule a meeting for this week.

Secretary : Okay Sir

As demonstrated in the quote above, language was used by an entrepreneur to instruct their secretary. Naturally, this conative function is critical when developing into an entrepreneur who will undoubtedly lead his subordinates or colleagues, and thus the function of language in this instance is to instruct colleagues or subordinates.

Fourthly, entrepreneurs employed an emotive function. This function was activated when someone wished to express their emotions without speaking to provide information. An interjection, for example, is a word or phrase used to express surprise, amazement, or pleasure suddenly.

Excerpt 4 :

Entrepreneur : Wow, it will be really cool if we add live music!

This function was contingent upon how a person feels about what occurred, whether it was a result of events, conversations, or specific topics, such as the excerpt above, in which the entrepreneur was taken aback by the idea that their coworkers must incorporate live music into their cafe. As can be seen, this emotive function infuses the provided information with feelings. This function is frequently performed inadvertently, as it is associated with a person's spontaneity. However, this function is beneficial for displaying an entrepreneur's positive emotions or expressions, such as enthusiasm, admiration, and others.

The fifth was the metalingual function, which referred to a language's ability to teach or explain itself. Entrepreneurs rarely used this function because they reserved it for situations in which partners, coworkers, or clients had difficulty translating certain terms.

Excerpt 5 :

Entrepreneur : We will actualize this second project this week.

Co-Worker : Actualize?

Entrepreneur : In the Big Indonesian Dictionary, the word actualization comes from the root word actual, which means it exists or actually, so the word actualization means to make something really exist.

As seen from the excerpt above, the entrepreneur was explaining the term "actualization" to his coworker. As a result, entrepreneurs must use language to explain the meaning of unfamiliar terms to their colleagues. As a result, it can be concluded that language's metalingual function is critical for providing an understanding of unfamiliar vocabulary.

The sixth or last was the poetic function. This function is also referred to as the aesthetic function, as it pertains to a language whose primary focus is on the language's beauty. This function was used by entrepreneurs who required poetic or aesthetic language, such as slogans or social media captions for brands.

Excerpt 6 :

Entrepreneur : When we enjoy sushi with family and friends, the taste of sushi becomes more delicious

According to the excerpt above, the entrepreneur suggested aesthetic words for their business's social media posts. Naturally, the aesthetically pleasing words will pique customers' interest. This poetic function appears only on occasion, as it is primarily used to create interesting slogans or captions for the entrepreneur's innovations.

Based on the findings, it can be deduced that entrepreneurs used the following language functions: 40 phatic functions (40%), 20 referential functions (20%), 15 conative functions (15%), 15 emotive functions (15%), 5 metalingual functions (5%), and 5 poetic functions (5%). From there, it can be seen that the most frequently occurring language function was the phatic function, in which language was primarily used to facilitate communication between entrepreneurs and partners, coworkers, or clients, ensuring that conversations and discussions run smoothly and social relationships are maintained, despite the fact that this function only narrowly outperformed other functions, namely referential functions. A level below was a conative and an emotive function, which also contributed significantly to entrepreneurs' professionalism. Even so, the metalingual and poetic functions must take a back seat due to their infrequent use by entrepreneurs.

To corroborate the findings of the preceding observations, interviews were conducted with three entrepreneurs from diverse backgrounds: subject 1 was the owner of a sushi restaurant, subject 2 was the owner of a snack bar, and subject 3 was the owner of a cafe. The results of the interview showed that the three subjects gave the same response regarding the function of language, namely, language has six functions, as stated in Roman Jakobson's theory. And the three subjects also gave statements related to the relationship between language functions and their professionalism as follows:

Question : How is the relationship between language function and professionalism as

an entrepreneur?

Subject 1 : Language has many functions in our professionalism as an entrepreneur

Subject 2 : Of course, language has a function in our professionalism as an entrepreneur because without language, how do we communicate with partners, coworkers, or clients.

Subject 3 : Language has many functions, especially for us who are entrepreneurs; we are also greatly assisted by the use of correct and appropriate language.

Based on the answers given by all subjects, it can be concluded that language really functions in their professionalism as entrepreneurs. Therefore, from the results of observations, interviews, and also documentation, language serves to help their professionalism as an entrepreneur namely, language functions to:

1. The function of language as a means of socialization and interaction called the phatic function is essential for entrepreneurs because it can maintain relationships with partners, co-workers, or clients.
2. The function of language is to convey the topic or subject of conversation or information. And this referential function has an essential task for entrepreneurs where partners, co-workers, or clients really need clear information related to the topic, and of course, the language here serves as a means to convey it.
3. The function of language as a means for an entrepreneur to instruct their partners, co-workers, or clients. Of course, this conative function is essential when becoming an entrepreneur who will undoubtedly lead his subordinates or colleagues, so it can be concluded that the function of language here is to instruct colleagues or subordinates.
4. The function of language as an emotive function is to insert feelings into the information provided. This function usually occurs accidentally because it is associated with a person's spontaneity. But it seems that this function is beneficial for showing emotions or expressions of an entrepreneur positively, namely showing enthusiasm, admiration, and others.
5. The function of language as a metalingual function has an essential role in providing understanding related to unknown vocabulary. For example, entrepreneurs must use language to explain the meaning of words that are not understood by partners, coworkers, or clients.
6. The function of language as a poetic function is also known as an aesthetic function, relating to a language whose primary focus is the beauty of language itself. This function occurs when the entrepreneur provides aesthetic word ideas for his business post. Of course, the esthetic words will make customers interested. This poetic function only appears at certain times because it is only to make interesting slogans or captions for the entrepreneur's innovations.

Another research requestion that connects among language, entrepreneurship, and industry 4.0 would be discussed by displayed the result from the interview below:

Question : how does language functions in entrepreneurship 4.0?

Subject 1 : Entrepreneurship in industry 4.0 is about how to read the big data and figure out any opportunities that can be seen on the Internet or social media, so language functions to make us know and understand the information provided.

Subject 2 : Entrepreneurship in industry 4.0 is about working with technology, so we have many terms that our brain can't access, so language functions to make us easy to operate any technologies we need for entrepreneurship 4.0.

Subject 3 : Entrepreneurship in industry 4.0 is about selling or doing business with the help of social media, so language functions to distribute any information effectively.

Based on that result, it can be concluded that language has functions for entrepreneurship 4.0, namely:

1. Language functions to make us know and understand the information provided on the Internet or social media.
2. Language functions to make us easy to operate any technologies we need for entrepreneurship 4.0.
3. Language functions to distribute any information effectively when selling or doing business with the help of social media.

Roundy and Asllani (2018) previously discovered that entrepreneurs' lexicon was complex and fluid. The most frequently used terms alluded to emerging entrepreneurial trends. The findings and methodological procedures contribute to entrepreneurial research and, more specifically, to work on entrepreneurial discourse, language use, and new venture communication. Entrepreneurs and policymakers should also take note of the findings. Suhariyanti (2018) explained that Indonesian had a great opportunity, and the Indonesian language's existence was recognized. It had been used as a language of communication and commerce for a long period between ASEAN countries, also known as allied countries, providing an excellent opportunity for business cooperation with ASEAN countries. Indonesian had numerous advantages for enhancing one's competence. Assuming this is appropriately implemented, the belief in Indonesian becoming Indonesian grows. In other words, Indonesia can compete with English for national, state, and international language status.

The initial research concentrated on the lexicon, or terms that frequently appear in entrepreneurship. The second previous study's findings focused on the presence of Indonesians in the field of entrepreneurship. When compared to previous research, this study has several advantages; while both studies connect language and entrepreneurship, this study is more specific to the function of language according to Roman Jakobson's theory and also employs Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to interpret entrepreneurs' speech or expression. In addition, researcher also added the relation between language and entrepreneurship 4.0.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that language really functions in their professionalism as entrepreneurs. Thus, based on observations, interviews, and documentation, language contributes to their professionalism as an entrepreneur; specifically, language functions to:

1. The phatic function of language, which allows for socialization and interaction, is critical for entrepreneurs because it enables them to maintain relationships with partners, coworkers, and clients.
2. Language serves the purpose of conveying the topic or subject of conversation or information. And this referential function is critical for entrepreneurs when partners, coworkers, or clients require specific information about a topic, and language, of course, serves as a means of communication.
3. The role of language in instructing an entrepreneur's partners, coworkers, or clients. Naturally, this conative function is critical when aspiring to be an entrepreneur who will undoubtedly lead his subordinates or colleagues, and thus the function of language in this instance is to instruct colleagues or subordinates.
4. The emotive function of language is to infuse information with feelings. This function is frequently performed inadvertently, as it is associated with a person's

- spontaneity. However, this function is beneficial for displaying an entrepreneur's positive emotions or expressions, such as enthusiasm, admiration, and others.
5. The metalingual function of language is critical for providing an understanding of unfamiliar vocabulary. For instance, entrepreneurs must use language to clarify the meaning of words that partners, coworkers, or clients do not understand.
 6. The poetic function of language is also referred to as an aesthetic function, referring to a language whose primary focus is on its beauty. This function occurs when the entrepreneur contributes visually appealing word ideas for his business post. Naturally, the aesthetically pleasing words will pique customers' interest. This poetic function appears only on occasion, as it is primarily used to create interesting slogans or captions for the entrepreneur's innovations.

Moreover, language has the following functions for entrepreneurship 4.0:

1. Language functions to enable us to know and understand the information provided on the Internet and social media.
2. Language functions to facilitate the operation of all technologies required for entrepreneurial 4.0.
3. Language functions to effectively disseminate any information when selling or conducting business using social media.

IMPLICATION AND LIMITATION

This research implies linking the theory of language functions with the theory of entrepreneurship. The limitations in this study are due to the lack of research time and minimal data sampling, so it is hoped that future researchers can use more samples and studies.

REFERENCES

- Abernathy, W. F. and Clark, K. (1985). Innovation: Mapping the Winds of Creative Destruction, *Research Policy*, 14/1: 3-22.
- Acs, Z. I. (1992). Small business economics: A global perspective. *Challenge*, 35, Iss. 6; p. 38. Acs, Z. I and Carlsson, B. and Karlsson, K. (1999, eds.). *Entrepreneurship, Small and Medium-sized firms and the Macroeconomy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aldrich, H. E. and Austen, E. R. (1986). Even Dwarfs Started Small: Liabilities of Age and Size and their Strategic Implications, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8: 165-98.
- Amaduzzi, A. (1969). L'azienda, Torino, UTET.
- Amihud, Y. and Lev, B. (1981). Risk Reduction as a Managerial Motive for Conglomerate Mergers, *Bell Journal of Economics*, 12: 605-17.
- Baumol, W. J. (1993). Formal Entrepreneurship Theory in Economics: Existence and Bounds, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8: 197-210.
- Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, and Destructive, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98/5: 893-921.
- Berry, C. A. and Roberts, E. B. (1985). *Entering new business. Selecting strategies for success*, Sloan Management Review, Spring.
- Birch, D. L. (1987). *Job Creation in America: How our Smallest Companies put the Most People to Work*. New York: Free Press.
- Borland C. (1974). Locus of Control, Need for Achievement and Entrepreneurship. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Brikci, N. (2007). *A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology*. Guiding Book. London: Research Unit, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.
- Briones, G. (1963). *El empresario industrial en America Latina: Chile, Mar del Plata, Argentina*. Naciones Unidas Comision Economica para America Latina.
- Brock, W.A. and Evans, D.S. (1989). Small business economics. *Small Business Economics*, 1(1), 7-20.
- Brockhaus, R. H. and Horwitz, P. S. (1986). The Psychology of the Entrepreneur. In D. L. Sexton and Smilor R. W. (eds.), *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing.
- Brugnoli, C. (1990). *L'imprenditorialità per lo sviluppo di nuove aziende*, Milano, EGEA.
- Bull, I., and Willard, G. (1995). Towards a theory of entrepreneurship. In I. Bull, and Willard, G. (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship. Perspectives on theory building* (pp.1-16). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Bull, I., and Willard, G. E. (1993). Towards a theory of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8: 183-195.
- Burgelman, R. A. (1983). Corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management: Insights from a process study. *Management Science*, 29(12), 1349-1364.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cantillon, R. (1931). *Essai sur la nature du commerce en general*. [Essay on the nature of general commerce] (Translated by Henry Higgs.) London: MacMillan.
- Carland, J. W., Hoy F., Boulton W. R., Carland J. C. (1984). Differentiating Entrepreneurs from Small Business Owners: a Conceptualization, *The Academy of Management Review*, 9, 2, 354-359.
- Carree, M. A. and Thurik A. R. (2000). The impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth. In D. B. Audretsch and Acs Z. J. (eds.) *Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Casson, M. (1982). *The entrepreneur. An economic theory*. Oxford, UK: Martin Robertson.
- Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chung, L. H. and Gibbons, P. T. (1997). The roles of ideology and social capital, *Group and Organization Management*, 22, 1, 10-30.
- Church, R. (1993). The family firm in industrial capitalism: International perspectives on hypothesis and history. *Business History*, 35(4), 17-43.
- Coda, V. (1984). Sentieri di apprendimento dell'impresa innovativa. In F. Magrino (ed.), *I nuovi imprenditori*, Milano, Edizioni del Sole 24 Ore.
- Coda, V. (1988). *L'orientamento strategico dell'impresa*. Torino, UTET.
- Cole, A.H. (1959), *Business Enterprise in its Social Setting*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cole, A.H. (1949). Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial history. *Change and the Entrepreneur*, 88-107.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988), *Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: 95-120.
- Corno, F. (1989). *Lo sviluppo del sapere imprenditoriale nel governo dell'impresa*, Milano, Egea.
- Covin, J. G., and Slevin, D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16, pp.7-25.
- Covin, J. G., and Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environment, *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 1, 75-87.
- D'Aveni, R. A., Gunther R. (1994). *Hypercompetition: Managing the Dynamics of Strategic Maneuvering*, Free Press.
- Daft, R. L. (1992). *Organization Theory and Design*. New York: West.
- Dauids L. E. (1963). *Characteristics of Small Business Founders in Texas and Georgia*. Athens, Ga: Bureau of Business Research, University of Georgia.
- Davidsson, P. (2003). The Domain of Entrepreneurship Research: Some suggestions. In Katz, J. and Shepherd, S. (Eds.) *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*, Vol.6, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Davidsson, P., Low, M. B., and Wright, M. (2001). Editor's Introduction: Low and MacMillan Ten Years On: Achievements and Future Directions for Entrepreneurship Research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4, Summer), 5-15.
- Dess, G. G. and Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environment, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 1, 52-73.
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practice and Principles*. London: Heinemann.
- Dubrin Andrew J. (2008). *Leadership (Terjemahan)*. Edisi Kedua. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Dunkelberg, W.C and Cooper, A. C. (1982). Entrepreneurial Typoogies. In K. H. Vesper, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, Mass: Babson Center for Entrepreneurial Studies, 1-15.
- Elster, J. (1983). *Explaining Technical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erikson, T. (2001). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Study: A Few Comments and Some Suggested Extensions. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 12-13.
- Fiet, J. O. (2002). *The search for Entrepreneurial Discoveries*. Westport, CT.: Quorum Books.
- Finkle, T., Deeds, D. (2001). Trends in the Market for Entrepreneurship faculty, 1989-1998, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16.
- Floyd, S. W., and Lane P. (2000). Strategizing throughout the organization: managing role
- Gartner, W. B. (1990). What are we talking about when we are talking about entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business venturing*, 5, 15-28.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is the Entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12/4: 11-32

- Gartner, W. B. (2001). Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship research? Blind assumptions in theory development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25 (4, Summer), 27-39.
- Gasse, Y. (1977). *Entrepreneurial Characteristics and practices: a study of the dynamics of small business organizations and their effectiveness in the different environments*. Sherbrooke, Quebec, Rene Prince.
- Gerschenlkron, A. (1965). *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Ginsberg, A., and Buchholtz, A. (1989). Are Entrepreneurs a Breed Apart? A Look at the Evidence, *Journal of General Management*, 15/2: 32-40.
- Granovetter, M., (1995). The Economic Sociology of Firms and Entrepreneurs. In Alejandro Portes (ed.) *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, Russel Sage Foundation.
- Grant, R. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17:109-122.
- Hagan, E. (1962). *On the Theory of Social Change: How Economic Growth Begins*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Hage, J., and Aiken, M. (1970). *Social Change in Complex Organizations*. New York: Random House.
- Hall, R. H. (1996). *Organizations, Structures, Processes, and Outcomes*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hayek, F. A. Von. (1937). Economics and knowledge, *Economica*, New Series, 4, 33-54, reprinted. In F.A. Von Hayek (1948), *Individualism and Economic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. Von. (1948). *Individualism and Economic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hisrich, R.D. and Peters, M.P. (1989). *Entrepreneurship. Starting, Developing and Managing a New Enterprise*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, D. R., Camp, M. S. and Sexton, L. D. (2002). *Strategic entrepreneurship – Creating a new mindset*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, D. R., Camp, M. S. and Sexton, L. D. (2001). Integrating Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management Actions to Create Firm Wealth, *The Academy of Management Executive*, v15 i1 p49(15).
- Hitt, M. A., Reed, T. S. (2000). Entrepreneurship in the new competitive landscape. In Meyer G.D. and Heppard, K.A. *Entrepreneurship as strategy: competing on the entrepreneurial edge*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Culture and Organization*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hornaday, J. A. and Aboud, J. (1971). Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs, *Personnel Psychology*, 24, 141-53.
- Invernizzi G. (1993, ed.). *Imprenditorialità interna per lo sviluppo delle imprese e del sistema economico*. Milano: Egea.
- Invernizzi G., Molteni, M. and Corbetta, G. (1990). *Management Imprenditoriale*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Invernizzi G., Molteni, M. and Sinatra, A. (1988). *Imprenditorialità interna. Lo sviluppo di nuove attività nelle imprese*. Etas.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Style in Language Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. *Style in Language*, 351–377
- Junaidi, F., Mustopa, E., Putra, A., Aryanto S. (2020). Analisis Fungsi Bahasa dalam Komunikasi Adat Bejehum: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Jermal: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*. Vol. 1 No. 2.
- Kanter, R.M. (1983). *The Change Masters: Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the American Corporation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Kihlstrom, R. E., Laffont, J. J. (1979). A general equilibrium Entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion, *Journal of Political Economy*, 87, 719-48.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of Economic Literature* 35: 60-85.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1982). *Uncertainty, Discovery, and Human Action: A Study of the Entrepreneurial Profile in the Misesian System*. In I. M. Kirzner (ed.), *Method, Process and Austrian Economics: Essays in Honour of Ludwig von Mises*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath.
- Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kuratko, D.F. (2003). *Entrepreneurship Education: emerging trends and challenges for the 21st century*. Coleman Foundation White Paper Series for the USASBE.
- Landstrom, H. (2001). Who loves entrepreneurship research? Knowledge accumulation within a transient field of research. Paper presented at the RENT XV Conference, Turku, Finland, Nov. 22-23, 2001.
- Lipset, S. M. (1988). *Revolution and Counterrevolution*, New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Books.
- Low, M. (2001). The adolescence of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4, Summer), 17-26.
- Low, M. and MacMillan, I. C. (1988). Entrepreneurship: past research and future challenges. *Journal of Management* (14), 139-161.
- Lumpkin, G. T., and Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Lynskey, M. J. and Yonekura, S. (2002). *Entrepreneurship and Organization - The Role of the Entrepreneur in Organizational Innovation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Malerba, F., Orsenigo, L. (2000). Knowledge, innovative activities and industrial evolution, *Industrial and Corporate Change*; 9, 2, 289-314.
- Manoliu, M. N. (2017). Functions of Language and Elements of Poetry. *International Journal of Communication Research*, 7(1), 58.
- Marshall, A. (1930). *Principles of Economics*. London: Macmillan. First published 1890.
- Marsili, O. (2002). Technological regimes and sources of entrepreneurship, *Small Business Economics*; 19, 3, 217-231.
- Masini, C. (1979). *Lavoro e risparmio*, Torino, UTET.
- McClelland, D. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McGrath, R. G., and MacMillan, I.C. (1992). More like each other than anyone else? A cross-cultural study of entrepreneurial perceptions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7(5), 419.
- McGrath, R. G., MacMillan, I. C., and Scheinberg, S. (1992). Elitists, Risk-Takers, and Rugged Individualists? An Exploratory Analysis of Cultural Differences between Entrepreneurs and Non-Entrepreneurs, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7:115-35.
- McGrath, R. G., Venkataraman S., and MacMillan, I. C. (1994). The advantage chain: Antecedents to rents from internal corporate ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(5), 351-369.
- McGrath, R.G. and McMillan I.C. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Meenu. (2017). The Challenges Of Entrepreneurship In Industry 4 . 0 : A Case Of Aligarh District In Uttar Pradesh. *ABS International Journal of Management*.
- Menger, C. (1950). *Principles of Economics*, trans. and ed. by J. Dingwall and B. F. Hoselitz. Glencoe, M.: Free Press.
- Meyer G. D. and Heppard K. A. (2000). *Entrepreneurship as strategy: competing on the entrepreneurial edge*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Micheal S., Storey D. and Thomas H. (2002). Discovery and coordination in strategic management and entrepreneurship, In Hitt A. M., Ireland, D. R., Camp, M. S., Sexton, L. D., Strategic entrepreneurship: creating a new mindset, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1987). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.).
- Mill, J. S. (1848). Principles of Political Economy, Variorum edition, ed. J. M. Robson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Miller, D. and Friesen, P. H. (1983). Strategy-making and environment: the third link, *Strategic Management Journal*, 4, 3, 221-235.
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy safari: a guided tour through the wilds of strategic management*, London: Prentice Hall.
- Mises, L. von (1949). *Human Action: A Treatise on Economics*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Morris, M. H. and Kuratko, D.F. (2002). *Corporate Entrepreneurship*. Fort Worth, Tex.: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Morris, M. H. (1998). *Entrepreneurial intensity: sustainable advantages for individuals, organizations and societies*. Westport, Conn: Quorum, 1998.
- Murray, J. A. (1981). Marketing is Home for the Entrepreneurial Process, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 10/2: 93-9.
- Murray, J. A. (1984). A concept of entrepreneurial strategy, *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 1, 1-13.
- Nelson, R. R. and Winter, S. G. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Newmeyer, F.J. 1997. *Generative Linguistics: An Historical Perspective*. Google Books. p-170. 21 January 2014 <<https://www.google.com/search?tbo=p&tbm=bks&q=isbn:1134820518>>
- Onida, P. (1975). *Economia d'azienda*, Torino, UTET.
- Palmer M. (1971). The Application of Psychological testing to entrepreneurial potential. *California Management Review*, 13(3), 38.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1973). *The Politics of Organizational Decision-Making*. London: Tavistock.
- Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why You Don't Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Richard, J. C. & Schmidt, R. W. 2010. *Longman Dictionary of Language*.
- Richard, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language*.
- Roberts, E. B. (1968). Entrepreneurship and technology: a basic study of innovators, how to keep and capitalize on their talents, *Research Management*, 4.
- Roundy, P. T., & Asllani, A. (2018). Understanding the language of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 35(2), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jeas-08-2017-0084>
- Salma, N. F. (2018). Exploring Van Dijk: Critical Discourse Analysis's Aims. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/mwrnq>
- Salvato, C. (2003). *Le opportunità imprenditoriali. Come nascono, come si individuano, come si concretizzano*. Milano: Guerini.
- Sandberg, W. R. (1992). Strategic Management's Potential Contributions to a Theory of Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* (Spring), 73-90.
- Santarelli, E., and Pesciarelli, E. (1990). The Emergence of a Vision: The Development of Schumpeter's Theory of Entrepreneurship, *History of Political Economy*, 22: 677-96.
- Say, J.-B. (1971). *A Treatise on Political Economy or the Production, Distribution and Consumption of Wealth*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley. 1st edn., 1803.
- Schendel, D. E. and Hofer, C. W. (1979). *Strategic Management: A new view of business Policy and Planning*. Boston, Little Brown & Co.

- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Originally published in 1912 as „Theorie der Wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung“, Leipzig: Dencker & Humblot.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Scott, S., Venkataraman, S. and MacMillan I. C. (1995). Cultural differences in innovation championing strategies. *Journal of Management*. New York, Vol 21, Iss. 5.
- Sexton, D. L. (1980). Characteristics and role demands of successful entrepreneurs, Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Detroit.
- Shane, S. (1996). Hybrid organizational arrangements and their implications for firm growth and survival: a study of new franchisors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 216 – 234.
- Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2001). Entrepreneurship as a field of research: a response to Zahra and Dess, Singh, and Erikson. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 13-16.
- Shapero, A. (1975). The Displaced, Uncomfortable Entrepreneur, *Psychology Today*, 9/6: 83-8.
- Sharma, P. and Chrisman, J. J. (1999). Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 11-27.
- Shrivastava P. (1995). Environmental technologies and competitive advantage, *Strategic Management Journal* Summer v16 n. SPEISS p183(18).
- Singh, R. P. (2001). A Comment on Developing the Field of Entrepreneurship Through the Study of Opportunity Recognition and Exploitation. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 10-12.
- Smith, A. (1937). *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: The Modern Library. Published originally in 1776.
- Smith, K. G., Mitchell, T. R., and Summer, C. E. (1985). Top Level Management Priorities in Different Stages of the Organizational Life Cycle, *Academy of Management Journal*, 28/4: 799-820.
- Sorrentino, M. (1996). *L'imprenditorialità interna per l'innovazione*, Padova, CEDAM.
- Stevenson, H. H., and Gumpert, D.E. (1985). The heart of entrepreneurship. *Harvard Business Review*: 85-94.
- Stevenson, H. H. and Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal*, Summer Special Issue, 11, pp.17-27.
- Stopford, J. M., and Baden-Fuller, C. W. F. (1994). Creating corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 521-536.
- Sugiyono. 2012. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suhariyanti. (2018). EKSISTENSI BAHASA DIBIDANG ENTREPRENEURSHIP Suhariyanti. *Jurnal Bisnis Net*, 1(2).
- Sutton F. X. (1954). Achievement norms and the motivation of entrepreneurs, In *Entrepreneurs and Economic Growth*. Cambridge, Mass: Social Science Research Council and Harvard University Research Center in Entrepreneurial History.
- Sutton, J. (1998). *Technology and Market Structure, Theory and History*, Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.
- Swedberg, R. (2000). *Entrepreneurship – The Social Science View*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, V. (1965). Bureaucracy and Innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10: 1-20.
- Timmons, J. A. (1978). Characteristics and role demand of Entrepreneurship, *American Journal of Small Business*, 3, 5-17.
- Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the Waves of Culture*. London: Nicolas Brealey.

- Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P., and Wright, M. (2001). The Focus of Entrepreneurship Research: Contextual and Process Issues. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4, Summer), 57-80.
- Van de Ven, A., Angle, H. L. and Poole, M. S. (1989). *Research on the management of innovation: the Minnesota Studies*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Van de Ven, A., Polley, D., Garud, R. and Venkataraman, S. (1999). *The innovation journey*, Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Vennekers, S., Thurik, R. and Buis, F. (1997). *Entrepreneurship, Economic Growth and what links them together*. Zoetormer: EIM Small Business Research and Consultancy.
- Vernon R. (1963). *The dilemma of Mexico's development*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Vesper, K. H. (1980). *New venture strategies*. Prentice Hall.
- Waldinger, R. D. (1986). A theory of immigrant enterprise. In *Through the Eye of the Needle: Immigrants and Enterprise in New York's Garment Trades*, New York, New York University Press, 19-47, 214-17.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. T. Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner.
- Welsh, J. A., and White, J. F. (1981). Converging on characteristics of Entrepreneurs. In K. H. Vesper, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, Mass: Babson Center for Entrepreneurial Studies, 504-515.
- Whitley, R. (1992). Societies, Firms and Markets: The Social Structuring of Business Systems. In R. Whitley (ed.), *European Business Systems*. London: Sage.
- Whitley, R. (1999). *Divergent Capitalisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winter D. G. (1973). *The Power motive*, New York, Free Press.
- Winter, S. G. (1984). Schumpeterian Competition in Alternative Technological Regimes, *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization*, 5, 287-320.
- Zahra, S. A. (1995). Corporate entrepreneurship and financial performance: The case of management leveraged buyouts. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(3), 225-247.
- Zahra, S. A. (1993). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior: A critique and extension. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Summer, 5-21.
- Zahra, S. A. (1996). Governance, ownership, and corporate entrepreneurship: The moderating impact of industry technological opportunities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6), 1713-1735.
- Zahra, S. A. and Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship- performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10, 43-58.
- Zahra, S. A. and Dess, G. G. (2001). Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research: Encouraging Dialogue and Debate. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 8-10.
- Zappa, G. (1957). *Le produzioni nell'economia delle imprese*, Milano, Giuffrè, 1957.
- Zimmerer, Thomas W., Scarborough, Norman M., Wilson, Doug. (2008). *Essentials of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management : Kewirausahaan dan Manajemen Usaha Kecil (Buku 1) (5th)*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Zook, C., Allen, J. (2001). *Profit From the Core: Growth Strategy in an Era of Turbulence*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University School Press.