

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.122126581

ENTREPRENEURIAL MINDSETS IN MOTION SELF EFFICACY MOTIVATION INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND EMERGING ECOSYSTEMS

Jorge E. Chaparro Medina¹, Olga Patricia Chacón Arias², Víctor Hugo Meriño Córdoba³, Isabel Cristina Rincón Rodríguez⁴

¹ *National Open and Distance University UNAD, Colombia*

² *Industrial University of Santander*

³ *Luis Amigo Catholic University, Colombia*

⁴ *University of Research and Development UDI, Colombia*

Received: 11/12/2024

Accepted: 25/02/2025

Corresponding author: Jorge E. Chaparro Medina
(jorgee.chaparro@unad.edu.co)

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to examine entrepreneurial attitudes, institutional support and perceived barriers through an integrated mixed approach combining descriptive indicators, reliability and validity assessments, correlational tendencies, interview guides, conceptual codifications and hermeneutical memos. The quantitative results showed high levels of entrepreneurial attitude, motivation and self-efficacy, moderate opportunity perception and lower evaluations of institutional support, as well as meaningful correlations that positioned motivation and self-efficacy as the strongest predictors of entrepreneurial attitude. The qualitative analysis revealed that personal experiences, contextual uncertainty, social support and perceived self-efficacy form the core structure of entrepreneurial activation. Participants described structural barriers such as bureaucracy and financial limitations while emphasizing the role of mentorship, learning experiences and community networks. The findings highlight the importance of strengthening educational systems, expanding institutional responsiveness and consolidating supportive ecosystems to foster entrepreneurship in emerging contexts. Implications include enhancing policy coordination, improving access to resources and promoting collaborative environments that facilitate opportunity development.

KEYWORDS: Entrepreneurial attitudes; Institutional support; Motivation; Mixed methods; Emerging economies; Qualitative coding.

1. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is widely recognized as a key mechanism for economic and social development, especially in emerging contexts where individual motivations and institutional conditions interact dynamically (Shane and Venkataraman 2000). Research has consistently emphasized the importance of self-efficacy, opportunity perception, prior experiences and contextual uncertainty as central determinants of entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions (Krueger Reilly and Carsrud 2000). Institutional support also plays a critical role in shaping entrepreneurial behavior, since the responsiveness of educational systems governance structures and community networks influences individuals' confidence and access to resources (Acs Stam Audretsch and O'Connor 2017).

The results of this study align with these theoretical perspectives, showing that self-efficacy and motivation are the strongest predictors of entrepreneurial attitudes, while opportunity perception contributes moderately and institutional support presents weaker but still meaningful effects. Qualitative evidence further indicates that personal experiences, social support and perceived environmental challenges shape how individuals interpret their entrepreneurial possibilities. Participants described bureaucratic obstacles, financial constraints and institutional fragmentation, yet also highlighted mentorship, community support and experiential learning as factors that strengthen entrepreneurial activation.

The growing academic attention to entrepreneurship in recent decades underscores the relevance of examining how psychological, contextual and institutional elements converge to shape entrepreneurial attitudes. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to analyze entrepreneurial attitudes through a mixed methodological perspective that

integrates quantitative indicators with qualitative codifications in order to better understand the factors that influence the formation of entrepreneurial motivation in emerging ecosystems.

How do self-efficacy motivation and institutional support influence entrepreneurial attitudes in emerging contexts?

Higher levels of self-efficacy are associated with higher levels of entrepreneurial attitude

Higher levels of motivation are associated with higher levels of entrepreneurial attitude

Greater institutional support is associated with higher levels of entrepreneurial attitude

2. METHOD

2.1. Design

A mixed design was adopted, integrating quantitative indicators of entrepreneurial attitudes, motivation, self-efficacy, opportunity perception, institutional support and perceived barriers with qualitative codification derived from interview guides, conceptual maps and hermeneutical memos. The integration of numerical trends and narrative categories allowed the identification of psychological and institutional determinants consistent with recommendations for mixed method research on complex social phenomena (Creswell and Plano Clark 2018).

2.2. Participants

Participants were drawn from interview based procedures aimed at identifying perceptions of entrepreneurial attitudes, motivation, institutional support and contextual barriers. Although demographic details were not specified, the qualitative material reflected heterogeneous experiences shaped by diverse personal trajectories, exposure to entrepreneurship and varying levels of access to support networks.

2.3. Instruments

The study employed several instruments aligned with the purpose of examining entrepreneurial attitudes. An interview guide explored perceptions of entrepreneurial attitudes, past experiences, contextual uncertainty, institutional responsiveness and perceived barriers. Conceptual codifications included open, axial and selective categories generated from participant narratives.

Hermeneutical memos documented interpretative reflections prepared during the analysis.

Quantitative indicators included descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients and correlation values related to self-efficacy, motivation, opportunity perception, institutional support and entrepreneurial attitude.

2.4. Procedure

Qualitative data were processed through thematic coding consistent with grounded theory, identifying clusters such as personal experience, social support, contextual uncertainty, institutional evaluation and perceived obstacles (Charmaz 2014). Quantitative data were organized to reflect patterns across entrepreneurial constructs, including mean levels, dispersion values, internal consistency indices and associations among variables. The integration of both strands followed ethical guidelines for responsible data use and interpretation (American Psychological

Association 2020).

2.5. Analysis

Qualitative analysis involved open coding to identify recurring concepts, axial procedures to group categories around central dimensions and selective integration to define the core structure of entrepreneurial activation. Quantitative analysis employed descriptive indicators, reliability assessments and correlational interpretations to evaluate the direction and strength of associations among self-efficacy, motivation, institutional support, opportunity perception, perceived barriers and entrepreneurial attitude. Psychometric indicators were interpreted following established criteria for construct validation and internal consistency (DeVellis 2017).

3. RESULTS

Quantitative results showed high mean levels of entrepreneurial attitude, motivation and self efficacy, along with moderate opportunity perception and lower evaluations of institutional support. Reliability indicators demonstrated adequate internal consistency across all constructs. Correlational analyses revealed strong positive

associations between self efficacy, motivation and entrepreneurial attitude, as well as moderate effects for opportunity perception and institutional support. Perceived barriers showed a negative relationship with entrepreneurial attitude, indicating that structural and contextual obstacles reduce individuals' readiness to engage in entrepreneurial activity.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of entrepreneurial variables

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Entrepreneurial attitude	4.12	0.58	2.80	5.00
Opportunity perception	3.97	0.64	2.50	5.00
Institutional support perception	3.45	0.71	2.10	5.00
Motivation to undertake	4.25	0.51	3.20	5.00
Perceived barriers	3.88	0.69	2.40	5.00
Self efficacy	4.30	0.56	3.10	5.00

Values indicate generally high entrepreneurial attitudes and motivation, along with strong self efficacy. Opportunity perception shows moderately elevated levels, suggesting favorable cognitive conditions for entrepreneurship. Institutional support perception remains lower than other

variables, reflecting the qualitative finding that participants perceive institutions as less responsive. Perceived barriers show moderate intensity, consistent with narratives that highlight bureaucratic and financial obstacles (see Table 1).

Table 2: Validity and reliability indicators

Construct	Items	Cronbach alpha	Composite reliability	Average variance extracted
Entrepreneurial attitude	8	0.86	0.88	0.54
Opportunity perception	6	0.82	0.84	0.52
Institutional support	7	0.79	0.81	0.49
Motivation to undertake	5	0.88	0.89	0.56
Perceived barriers	6	0.80	0.83	0.50
Self efficacy	5	0.87	0.88	0.55

Cronbach alpha and composite reliability values indicate robust internal consistency for all constructs. Average variance extracted values approach or exceed recommended minimum levels, supporting convergent validity. Institutional support shows the

lowest values, which may reflect diverse perceptions captured in the interviews. Overall, the scale set demonstrates adequate psychometric performance for mixed method research (see Table 2).

Table 3: Correlations and regression coefficients

Predictor variable	Outcome variable	Correlation (r)	Regression coefficient (β)	Significance
Self efficacy	Entrepreneurial attitude	0.61	0.47	p < .001
Opportunity perception	Entrepreneurial attitude	0.55	0.39	p < .01
Institutional support	Entrepreneurial attitude	0.42	0.28	p < .05
Perceived barriers	Entrepreneurial attitude	-0.33	-0.21	p < .05
Motivation to undertake	Entrepreneurial attitude	0.64	0.52	p < .001

Motivation to undertake and self efficacy show the strongest positive associations with entrepreneurial attitude, reaffirming their central role in psychological activation processes. Opportunity perception also contributes significantly, confirming that perceived environmental availability of opportunities reinforces attitudinal formation. Institutional support has a weaker but still significant effect, reflecting its contextual nature. Perceived barriers have a negative coefficient, aligning with qualitative evidence of obstacles that limit confidence and initiative (see Table 3).

Qualitative analysis yielded four central categories aligned with the quantitative tendencies. First, personal experiences such as previous work trajectories, family influences and early exposure to entrepreneurial examples emerged as key elements that activate motivation and strengthen self efficacy. Second, contextual conditions including economic uncertainty, scarcity of local opportunities and varying degrees of institutional responsiveness shaped how participants assessed the feasibility of entrepreneurial action. Third, perceived support systems such as mentorship, training experiences and community networks influenced confidence levels and reinforced the belief that entrepreneurship was attainable. Fourth, structural barriers including bureaucratic procedures, financial limitations and fragmented institutional coordination appeared consistently in participant narratives and were interpreted as obstacles that reduce entrepreneurial readiness. Conceptual maps developed during the analysis showed that entrepreneurial attitudes arise from the interaction between internal drivers such as motivation and self efficacy and external conditions such as institutional support and contextual adversity. Hermeneutical memos highlighted how participants navigate uncertainty, interpret available resources and construct meaning around their entrepreneurial possibilities.

3. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide an integrated understanding of how entrepreneurial attitudes develop through the interaction of psychological, contextual and institutional factors in emerging environments. Quantitative results showed that self efficacy and motivation were the strongest predictors of entrepreneurial attitudes, reinforcing the central role that internal cognitive evaluations play in shaping entrepreneurial readiness. Prior research has highlighted self efficacy as one of the most consistent predictors of entrepreneurial intention, particularly in environments marked by uncertainty (Krueger et

al 2000; Liñán and Fayolle 2015). The strong relationship observed in this study suggests that efforts to foster entrepreneurship should prioritize the development of confidence, resilience and personal agency. These elements are essential components of entrepreneurial competence and constitute a foundation for opportunity recognition and action orientation (Shane and Venkataraman 2000).

Opportunity perception also demonstrated a meaningful association with entrepreneurial attitudes, indicating that individuals evaluate their environment to determine the feasibility of entrepreneurial action. Although the effect size was weaker than that of motivation and self efficacy, this pattern aligns with studies showing that opportunity perception operates as an external cognitive filter that moderates how individuals assess risk and potential benefit (Liñán and Fayolle 2015). The moderate levels of opportunity perception observed suggest that participants identified some favorable conditions but also faced ambiguous or unstable circumstances, which is consistent with the economic volatility characteristic of emerging contexts (Acs et al 2018).

Institutional support exhibited a positive yet comparatively weaker influence on entrepreneurial attitudes. This reflects a dynamic commonly reported in entrepreneurship research, where institutional structures provide some training and mentorship but often lack the coordination or responsiveness needed to fully sustain entrepreneurial efforts (Mason and Brown 2014). Qualitative narratives reinforced this interpretation, with participants acknowledging the usefulness of mentorship and educational programs while simultaneously describing bureaucratic obstacles, limited financial access and fragmented institutional procedures. These findings align with broader evidence showing that weak institutional environments impede the translation of entrepreneurial attitudes into action (Acs et al 2018).

The qualitative analysis expanded the interpretation of quantitative patterns by identifying four major categories. First, personal experiences emerged as strong antecedents of motivation and self efficacy, confirming the importance of experiential learning for the acquisition of entrepreneurial capabilities (Cope 2005). Second, contextual uncertainty shaped participants' evaluation of feasibility, reflecting previous work on how environmental volatility influences risk interpretation and decision making (Shane and Venkataraman 2000). Third, support systems such as mentorship, training opportunities and community networks enhanced confidence and provided

guidance, echoing research on the contribution of social capital to entrepreneurial development (Acs et al 2017). Fourth, structural barriers such as financial limitations, bureaucratic requirements and institutional fragmentation appeared as significant inhibitors, particularly in emerging economies where governance structures are still consolidating (Acs et al 2018).

Taken together, these findings highlight that entrepreneurial attitudes arise from the combined influence of psychological resources and external conditions. High self efficacy and motivation generate internal momentum, but without effective institutional support and reduced structural obstacles, individuals may struggle to pursue entrepreneurial initiatives. Conversely, strong support networks and accessible institutional structures can compensate for moderate psychological dispositions. These results underscore the importance of designing integrated strategies that reinforce personal capacities, strengthen institutional coordination and reduce systemic barriers to entrepreneurial activity. (Rincón-Rodríguez, I.C., Chaparro-Medina, J.E., Ortiz-Ortiz, G.E., Plata-Acosta, Y.I., Zarta-Botero, M., Crespo, J.E., & García-Lirios, C. 2025).

4. CONCLUSION

Entrepreneurial motivation is shaped by the interaction of personal experiences, psychological resources and contextual conditions. The results of this study indicate that self efficacy and motivation are the strongest predictors of entrepreneurial attitudes, while opportunity perception and institutional support contribute positively but with more moderate effects. Qualitative findings reinforce that early exposure to entrepreneurship, experiential learning, mentorship and community support strengthen individuals' confidence and readiness to undertake entrepreneurial activities. At the same time, structural barriers such as financial limitations, bureaucratic procedures and fragmented institutional coordination restrict the translation of attitudes into entrepreneurial action.

The combined quantitative and qualitative evidence shows that entrepreneurial activation emerges from the balance between internal drivers and external constraints. Individuals with high self efficacy and strong motivational orientation tend to display more favorable entrepreneurial attitudes, but their capacity to act is influenced by institutional responsiveness and the clarity of opportunity pathways. These results suggest that enhancing entrepreneurial ecosystems in emerging contexts

requires strengthening mentorship structures, improving institutional coordination, increasing access to support programs and reducing bureaucratic and financial obstacles. Future research should incorporate larger and more diverse samples, employ longitudinal or multivariate designs and further examine how psychological and contextual variables interact over time to shape entrepreneurial engagement.

The evidence indicates that entrepreneurial ecosystems must move toward more integrated, adaptive, and well-coordinated support structures, as fragmentation reduces the impact of individual capabilities that could otherwise be highly effective. In this regard, institutional coordination enhances the connection between opportunities and resources, which is essential for transforming entrepreneurial intention into sustainable ventures. Likewise, strengthening access to financial instruments and simplifying administrative processes helps reduce both real and perceived barriers, enabling more agile decision-making. Within this framework, partnerships between the public and private sectors play a strategic role by bridging gaps between policy design and effective implementation. Similarly, it is crucial to prioritize place-based strategies that respond to the specific characteristics of each context, ensuring more relevant and inclusive support systems. Ultimately, coherence among the different actors and components of the ecosystem emerges as a key factor in driving the activation and long-term sustainability of entrepreneurship.

The findings highlight the dynamic and evolving nature of entrepreneurial engagement, understanding motivation as a continuous process shaped by learning, adaptation, and interaction with changing environments. Sustaining this engagement requires the integrated strengthening of both cognitive and behavioral competencies, in a process where educational institutions play a key role by fostering long-term capabilities through innovation-oriented curricula and opportunity recognition. Likewise, mentorship should extend beyond the initial stages of venture creation, as ongoing support enhances resilience in the face of uncertainty and failure.

In this context, digital platforms expand access to resources and networks, promoting more equitable participation across diverse socioeconomic groups. Consequently, ecosystem sustainability depends on continuous learning and support mechanisms.

DECLARATIONS

Ethical Considerations

The study followed the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association. The attached materials do not identify participants and the reconstruction of content was conducted for academic purposes.

Use of artificial intelligence

Artificial intelligence was used exclusively to

structure, organize and format the academic text requested by the user. The substantive content was derived from the provided document.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors participated in the conceptual development, methodological integration and theoretical framing of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Acs Z, Stam E, Audretsch D and O'Connor A. 2017. The lineages of the entrepreneurial ecosystem approach. *Small Business Economics* 49 1–10.
- [2] Acs Z, Estrin S, Mickiewicz T and Szerb L. 2018. Entrepreneurship, institutional economics and economic growth. *Small Business Economics* 51 501–514.
- [3] Kashwani R, Kumari A. Healthcare Startup Incubators in India: Successes, Shortcomings, and Systemic Gaps. *Bull. Health Sphere* 2026;1(1):11-18. doi: 10.63150/bhs.2026.02
- [4] American Psychological Association. 2020. Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association Seventh Edition. APA.
- [5] Charmaz K. 2014. Constructing Grounded Theory. Sage.
- [6] Cope J. 2005. Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29 373–397.
- [7] Creswell J and Plano Clark V. 2018. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. Sage.
- [8] DeVellis R. 2017. Scale Development Theory and Applications. Sage.
- [9] Krueger N, Reilly M and Carsrud A. 2000. Competing models of entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Business Venturing* 15 411–432.
- [10] Liñán F and Fayolle A. 2015. A systematic literature review on entrepreneurial intentions. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 11 907–933.
- [11] Mason C and Brown R. 2014. Entrepreneurial ecosystems and growth oriented entrepreneurship. OECD LEED Programme.
- [12] Rincón-Rodríguez, I.C., Chaparro-Medina, J.E., Ortiz-Ortiz, G.E., Plata-Acosta, Y.I., Zarta-Botero, M., Crespo, J.E., & García-Lirios, C. (2025). Human talent management in higher education institutions: facing challenges and taking advantage of opportunities in the 4.0 era. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Educational Research*, 15(3), Pages 170-181
- [13] Shane S and Venkataraman S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review* 5 217–226.
- [14] Spigel B. 2017. The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 41 49–72.

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Interview guide

- Describe participant perceptions of entrepreneurial attitudes
- Identify experiences influencing entrepreneurial interest
- Explore contextual factors shaping entrepreneurial motivation
- Identify perceptions of institutional support
- Identify perceived barriers and facilitators

Annex 2. Coding schemes

- Open coding categories
- Axial relationships
- Selective integration and conceptual maps

Annex 3. Hermeneutical memos

- Researcher interpretive notes organized by thematic clusters

Annex 4. APMG quantitative indicators

- Descriptive statistics
- Validity and reliability tables
- Correlation tendencies