

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Hatt, Lucy (2018) Threshold Concepts in Entrepreneurship – the Entrepreneurs' Perspective. *Education + Training*, 60 (2). pp. 155-167. ISSN 0040-0912

Published by: Emerald

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-08-2017-0119> <<https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-08-2017-0119>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/32709/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl



Threshold Concepts in Entrepreneurship – the Entrepreneurs' Perspective

Journal:	<i>Education + Training</i>
Manuscript ID	ET-08-2017-0119.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	threshold concepts, Entrepreneurship education, Delphi, entrepreneur, pedagogical approach, practitioner perspective

Title

Threshold Concepts in Entrepreneurship – the Entrepreneurs’ Perspective

Structured Abstract:

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to present research into the entrepreneurs’ perspective of concepts critical to thinking as an entrepreneur, in order to inform enterprise and entrepreneurship course design in higher education.

Approach: Taking a social constructivist approach, using a Delphi-style method, semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs were conducted, transcribed, thematically coded and analysed, and a list of candidate threshold concepts drawn up. Two rounds of Delphi were conducted with the entrepreneur panel and consensus was reached on a final collection of threshold concepts in entrepreneurship.

Findings: The threshold concepts identified are “I can create value” (or self-efficacy), “I see opportunities” (or opportunity), “I can manage risk” (or risk), “I know what’s important” (or focus) and “I take action” (or impact).

Implications: Entrepreneurship is generally regarded as an important factor in economic growth, and higher education an appropriate place for the development of entrepreneurship. However, there is a lack of consensus regarding how best to educate students for entrepreneurship in higher education or indeed what educating students for entrepreneurship really means. Identifying threshold concepts in entrepreneurship using the lived experience of entrepreneurs is likely to open up new and more effective approaches to teaching this multidisciplinary subject area.

Value: This study contributes to the call for more research-grounded discussion on the quality of entrepreneurship education initiatives, particularly in relation to what makes pedagogical innovations effective by suggesting 5 entrepreneurship threshold concepts. These entrepreneurship threshold concepts can be used to set out a structure for the design and (re)development of enterprise and entrepreneurship curricula, as well as enabling more constructively aligned assessments.

Introduction

Entrepreneurship is an important factor in economic growth according to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (Entrepreneurship Policy Framework and Implementation Guidance, 2012), and higher education is regarded by the UK government at least as an appropriate place for the development of entrepreneurship (QAA, 2012). Most higher education institutions now offer some sort entrepreneurship classes ranging from extracurricular activities, to specialised optional and modules, as well as entire degree programmes. However, there scant evidence of consensus regarding how best to educate students for entrepreneurship in higher education (Pittaway and Cope, 2007) or indeed what educating students for entrepreneurship really means. A general lack of research-grounded discussion on the quality of entrepreneurship education initiatives has also been highlighted (Béchar and Grégoire, 2007), particularly in relation to what makes pedagogical innovations effective.

This paper presents a study which was conducted to gather a consensus of expert opinion on the concepts critical to thinking as an entrepreneur, as part of a doctoral research project using transactional curriculum inquiry (Cousin, 2008) to enhance the quality of entrepreneurship education. The concepts which are critical to thinking as an entrepreneur, and consequently to entrepreneurship, may be termed threshold concepts (Meyer and Land, 2003, Meyer and Land, 2005).

Taking a social constructivist approach, using a Delphi-style method, semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs were conducted, transcribed, thematically coded and analysed, and a list of candidate threshold concepts drawn up. Two further data sets were collected and consensus was reached on 5 entrepreneurship threshold concepts.

Applying threshold concept theory to entrepreneurship education is likely to suggest ways to improve the effectiveness of programmes and modules claiming this specialism. Further stages of this research will gather educator and student perspectives and ultimately findings will enable the recommendation of changes to curricula that are likely to have a positive impact on the quality and effectiveness of entrepreneurship programmes in higher education.

Threshold Concepts

Threshold concepts may be described as ‘conceptual gateways’ or ‘portals’ that lead to previously inaccessible ways of thinking about something – particularly in the context of

1
2
3 academic disciplines (Meyer and Land, 2005). These conceptual gateways may be
4 recognised by their *transformative*, *irreversible* and *integrative* characteristics. In
5 transforming the learner, they change the learner's perceptions, subjectivities and world-
6 view. There is a 'repositioning of the self' (Meyer and Land, 2005); an ontological as well as
7 a conceptual shift. This can often be uncomfortable and is sometimes resisted, so a threshold
8 concept may also be characterised as troublesome. Mastery of a threshold concept
9 simultaneously changes an individual's idea of what they know and who they are (Cousin,
10 2009). Such changes are likely to be irreversible, and are unlikely to be forgotten or
11 unlearned. They are integrative in that they expose how other things can be related to each
12 other. When individuals master threshold concepts, they can see the relationships between
13 other important concepts in the subject discipline. Examples of threshold concepts have
14 included *precedent* in Law, *depreciation* in Accounting, *pain* in Physiology, *irony* in Literary
15 Studies and *entropy* in Physics (Meyer and Land, 2005).

16
17 A threshold concept is also likely to be *bounded* in that 'any conceptual space will have
18 terminal frontiers, bordering with thresholds into new conceptual areas' (Meyer and Land,
19 2006, p. 6). In recognising the threshold concepts in a subject area such as entrepreneurship,
20 individuals appreciate how it is qualitatively different to other subjects areas and disciplines
21 such as Management or Design (Donovan, 2017). A threshold concept can be a form of
22 disciplinary property (Cousin, 2006) and offers a useful way of identifying and distinguishing
23 a discipline, subject, profession or field of study. Land, Meyer & Smith (2008) suggest they
24 may define the boundaries of academic territories. This study presents five entrepreneurship
25 threshold concepts. Further work is indicated to find whether they are, separately or in
26 combination, distinctive to the field and study of entrepreneurship.

27 **Entrepreneurship**

28 Theories of entrepreneurship are full of paradox and uncertainty and necessitate a level of
29 improvisation (Schumpeter, 1934). To add to the complexity, "There are many
30 entrepreneurships in terms of focus, definitions, scopes and paradigms" (Murphy *et al.*,
31 2006). However, if entrepreneurship is to be taught and curricula are to be developed which
32 enable students to understand what it means to think like an entrepreneur, then it would be
33 useful, to say the least, to identify a knowledge base for entrepreneurship.

34 From an economic perspective, entrepreneurship has been conceptualised in terms of
35 financial risk, serving to compensate for discrepancies between supply and demand by
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 buying something cheaply and selling it again at as high a price as possible (Schumpeter,
4 1934). The entrepreneur obtains and distributes resources at his or her own risk, thereby
5 bringing the economy into equilibrium (McClelland, 1967); a type of 'Del Boy Wheeler
6 Dealer' [1] (BBC, 2014) scenario. Gartner (1988) refers to Knight in the 1900's who stated
7 the function of the entrepreneur was to carry the inherent uncertainty within the economy on
8 his shoulders.
9
10
11

12
13 Entrepreneurship can also be regarded purely as an investment alternative, and a mechanism
14 for growing capital. A distinction can be made between people who supply funds and people
15 who create profit (Carland *et al.*, 1988). Pittaway (2005) argued that the entrepreneur in fact
16 bears no risk, instead it is the venture capitalist who allocates the funds to the entrepreneur
17 who bears the uncertainty and risk in the economy. Entrepreneurship therefore can be about
18 the maximisation of return on investment.
19
20
21
22

23 Schumpeter also argued that entrepreneurship is a proactive and creative activity, generating
24 new opportunities and organisations in the economy by combining existing things, and
25 arguably acting as the main source of development in the economy (Schumpeter, 1934).
26 Increasingly, concepts of entrepreneurship have become centred on innovation and the
27 creation of value – where new venture creation is only one of many possible outputs.
28 Entrepreneurship can be regarded as innovation (Schumpeter, 1934) and the act of value
29 creation.
30
31
32
33
34

35 If an entrepreneur is someone who comes up with new ideas, recognises opportunities and
36 translates these into added value for society by assuming the risk of starting a new business
37 (Baron, 1998), then perhaps entrepreneurship can be regarded as anything that an
38 entrepreneur does. However, many would argue that entrepreneurship is not only possible in
39 the context of starting a new business.
40
41
42
43

44 A more holistic conceptualisation of entrepreneurship has also been extended to the human
45 condition; "We are entrepreneurs of the self", (Lazzarato, 2012). Entrepreneurship has thus
46 been used to describe behaviours within corporate contexts (Nielsen *et al.*, 2012) and
47 therefore may not exclusively be about the creation of new and independent organisations.
48 Entrepreneurship can be regarded as being about more than just starting an independent
49 organisation, but a complex phenomenon that occurs in many different contexts, varying in
50 terms of scope, process and output (Nielsen *et al.*, 2012). Entrepreneurship becomes possible
51 for employees, and is thus transformed into the concept of 'intrapreneurship' (Pinchot, 1987).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, others would argue against this conceptualisation as it neglects the extent of
4 personal financial risk normally involved in new venture creation.
5

6 Entrepreneurship has been conceptualised in terms of specific personality traits such as
7 creativity, opportunism and persuasiveness combined with an unusually low level of aversion
8 to uncertainty. These traits may be inherent, developed, or a combination of the two.
9
10 Repeated research attempts have attempted to distinguish those who engage in
11 entrepreneurship through having a particular psychological mentality (Autio, 2007).
12
13
14

15 However, the literature exploring the personality traits of successful entrepreneurs has been
16 challenged on three main fronts. Firstly, the interdependency of traits and the influence of
17 environmental factors has been largely ignored and is challenging or impossible to quantify.
18
19 Secondly, such a wide range of traits have been generated as to render the concept of the
20 characterisation of ‘a successful entrepreneur’ meaningless, and finally, the identification of
21 ‘the entrepreneurial personality’ has not yet been empirically possible (Kolb, 1984). More
22 recently “EntreComp” (Bacigalupo *et al.*, 2016) has been published and is starting to gain
23 traction. This framework sets out 3 competence areas, 15 competencies and 442 learning
24 outcomes, but the extent to its contribution to entrepreneurship education it not yet clear.
25
26 Proponents of Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) regard constructs such as
27 traits and demographics as antecedents of intention, which is seen as a more immediate
28 predictor of behaviour (Kautonen *et al.*, 2013), specifically the intention to start a business
29 translating into actually starting a business.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 If an entrepreneur is defined as anyone practicing entrepreneurship, and anyone practicing
38 entrepreneurship is defined as an entrepreneur; the problem of definition and distinction of an
39 entrepreneur and entrepreneurship is not progressed. This is the basis of the longstanding
40 ‘structure–agency’ debate, and a separation of the individual and the process is indicated.
41
42
43

44 Shane (2000) explains entrepreneurship by considering the nexus of enterprising individuals
45 and valuable opportunities and other researchers have attempted to address these issues by
46 offering theoretical perspectives that combine structure and agency in some form of mutually
47 constitutive duality. Bourdieu (1990) as cited by Mutch (2007), for example, overcomes what
48 he sees as the false antimony between agency and structure, replacing this with a focus on
49 practice. According to these researchers, structure is both the medium and outcome of social
50 practices: instead of being in opposition, structure and agency presuppose each other and are
51 mutually constitutive (Sewell Jr, 1992).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Whichever conceptualisation or combination of conceptualisations one chooses for entrepreneurship; the fact remains that none of them so far tell the whole story. None is sufficient on its own; many people with supposedly entrepreneurial traits have not set up new ventures, and many self-employed people or small business founders do not display an entrepreneurial approach.

Entrepreneurship in Higher Education

Entrepreneurship education, the transformation of universities into entrepreneurial universities and the establishment of corresponding entrepreneurship education ecosystems (EEE), are widely seen as a primary facilitator and catalyst of university collaborations with industry and government, and the source of development frameworks supporting knowledge spillovers boosting startup activity (Belitski and Heron, 2017).

Intention and perceived behavioural control (PBC) can be significant predictors of entrepreneurial behaviour and an increased focus by entrepreneurship educators on developing PBC is gaining increasing ground (Kautonen *et al.*, 2013). More traditional short-term and subjective outcome measures of entrepreneurship education programmes are increasingly seen as insufficient, and there are calls for more novel impact indicators related to mind-set and emotion, such as those related to the intention-to-behaviour transition (Nabi *et al.*, 2017). The importance of theory-based capability development through practise is acknowledged and more research into entrepreneurship education deliver methods focusing on the development of entrepreneurship culture and skills is called for (Belitski and Heron, 2017).

Others highlight the confusion regarding what entrepreneurship education is and what it aims to accomplish and suggest part of the solution might be to make the design of such programmes more explicit and to contextualise the components of the associated outcomes, objectives, assessment and pedagogy (Maritz and Brown, 2013, Nabi *et al.*, 2017, Maritz, 2017).

Focusing on the distinctive ways in which entrepreneurs think and practice is particularly appealing in an educational context notwithstanding the many challenges this approach presents to the educator. Threshold concept theory offers a means of distilling the essence of entrepreneurship in a way that may be usefully applied in an educational context and is the focus of the research presented here.

The Delphi Method

It is argued that a shared understanding of threshold concepts is critical and therefore a level of consensus, such as that achieved by the Delphi method, is invaluable to the identification of threshold concepts in any field or discipline (Barradell, 2013). The term “Delphi” has been extended over the years to cover a wide variety of types of group interaction (Linstone and Turoff, 1975). Most involve a group where the goal of the exercise is information (i.e. the exercise is an inquiry), the information being sought is uncertain the minds of the group and some pre-formulated systematic procedure is followed to obtaining a group output

A way of gathering expert opinion, it is a type of remote group interview or focus group where the participants are aware of the perspectives of each other but are not aware of which participant has which perspective. The intention is that participants are influenced by each other’s perspectives according to the content and not the author. Opinion is gathered over several rounds interspersed with controlled feedback until the results become stable or consensus is achieved. A number of studies concerned with entrepreneurship have used the Delphi method to collect research data (Amos and Pearse, 2008, Gartner, 1990, Morris *et al.*, 2013, Robles and Zárraga-Rodríguez, 2015).

The Delphi method typically uses one panel with a number of rounds (Amos and Pearse, 2008). The researcher alternates between discovering and interpreting the data with the aim of approaching a consensus of opinion which is more informed and sophisticated than any of the preceding constructions including that of the researcher (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

The main advantage of the method is that it allows the heterogeneity of the participants to be preserved assuring greater validity of results, as the group is not open to domination by quantity or by strength of personality from any particular individual or group of individuals (Linstone and Turoff, 1975).

The approach for this study

This research adopts a constructivist paradigm where many realities are constructed from social and experiential bases that are local and specific in nature. The aim of this inquiry, adapted from Guba and Lincoln (1994), therefore is to understand and reconstruct concepts that are critical to thinking as an entrepreneur regarding reality as relative and socially constructed.

1
2
3 A three stage Delphi-inspired method was used to identify and obtain expert consensus on
4 entrepreneurship threshold concepts. The first stage consisted of semi-structured
5 interviews conducted with expert entrepreneurs. The aim of the interviews was to answer the
6 overarching research question, “What does it mean to think as an entrepreneur?” 23
7 individuals were approached to participate in the interview stage. 17 agreed to participate
8 and interviews of around 40 minutes were conducted and transcribed (9 were conducted face
9 to face and 8 over the telephone). 12 participated in the 2nd round and 10 contributed to the
10 3rd and final consensus round. For additional context four other individuals with relevant
11 experience (non-entrepreneurs) were also interviewed, including an expert in venture capital,
12 two founders of smaller businesses and an expert in entrepreneurship education.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 A purposive sample of entrepreneurs was identified from the membership records of the
20 Entrepreneurs’ Forum (2017). The Entrepreneurs’ Forum is a members’ organisation in the
21 North East of England dedicated to helping their members develop, create new opportunities
22 and grow their businesses (2017). All members are owner/managers of businesses who work
23 full-time on their business, which must have an annual turnover in excess of £250,000.
24 Further participants were introduced by individuals in the initial participant set, in a snowball
25 fashion. Two additional participants were known personally by the author and served to pilot
26 the research communication and interview questions.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The criteria for the sample of expert entrepreneurs was adapted from research by Sarasvathy
34 (2008) who defined an expert entrepreneur as “a person who, either individually or working
35 as part of a team, had founded one or more companies, remained a full time
36 founder/entrepreneur for 10 years or more, and participated in taking at least one company
37 public”.
38
39
40
41

42 Target participants were chosen who satisfied the first two criteria and whose company had
43 reached a significant turnover (over £2m) and employed over 20 people. Ultimately the third
44 criterion of company floatation was not applied, as the consensus of the participating expert
45 entrepreneurs was that floatation was not necessarily the only reliable indication of business
46 success, and was not generally regarded as the ultimate goal for every business. The
47 turnovers of the companies founded by the respondents ranged from £2.4m to £1.3bn and 5
48 had publically floated the companies they had founded.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Many other people who do not comply with the criteria set out here may also be argued to be
4 entrepreneurs, or even expert entrepreneurs, but it would be hard to argue that any individual
5 complying with the criteria set out above was not an expert entrepreneur.
6
7

8 A list of nine candidate threshold concepts together with brief descriptors was developed
9 from the interview data using NVIVO10 software. Thematic analysis was combined with
10 grounded theory and a social constructivist approach. Interview data were treated as stories
11 and narratives through which the interviewees described their world and not as “potentially
12 ‘true’ pictures of ‘reality’” (Silverman, 2013). The aim was to generate threshold concepts
13 that served as hypotheses theoretically describing the constructs in every sentence. The
14 interview transcripts were coded according to particular themes, which emerged on reading
15 and re-reading them, line by line. Coding and analysis were conducted hand in hand in a
16 cyclical fashion, recognising that they are related but separate activities (Saldaña, 2009). The
17 process of coding lead from the data to the idea and from the idea to all the data pertaining to
18 the idea (Richards and Morse, 2007). A large number of themes were developed quickly at
19 first, and then as more transcripts were coded, the number of themes plateaued, indicating
20 that saturation had been reached. At the same time, the themes were also gradually grouped
21 together in families from which the candidate threshold concepts emerged. For example,
22 “Focus” included the themes of “persuasive”, “prioritisation”, “seeing the big picture”,
23 “stubborn” and “vision”. Candidate threshold concepts were developed which highlighted
24 patterns in the data and attempted to explain why the patterns were there in the first place.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Once the candidate threshold concepts had been developed, the panel was asked to rate each
37 candidate threshold concept (and descriptor) according to *how important they felt it was to*
38 *thinking as an entrepreneur*, using online survey software (Bristol Online Survey). They
39 were also asked to rank the candidate threshold concepts according to their importance to
40 thinking as an entrepreneur, and also according to how much they differentiated between
41 thinking as an entrepreneur, and not thinking as an entrepreneur. Responses were analysed
42 and slight modifications were made to the descriptors of two of the candidate threshold
43 concepts as a result. At this rating stage, the online questionnaire was sent to 16 of the
44 interviewees (the expert in entrepreneurship education was not invited to participate) asking
45 them to rate each candidate threshold concept in terms of importance to thinking as an
46 entrepreneur. 15 responded, 3 of which were excluded as the respondents did not strictly
47 comply with the definition of expert entrepreneur being used here, to ensure an homogenous
48 sample.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The third and final stage of the process was conducted via email. The collated perspective of
4 the panel was shared from the second stage – however it seemed inappropriate to ask the
5 panel to repeat the previous exercise, with the only difference being knowledge of the group
6 response. Little comment has been made on the required levels of tolerance of a Delphi
7 panel. Repeatedly being asked the same question, albeit with new information regarding how
8 everybody else answered it last time could become tiresome, especially for respondents with
9 strongly held opinions that are relatively fixed and not easily influenced by others, as was
10 likely in this case. It was also difficult to see how any consensus could be claimed that was
11 not in fact unanimity in participant ranking. Consequently, in the final round, the panel were
12 asked to indicate if they thought each candidate threshold concept was critical to thinking as
13 an entrepreneur. 10 responses were received at this final stage.

21 Consensus is generally regarded to be broad agreement, a collective opinion, a shared view.
22 Keeney, Hasson & McKenna (2011) discuss a “level of consensus” in a Delphi, implying that
23 unanimity is not required. They point out that the definition of an acceptable level of
24 consensus is contentious and is often an arbitrary figure which is not stated at all in many
25 studies. With this in mind participants were asked to vote on the candidate threshold concepts
26 in the final round and consensus was defined as >80% agreement.

31 **Findings**

32
33
34 An initial set of nine candidate threshold concepts were developed from the 17 interviews
35 conducted (Table 1).

36
37
38 *[Insert Table 1 here]*

39
40 16 participants were asked to rate these 9 concepts in terms of importance to thinking as an
41 entrepreneur (Table 2), and rank them in terms of importance (Table 3) and also in terms of
42 how well they differentiated thinking as an entrepreneur from not thinking as an entrepreneur
43 (Table 4).

44
45
46
47 *[Insert Table 2 here]*

48
49
50 *[Insert Table 3 here]*

51
52
53 *[Insert Table 4 here]*

54 All 9 candidate threshold concepts were rated as at least ‘important’ to thinking as an
55 entrepreneur by the majority of the participants, but it was difficult to judge whether or not
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 any consensus had been achieved. Agreement was even less apparent in the ranked
4 responses. Consensus could be claimed for Focus being important to thinking as an
5 entrepreneur (ranked in the top 4 by 10 of the 12 respondents) and Business Fundamentals
6 being less important to thinking as an entrepreneur (ranked in the bottom 4 by 11 of the 12
7 respondents.)
8
9

10
11 Little consensus was apparent when asked to distinguished between thinking as an
12 entrepreneur from not thinking as an entrepreneur, with the exception of 11 of the 12
13 respondents ranking Business Fundamentals in the bottom 4 for this property
14
15

16
17 In the final Delphi round, the panel was asked to indicate which of the 9 concepts were
18 critical to thinking as an entrepreneur. 10 responses (from 12) were received (Table 5).
19

20
21 *[Insert Table 5 here]*
22

23 It was judged that consensus had been reached for five of the nine candidate threshold
24 concepts, with at least 9 of the 10 respondents indicating these were critical to thinking as an
25 entrepreneur. These were Self-Efficacy, Opportunity, Risk, Focus, and Impact. The
26 following section illustrates these with interview quotes.
27
28

29 30 **Entrepreneurship Threshold Concepts**

31
32 *Self-Efficacy – “I can create value”*
33

34 The threshold concept of Self-efficacy is about being attracted to challenges and thinking “I
35 can do this” whilst being highly self-aware, self-controlled and conscious of one’s own
36 strengths and weaknesses. One respondent summarised it like this,
37
38

39
40 *“...you don’t want an easy ride, because that would be boring.”*
41

42
43 *(Transcript 10)*
44

45 Mistakes are regarded as an important way of learning, and par for the course.
46

47 *“You’ve also got to grasp the concept, and this is where I would define a good*
48 *entrepreneur is somebody who does not recognise failure. And what I mean by that is*
49 *that you may not succeed, but you see that as something different. So my, what would*
50 *seem to the world, say, at times my failures, I, I don’t see them as fail-, I may be, I*
51 *may hurt at the time that they happen...and I feel all the pain of failure...but I quickly*
52 *get engaged in a dialogue that says, “Well, that’s a learning experience.”*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Transcript 7)

Self-efficacy is also concerned with self-confidence, almost to the point of arrogance and a level of self-knowledge that is deep enough to acknowledge important limitations, but not so deep as to inhibit risk taking.

“I mean overwhelmingly we tend to look at everything and go “we could do that better” Doesn’t matter what it is actually!”

(Transcript 14)

Opportunity – “I see opportunities”

The threshold concept of Opportunity is about seeing commercial potential where others do not.

“You join dots. You know, you see connections. You see, you see your own pathways that other people just don’t see.”

(Transcript 7)

Is also involves a strong desire to change the status quo.

“There’s definitely that desire to change, to want to do things differently and to be the person that thinks they’re the ones that can do it. I think you also have to have a certain level of dissatisfaction about just the general status quo all the time, I guess it ties in to wanting to change things but I get irritated when...I think I mean I look for solutions to things all the time.”

(Transcript 14)

Risk – “I understand the risks”

The threshold concept of Risk is about understanding risk as an inherent part of pursuing any potential opportunity, and something not to be avoided but perhaps even sought out.

“So every spare penny we ever had, and in fact quite a lot of money we didn’t have, we used to put into growing and scaling up as quickly as possible.”

(Transcript 14)

1
2
3 *“I have a high propensity for risk, even to the point where, I’m uncomfortable when*
4 *I’m comfortable.”*

5
6 (Transcript 7)
7
8

9 Risk also involves being discerning regarding potential opportunities, but also having faith in
10 your own decisions, trusting your gut and not needing to have all the detail,
11

12
13 *“But I do think that a very sort of rigid approach and very analytical approach to, to*
14 *things probably isn’t the obvious characteristic of an entrepreneur because they will*
15 *do, you know, those kind of people will do things logically, they’ll do lots of analysis*
16 *and, again, to use those dreadful phrases, you get paralysis by analysis. You need*
17 *someone who says, “Yeah, yeah, I know all of that, but...””*
18
19

20
21
22 (Transcript 6)
23
24
25

26
27 *Focus – “I know what’s important”*
28

29 The threshold concept of Focus is about making choices and perhaps turning away from other
30 attractive opportunities as explained here,
31

32
33 *“...you realise you know years on, that actually being very focussed and not straying*
34 *is a key asset...there’s always that desire to break out and try and do more, go off and*
35 *do other things at the same time as running your business, your core business...And*
36 *whilst you might think it’s entrepreneurial to go and sort of try to do other things or,*
37 *or tangential things along the way, actually - don’t.”*
38
39

40
41
42 (Transcript 13)
43

44 In the context of Focus, it is important to have a clear vision and passionately, and perhaps
45 stubbornly, drive towards it.
46

47
48 *“I think an entrepreneur is somebody who, as I said before, has a vision for*
49 *something that can be, that they can do... and perhaps something that you see a real*
50 *opportunity and you think, “I can do that better than somebody else. I can make a*
51 *real success of that. I can gather a team of people around me to deliver that” and*
52 *they’ve got the drive and determination to make it work because failure is not an*
53 *option. You know, you have to succeed or, you know, the business will, will fold.”*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Transcript 9)

Effective prioritisation is also an important component of Focus,

“I learned how to, you know, cut through the crap basically and sort of, you know, just sort of spend time on what was important.”

(Transcript 15)

as well as the ability to quickly see the big picture:

“One of the things a lot of entrepreneurs are very quick, they’re not as some people think, they’re not kind of salesmen or somebody trying to do a quick turn or a quick deal or do something very, very quick, you just do it. Most entrepreneurs that I know that are really successful are able to take in the whole world view whether that’s the environment that’s round and about you, the people that are working for you, the customers, quite a lot of different things, but just to be able to take that whole view into account very, very quickly, and they can see themselves and their business decisions in the context of the local economy, the place in which they work, the market place in which they work, the wider economy, other things going on around about in a different that may influence the consumer. They can see all those different things going on but they get that big world picture very, very quickly. I, I find that that’s something that I’ve got a, a knack of doing and not everybody else can...”

(Transcript 8)

The final aspect of Focus is its all absorbing nature.

“Just that incredible sort of consistency of dedication to the whole thing. You know, you just never let it drop, you never relax, you never, you know, you don’t ever stop doing what you’re trying to do really. It’s, it’s kind of, it’s what drives you, sort of thing.”

(Transcript 5)

Impact – “I take action”

Finally, the threshold concept of Impact is about making things happen and taking action.

“And I think an entrepreneur is someone who – really important – doesn’t think about the consequences because if you start to think about it too much, you don’t do it, and

1
2
3 *that is **the most**, for me, defining thing about an entrepreneur. And the second thing –*
4 *it's strange to say it's second, but I think it's really important – is that you then do it.*
5 *You don't delay by a day. You don't delay by a week. You just absolutely do it.”*
6
7

8 *(Transcript 10)*
9

10
11 To summarise, when an individual has understood the threshold concepts of Focus, Self-
12 efficacy, Risk, Opportunity and Impact, they will also understand what it means to think like
13 an entrepreneur.
14

15 16 17 **Conclusions** 18

19
20 In this paper, ways in which entrepreneurs think have been explored and, using thematic
21 coding and a Delphi-style method with a panel of expert entrepreneurs; five threshold
22 concepts have been identified that could be distinctive to entrepreneurship; Self-Efficacy,
23 Opportunity, Risk, Focus, and Impact. It remains to be seen if they are bounded and distinct;
24 and not simply a list of activities entrepreneurs (and others) may engage in, or competencies
25 that entrepreneurs (and others) demonstrate.
26
27

28
29
30 Further research is indicated to explore the generalisability of these findings, and
31 applicability to entrepreneurs in different countries, industries, etc. It is acknowledged in
32 addition that there are many types of entrepreneurship where other or additional threshold
33 concepts might be pertinent, for example in technological areas where turnover can be
34 significantly affected by time lags.
35
36
37

38
39 Threshold concepts in any discipline or multidisciplinary subject area are important to
40 educators and trainers in developing enterprising and pedagogical approaches, and it is hoped
41 that those identified here will contribute to the process of clarifying what educating students
42 for entrepreneurship really means. Entrepreneurship threshold concepts can be used to set
43 out a structure for the design and (re)development of enterprise and entrepreneurship
44 curricula, as well as enabling more constructively aligned assessments.
45
46
47

48
49 Conceptual and teaching and learning frameworks and models for EEP are becoming more
50 widely adopted (Maritz, 2017, Nabi *et al.*, 2017) and mainstream approaches to
51 entrepreneurship education are attracting increasing criticism for failures to evidence
52 measurable and meaningful impact across contexts (Rae, 2004). There is significant potential
53 for new and novel approaches that promote learner transformation, perceived behavioural
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 control, intention-behaviour transitions, entrepreneurial learning and identity formation.
4 Consequently, the development of entrepreneurship threshold concepts to support the
5 development of a holistic practice based theory of entrepreneurial learning is worthy of
6 serious consideration.
7
8

9
10 [1] Only Fools and Horses is a British television situation comedy originally broadcast from 1981 to 1991. One
11 of the lead characters is Derek “Del Boy” Trotter; a fast-talking, archetypal South London 'fly' trader, willing to
12 sell anything to anyone to make money.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Education + Training

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 179-211.
- 6
7
8 Amos, T. & Pearce, N. (2008), "Pragmatic research design: An illustration of the use of the Delphi technique", *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 95-102.
- 9
10
11
12 Autio, E. (2007), *Entrepreneurship teaching in the Öresund and Copenhagen regions*, Greenhouse+, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark.
- 13
14
15 Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P., Punie, Y. & Van den Brande, G. (2016), *EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework*, Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- 16
17
18
19 Baron, R. A. (1998), "Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 275-294.
- 20
21
22
23 Barradell, S. (2013), "The identification of threshold concepts: A review of theoretical complexities and methodological challenges", *Higher Education*, Vol. 65 No. 2, pp. 265-276.
- 24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- BBC (2014), *Only fools - Peckham Uncovered* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/comedy/onlyfools/uncovered/derek.shtml> (accessed 11 August 2016).
- Béchar, J-P. & Grégoire, D. (2007), "Archetypes of pedagogical innovation for entrepreneurship in higher education: Model and illustrations", in *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education: A General Perspective*, Vol. 1, pp. 261-284.
- Belitski, M. & Heron, K. (2017), "Expanding entrepreneurship education ecosystems", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 163-177.
- Carland, J. W., Carland, J., Hoy, F. & Boulton, W. R. (1988), "Distinctions between entrepreneurial and small business ventures", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp 98-103.
- Cousin, G. (2006), "An introduction to threshold concepts", *Planet*, Vol. 17 No.1, pp. 4 -5.
- Cousin, G. (2008), *Strategies for Researching Learning in Higher Education: An Introduction to Contemporary Methods and Approaches*, Routledge Ltd., Oxford.
- Cousin, G. (2009), *Researching learning in higher education*, Routledge Ltd., Oxford.
- Donovan, P. (2017), "A Threshold Concept in Managing: What Students in Introductory Management Courses Must Know", *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. 835 – 851.
- Entrepreneurs' Forum. (2017), *About Us - Entrepreneurs' Forum* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.entrepreneursforum.net/about-us> (accessed 19 April 2017).
- Entrepreneurship Policy Framework and Implementation Guidance. (2012), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, New York and Geneva.

- 1
2
3 Gartner, W. B. (1988), “‘Who is an Entrepreneur?’ Is the Wrong Question”,
4 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 11 – 32.
- 5
6 Gartner, W. B. (1990), “What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship?”,
7 *Journal of Business venturing*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 15-28.
- 8
9 Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994), “Competing paradigms in qualitative research”, in
10 *Handbook of qualitative research*, Vol. 2, pp. 105 - 117.
- 11
12 Kautonen, T., Van Gelderen, M. & Tornikoski, E. T. (2013), “Predicting entrepreneurial
13 behaviour: a test of the theory of planned behaviour”, *Applied Economics*, Vol. 45
14 No. 6 , pp. 697-707.
- 15
16 Keeney, S., Hasson, F. & McKenna, H. (2011), *The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health
17 Research*, Wiley-Blackwell, UK.
- 18
19 Kolb, D. A. (1984), *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and
20 Development*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- 21
22 Land, R., Meyer, J.H.F. & Smith, J. (2008), *Threshold concepts within the disciplines*, Sense
23 Publishers, Rotterdam.
- 24
25 Lazzarato, M. (2012), *The making of the indebted man: An essay on the neoliberal condition*.
26 Semiotexte, distributed by MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA & London, UK.
- 27
28 Linstone, H. A. & Turoff, M. (1975), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*,
29 Addison-Wesley Reading, MA, USA.
- 30
31 Maritz, A. (2017), “Illuminating the black box of entrepreneurship education programmes:
32 Part 2”, *Education + Training*, Vol. 59 No. 5, pp. 471-482.
- 33
34 Maritz, A. & Brown, C. R. (2013), “Illuminating the black box of entrepreneurship education
35 programs”, *Education + Training*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 234-252.
- 36
37 McClelland, D. C. (1961), *The Achieving Society*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ, USA.
- 38
39 Meyer, J. & Land, R. (2003), “Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (1) -
40 Linkages to ways of thinking and practising”, in *Improving Student Learning - 10
41 years on*, C. Rust (Ed), OCSLD, Oxford.
- 42
43 Meyer, J. & Land, R. (2005), “Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2):
44 Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and
45 learning”, *Higher Education*, Vol. 49 No 3, pp. 373-388.
- 46
47 Morris, M. H., Webb, J. W., Fu, J. & Singhal, S. (2013), “A Competency-Based Perspective
48 on Entrepreneurship Education: Conceptual and Empirical Insights”, *Journal of Small
49 Business Management*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 352-369.
- 50
51 Murphy, P. J., Liao, J. & Welsch, H. P. (2006), “A conceptual history of entrepreneurial
52 thought”, *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 12-35.
- 53
54 Mutch, A. (2007), “Reflexivity and the Institutional Entrepreneur: A Historical Exploration”,
55 *Organization Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 1123-1140.
- 56
57 Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N. & Walmsley, A. (2017), “The impact of
58 entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research
59
60

- 1
2
3 agenda”, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 277-
4 299.
- 5
6 Nielsen, S. L., Klyver, K., Evald, M. R. & Bager, T. (2012), *Entrepreneurship in theory and*
7 *practice: Paradoxes in Play*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, Cheltenham.
- 8
9 Pinchot, G. (1987), “Innovation through intrapreneuring”, *Research management*, Vol. 30
10 No. 2, pp. 14-19.
- 11
12 Pittaway, L. (2005), “Philosophies in entrepreneurship: a focus on economic theories”,
13 *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp.
14 201-221.
- 15
16 Pittaway, L. & Cope, J. (2007), “Entrepreneurship education: a systematic review of the
17 evidence”, *International small business journal*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 479-510.
- 18
19 QAA (2012), *Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education. Guidance for UK Higher*
20 *Education Providers*, The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, London.
- 21
22 Rae, D. (2004), “Entrepreneurial learning: a practical model from the creative industries”,
23 *Education+ Training*, Vol. 46 No. 8/9, pp. 492-500.
- 24
25 Richards, L. & Morse, J. M. (2007), *Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*,
26 Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- 27
28 Robles, L. & Zárraga-Rodríguez, M. (2015), “Key Competencies for Entrepreneurship”,
29 *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 23, pp. 828-832.
- 30
31 Saldaña, J. (2009), *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, SAGE Publications Ltd,
32 London.
- 33
34 Sarasvathy, S. D. (2008), *Effectuation. Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise*, Edward Elgar
35 Publishing Ltd, Cheltenham.
- 36
37 Schumpeter, J. A. (1934), *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits,*
38 *capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*, Transaction publishers, NJ, USA.
- 39
40 Sewell Jr, W. H. (1992), “A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation”,
41 *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 98 No. 1, pp. 1-29.
- 42
43 Shane, S. A. (2000), *A general theory of entrepreneurship: the individual-opportunity nexus*,
44 Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, Cheltenham.
- 45
46 Silverman, D. (2013), *Doing Qualitative Research*, SAGE Publications Ltd, London.
- 47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Initial set of nine candidate entrepreneurship threshold concepts drawn from interview data.

Self-Efficacy	Self-efficacy is about thinking "I can do this" whilst being highly self-aware, self-controlled and conscious of one's own strengths and weaknesses. It is about accepting mistakes as part of learning, and always being interested in knowing more.
Focus	Focus is about making choices, having a clear vision and passionately driving towards it. It implies effective prioritisation, appropriate delegation and never switching off. Focus means intense, single-minded determination.
Deviance	Deviance is about being unconsciously unconventional, able to resist the pressure to conform or do what family and society expect. It implies a degree of strong mindedness and can sometimes be perceived as being difficult or arrogant.
Risk	Risk is regarded as a sign of a potential opportunity, something to be understood - even sought out - rather than necessarily avoided. It implies quick wits, requires discernment and is not reckless.
Opportunity	Opportunity is about seeing commercial potential where others do not. It is associated with intuition, making patterns and connections. It implies future orientation and a focus on possibilities for improvement.
Impact	Impact is about making things happen and taking action on a grand scale combined with a sense of urgency and a desire to make a difference. It requires courage and implies a degree of compulsion.
Work	Work is not a distinct bounded set of activities, but integral to and indistinguishable from living and playing. It implies incredible effort invested by choice which is intrinsically motivated.
Team	An effective team is prerequisite to success. Team is about knowing that the team can do more than the collection of individuals combined, not feeling threatened by the capabilities of others, but seeking out others more able than you.
Business Fundamentals	Having fundamental knowledge in sale and marketing, finance and human resources.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Education + Training

Table 2. Participant rating of initial set of 9 candidate entrepreneurship threshold concepts.

Importance to thinking as an entrepreneur	not related	little relevance	some relevance	important	critical
Focus				2	10
Risk				3	9
Opportunity				3	9
Self-Efficacy			1	3	8
Impact			1	4	7
Work			2	4	6
Team		1	1	4	6
Business Fundamentals		1	5	3	3
Deviance			5	5	2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3. Participant ranking of initial set of 9 candidate entrepreneurship threshold concepts in terms of importance to thinking as an entrepreneur.

	Top 4	Bottom 4
Self-Efficacy	7	4
Focus	10	0
Deviance	4	8
Risk	6	4
Opportunity	6	5
Impact	4	5
Work	4	7
Team	6	4
Business Fundamentals	1	11

Education + Training

Table 4. Participant ranking of initial set of 9 candidate entrepreneurship threshold concepts in terms of how well they distinguish between thinking as an entrepreneur from not thinking as an entrepreneur.

	Top 4	Bottom 4
Self-Efficacy	7	4
Focus	8	2
Deviance	3	6
Risk	8	3
Opportunity	9	1
Impact	5	6
Work	5	6
Team	2	9
Business Fundamentals	1	11

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 5. Participant voting on initial set of 9 candidate entrepreneurship threshold concepts in terms whether they are critical or not to thinking as an entrepreneur.

<i>Critical to thinking as an entrepreneur</i>	YES	NO
Focus	10	0
Self-Efficacy	9	1
Risk	9	1
Opportunity	9	1
Impact	9	1
Deviance	7	3
Work	6	4
Team	6	4
Business Fundamentals	5	5

Education + Training