FROM ENTREPRENEURIAL MINDSET TO ENTERPRISING MINDSET: ANALYSES IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP COURSE

Rafiati Kania, **Politeknik Negeri Bandung**

ABSTRACT

Drawing on entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial mindset, this study conceptualizes how entrepreneurial mindset that is built from education establishes distinguishable enterprising mindset dimensions: elaborating mindset and implementing mindset. Both dimensions reflect different emphasis on intention and action. In testing how both mindsets are formed from entrepreneurial mindset and building on entrepreneurship education process, this study uses PLS-SEM to confirm the model. This study uses a sample of 301 vocational students participating in the educational setting that emphasizes on entrepreneur profession, management knowledge, and entrepreneurial skills. There is a significant variation in entrepreneurial mindset toward enterprising mindset which is directly attributable to the particular self-concept and entrepreneur profession to strengthen intention-action orientation from educational setting. Since few studies performed exploration on intention-action interaction, this study has done a reconstruction on how self-concept regarding entrepreneurship differentiates between analytical oriented (elaborating mindset) and action oriented (implementing mindset).

Keywords: Enterprising Mindset, Entrepreneurial Mindset, Entrepreneurship Education, Higher Education, Entrepreneurship.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is one of the growing attentions in education. The perspective is reflected by growing research in development of entrepreneurship education quality to strength higher education competitiveness (Akhmetshin et al., 2019; Vasiliev, 2020; Welsh et al., 2016). In addition, Tretyakova et al. (2020) reveals optimizing entrepreneurial education could resolve socio-economic problems such as graduates' unemployment and mismatched issues between labor market requirement and education offering. Moreover, stimulating entrepreneurial activity which resulted from teaching entrepreneurship faded popular myth questioning entrepreneurs are rather born than made (Ustyuzhina et al., 2019). Hence, optimizing Entrepreneurship Education (EE) is a pivotal tool to strengthen graduate quality.

Mwasalwiba (2010) observes general objectives of Entrepreneurship Education (EE) in various countries are increasing entrepreneurial mindset (34%), creating firm and startup (27%), making better society (24%), and improving entrepreneurial skills (15%). Focusing on entrepreneurial mindset, teachers should offer tools and methods to influence student's entrepreneurial intention (Teerijoki & Murdock, 2014). Not only for student, Jusoh et al. (2011) confirm the view of EE makes a significant different in the performance of entrepreneurs, with entrepreneurs expressing a need for further training and education in specific business issues. Regarding most entrepreneurship education's aim to increase students` entrepreneurial mindset

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

(EM), this study chooses EM as the cornerstone of research as well as filling the gap of research in EE studies.

To date, research employing intention models of entrepreneurial behavior as EE impact has almost exclusively focused on explaining intention and paying little attention in investigating whether intentions lead to actions to establish a business (Sanchez, 2013a; Schlaegel & Koenig, 2014). Among the few previous studies in these concepts, this study found a study in secondary school (Sanchez, 2013b) and higher education were particulary noteworthy. These studies verified that students who attend entrepreneurship education show greater entrepreneurial intention as well as higher self-efficacy of becoming self-employment.

Furthermore, the term self-efficacy has been claimed as the strength entrepreneurial mindset from EE (Cui et al., 2019; Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020; Lindberg et al., 2017a; Morselli & Ajello, 2016). Previous studies confirm EE process was significantly impacted several self-efficacies such as Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC), Risk Management Capability (RMC), and Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC). This study utilizes previous perspective in (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020; Lindberg et al., 2017b) research which have used the term OIC, RMC, EC as entrepreneurial mindset. In addition to self-efficacy, this study also attempts to add novelty in terms of education delivery effectively to defining and influencing entrepreneurial mindset. Robinson & Gough (2020) argue that educating entrepreneurial mindset in EE need to emphasis mental characteristics which distinct entrepreneur apart from managers, professional, and workers. Hence, this study added degree of the education endeavor strength to deliver Distinctive Profession (DP) of entrepreneur as one of variables in EM.

As this study has highlighted, few researchers have purposefully considered what might differentiate strength of enterprising mindset in relation to self-efficacy and role model interpretation from education. Previous studies have identified the strength of willingness to build enterprise (Bogatyreva et al., 2019; Mathisen & Arnulf, 2013; Neneh, 2019; Van Gelderen et al., 2008). This study builds on prior studies, which have examined EM influenced by EE and the strength of willingness to build enterprise. Preous studies have been widely explored EM manifested on self-efficacy behavior in becoming entrepreneur. The study links the built enterprising mindset perspective with Mathisen & Arnulf's (2013) study which stated "*educational programs aiming to create entrepreneurs should pay attention to the differences between elaborating and implementing mindsets*". In general, this study aims to construct significant perception on how EM attribute can influence analytical thinking oriented (elaborating) & action oriented (implementing) as the type of enterprising mindsets.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, this paper presents a review of EM studies in the context of EE and enterprising mindset which elaborated the mindset of enterpreneurs' readiness to launch a business. Next, the research methodology is outlined before analysis of quantitative measurement and a detailed discussion of finding. This paper also describes entrepreneurship education approach at the State Polytechnic of Bandung, Indonesia and outline how entrepreneurial mindset offered to students. The paper finally concludes with a discussion and examine the significancy of EM attribute to construct different type of enterprising mindset.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Assessing Entrepreneurial Mindset (EM)

Enabling the students to develop new behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs reflecting EM is the main contribution from Entrepreneurship Education (EE). Previous studies have identified

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

pedagogical methods which validated EE contribution on EM. Strong linkage between engaged EE and EM has been found in Robinson and Gough (2020). Action-based education program has a significant effect on better ability to evaluate and provide judgment of entrepreneurial opportunities (Van de Sandt & Mauer, 2019) and to integrate balance and comfort in business tradeoff (Mitchell, 2004). In this way, EM reflects some properties such as ambiguity tolerance, entrepreneurial alertness, scanning and scarch, Association and connection, evaluation and judgement (Van de Sandt & Mauer, 2019). Through learning from experiences, experimentation, play and failure, embedding EE during education is critical to emphasis (Davey et al., 2016).

The discipline of EE is expanding in depth and breadth (Kuratko & Morris, 2018). How entrepreneur is distinct from another profession is one of the keys in enabling EM from education (Robinson & Gough, 2020). Previous status quo of entrepreneurship education regarding effectiveness is not complete without knowing student`s perception which in turn reflects how entrepreneurial mindset is embedded in their mind. Also, students` mindset will establish willingness of students to practice and develop entrepreneurial knowledge and competences (Boyles, 2012). Many countries have developed education climate in forming EM. One model is COPPS, developed in Rusia and Swedish, which includes five components: creativity exercises, opportunity identification assignments, problem-based learning sessions, self-directed tasks and supervision (COPSS). This model confirms all positive attitudes in the context Russian undergraduate students (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020) and Swedish undergraduate students (Lindberg et al., 2017a&b).

The first perspective is Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC). The definition of OIC applied in this paper draws upon Lindberg et al. (2017a) and Hulten & Tumunbayarova (2020) who define opportunity-related process in recognizing business potential. Possessing an entrepreneurial mind refers to an individual having the ability to identify opportunities, develop new ideas, and discovers new ways of looking at opportunities and problems and creative ways of solving those (Benedict & Venter, 2010). Education should emphasis on OIC because it is involved in beginning entrepreneurial act (Lindberg et al., 2017b) because the identification for opportunities is a critical task for an entrepreneur (Karlsson & Moberg, 2013). This study aim to modify conceptual underpinning by adding perspective alertness to opportunity from Cui et al. (2019). Alertness to opportunity is prior process in opportunity recognition (Cui et al., 2019; Neneh, 2019). Accordingly, opportunity recognition is one of the entrepreneurial mindsets within strategic entrepreneurship (Chang & Wang, 2013) and assimilated within entrepreneurs` cognitive mechanism (Ozgen, 2011).

The second perspective is Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC). The definition of EC applied in previous study is persons` perception on acts and thinking process leading to product/services (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020). Possessing entrepreneurial mind is, therefore, associated with being both creative and innovative (Benedict & Venter, 2010). Education should stimulate EC through self-directed learning in entrepreneurship (Lindberg et al., 2017a) and combine creativity thinking when searching for opportunity (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020). Boyles (2012) argue creative thinking that more emphasis in 21st century is novelty and originality. Accordingly, this study adds creative self-identity to represent EC in terms of growth mindset. According to Karwowski (2014), person`s entrepreneurial mindset related with growth-mindset is manifested in creative self-efficacy or creative personal identity.

The third perspective is Risk Management Capability (RMC). The definition of RMC applied in previous study is a persons` ability to manage ambiguities, risk, and intuition when they work to develop new product (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020; Lindberg et al., 2017b).

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

Practicing risk management capability in entrepreneurship education through experience allows students to be familiar with ambiguity and uncertainty (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020). Previous study confirms lack of risk management capability revealed significant influence on Nigerian SMEs business performance (Asenge et al., 2018). The success of self-employment depends on decision-making ability is related with risk management capability, adaptation, and initiation (Papagiannis, 2018).

The fourth perspective is Distinctive Profession (DP). The characteristics under consideration as part of the entrepreneurial mindset must be express distinguishable characteristics which is unique in type or amount that these entrepreneurs possess relative to other groups. Herein, this study proposes the term distinctive profession to examine whether the statement from Robinson and Gough (2020) truly influences entrepreneurial mindset perspective in educational setting. Another study also expresses and places emphasis on the same argument. Hayes & Richmond (2017) in page 90 clearly stated "*to understand entrepreneurship, one must understand the entrepreneur and, if entrepreneurs share certain behavioural characteristics, then entrepreneurship theories should take these into account*".

Enterprising Mindset

Previous studies have defined entrepreneurship education philosophy as transformative change between entrepreneurial thinking and execution to launch a business (Jones et al., 2012; Nasr & Boujelbene, 2014; Welsh et al., 2016). A person's self-efficacy is defined as person's belief in having the ability to perform task (Newman et al., 2019). Earlier studies on self-efficacy has shown that EE may impact the participants' beliefs in their ability to successfully perform certain entrepreneurial tasks (Karlsson & Moberg, 2013; Lindberg et al., 2017b; Lindberg et al., 2017a; Shinnar et al., 2018). High self-efficacy is found among students with their parents as entrepreneur and these students most-likely intend to build their own enterprise (Zellweger et al., 2011). Naktiyok et al. (2010) found that having high self-efficacy when developing new product and market opportunities, constructing core purpose of entrepreneurial action, and coping with unexpected challenges, have significant effect on entrepreneurial intentions. Accordingly, Mathisen & Arnulf (2013) argue that clearly recognizing business opportunity with profit potential the decision to start enterprising activity.

Although high self-efficacy seems promising to represent entrepreneurial intention, the action is somehow connected with how people process entrepreneurial knowledge identify opportunity and execute resources to achieve successful venture (Haynie et al., 2010). Further, having EM will orientate individual act toward entrepreneurial opportunities and its outcome (Zur & Naumann, 2018). In this way, the foundation of entrepreneurial mindset actualization within entrepreneur is cognitive adaptability, which Haynie et al. (2010) defined as "*the ability to effectively and appropriately evolve or adapt decision policies (i.e., to learn) given feedback (inputs) from environmental context in which cognitive processing embedded*". In entrepreneur perspective, creative mindsets in SMEs owner will help them to bring ideas into the market in effective way to create value for consumer (Asenge et al., 2018). Saturation of empathy and social interaction within entrepreneurial decision making are found in social entrepreneur when blending social and commercial logics (Zur & Naumann, 2018).

Van Gelderen et al. (2015) found a gap between intentions and act to build enterprise. researchers have widely shown that intention to become entreprenuer in students do not always translate to an action and that the association is contingent on several individuals and environmental characteristics (Kautonen et al., 2015; Shinnar et al., 2018; Shirokova et al., 2016; Van Gelderen et al., 2015) First, highly proactive individual propensity in terms of willingness to

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

change environment will move students from intention to action (Neneh, 2019). Second, self-control regarding action aversion, action doubt, and intention strength tends to affect transition between intention to become entrepreneur and action of enterprising (Van Gelderen et al., 2015). More specific, Susilo (2014) states that enterprising mindset occupies several things in avoiding doubt such as seeing opportunities rather than barrier, seeing possibility rather than failure, and wanting to make an impact. The term enterprising mindsets have not widely been explored in previous research. Thus, the specification of enterprising mindset from Susilo (2014) is the foundation of enterprising mindset in this study.

EE often exercises planning an action of building enterprise (enterprising). However, feasibility perception regarding opportunity level and business process in planning process sometime neglects implementation aspects in starting real business (Van Gelderen et al., 2015). Van Gelderen et al. (2015) clearly stated "*a person may be uncertain about what to do, where to start, and how to choose between different courses of action, leading to difficulties in action planning*" as action doubt. Emphasising in doubt, Mathisen & Arnulf (2013) highlight the pattern to act entrepreneurship requires open-mindedness involving doubt. People may suffer the doubtness particularly when entering entrepreneurial activity. Thus, re-orientation of goal and action is important issues in beginning enterprise establishment (Mathisen & Arnulf, 2013).

Following the study of Mathisen & Arnulf (2013), there are two kinds of EM that significantly differentiate persons to act in founding companies: elaborating mindset and implementing mindset. The first phase of journey toward entrepreneurial behavior is elaborating mindset. Elaborating mindset targeted the aim of starting business which include goal setting phase and finding "*why*" question (Freitas et al., 2004). Desirability and feasibility of expected outcome are central aspects in elaborating mindset. Desirability reflects expected value in executing entrepreneurial action. Meanwhile, feasibility reflects consideration of action whether the situational context is facilitating or impending. The focus of elaborating mindset is analytical thinking on performing entrepreneurial action. The second phase of journey toward entrepreneurial behavior is implementing mindset. Implementing mindset targeted action setting and focusing "*how*" question regard specification on how to implement a plan. Implementing mindset will activate accessibility of specific opportunities, goal-directed behavior and transformation from intention to action (Gollwitzer & Sheeran, 2006).

Revisiting enterprising mindset from Susilo (2014) emphasizes opportunities, possibility, and wanting to make an impact. Implemental mindset seems closer to enterprising mindset since, following Mathisen & Arnulf (2013), this mindset targeted on intention to engage entrepreneurial activities because of seeing the connection between opportunity and strategy for goal attainment. Elaborating mindset also relates with enterprising mindset when focusing on the why factor in making an impact. Related with self-efficacy, the interaction of both mindsets is still puzzling. However, the study of Baum & Locke (2004) who investigate founders` capability to initiate and grow the venture seems to confirm the connection of self-efficacy in directing persons` to create enterprise.

METHODOLOGY

The population of this study were students from all departments, both engineering and business, who undertook entrepreneurship study as a mandatory course for all departments at the State Polytechnic of Bandung, Indonesia. There were 825 students took the course in 2020 and participated in this survey at the end of the semester. Among the population, there were 303 students had participated in this survey (155 engineering & 148 business), 69 % female and 31%

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

male. The participants were 61.1 % students from middle year, 30.4% students from final year, and 8.6% students from first year. Determination of adequate sample size to represent population was referred to Slovin's Formula. This formula is related to the approach to get a 95 percent confidence level with an error tolerance of 5 percent (Adeniyi, 2011). The minimum sample size was 269 students from a total of 825 with a confidence interval of 95 %. Herein, the participant of study reached minimum sample.

The content of the entrepreneurship course in which this study tested offers entrepreneur profession, management knowledge, and entrepreneurial skills. The course instils entrepreneurial mindset in three domains such as human capital, social capital, and financial capital. All domains were exercised in two assignments. First assignment is selling project. In this project, the lecturer will prepare students to discover a considerably strategic and profitable business opportunity. In addition, the students have received direct experience and the assignments give them the chance to express the good and bad from their project. Evaluation of the project is based on opportunities recognition capability, creative thinking, and the selling profit. Selling exercise make it possible for students to practice their confidence to negotiate with supplier & prospective consumers. Here, the component of this project is students are self-directed, action-based, and they gain more confident from real experience. Second assignment was business plan project. This project is a group assignment where the lecturer equipped students with the ways to create business proposal. The assignments are usually handled in groups of six students. This exercise focused on measuring opportunity where the students practiced on how to address problems, analyze market-share potential, develop operational & finance system, and measure business risk. The component of this task aimed at encouraging the students to set their goals, weigh the opportunity, and anticipate business risk.

The third assignment focused to develop only two domains (human capital and social capital) was an interview project. The ambition of this project was to have the students broaden their perspective about entrepreneurship from experienced entrepreneur. Through interviewing, students are expected to know the "*real world*" regarding who and how an entrepreneur learns to be entrepreneurial and maintain their business. By getting acquainted with an entrepreneur, it is hoped that students can be inspired and can enrich their social and business networks. Following up the interviews, the lecturer placed emphasis on different jobs about entrepreneur among other professions.

This study uses deductive approach and utilizes existing theory to understand research problems. The concept of transition mindset was hypothesized based on interaction between self-efficacy built from EE and distinguishable EM to pursue enterprise establishment, namely enterprising mindset. The fundamental concept of enterprising mindset is taken from Susilo (2014) study that explores influencing factor of entrepreneurial spirit in Indonesian entrepreneur. In line with the concept of enterprising mindset, Mathisen & Arnulf (2013) identified two kinds of EM that significantly differentiate persons to act in founding companies. There were elaborating mindsets (analytical thinking) and implementing mindsets (decisive action strategies). Measurement of both mindsets was adopted from Mathisen & Arnulf (2013). This study examines self-efficacy of becoming entrepreneur due to several variables such as Distinctive Profession (DP), Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC), Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC), and Risk Management Capability (RMC). The measurement of DP is based on statement from Robinson and Gough, (2020) who stated that there are distinctive views of entrepreneur from others. Role model perception is one of the keys to enable entrepreneurial mindset (Robinson & Gough, 2020). Measurement of EC, OIC, and RMC was based on Hulten

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

& Tumunbayarova's (2020) study which measures the impact of these variables to entrepreneurial mindset. Particularly, this study added OIC measurement from another study. The statement to evaluate bad or good opportunities in the students` OIC draw upon Cui et al. (2019) when examining inspiration as a mediating role in entrepreneurial mindset impact from entrepreneurship education. This study also modified EC targeting inventive thinking as entrepreneurial competences in 21st (Boyles, 2012) and creative self-identity (Karwowski, 2014).

Data collection method was survey method using online questionnaires. Responses were put in 5-level-likert scale with 1 represents strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for moderately agree, 4 for agree, and 5 for strongly agree. Online questionnaire was distributed from courses lecturer to students who have finished a compulsory course on entrepreneurship. The hypotheses regarding mindset forming were tested using PLS-SEM. This study tested following hypotheses:

H_{1a}: *There is a positive relationship between distinctive profession and elaborating mindset*
H_{2a}: *There is a positive relationship between entrepreneurial creativity and elaborating mindset*
H_{3a}: *There is a positive relationship between opportunity recognition capability and elaborating mindset*
H_{4a}: *There is a positive relationship between risk management capability and elaborating mindset*
H_{1b}: *There is a positive relationship between distinctive profession and implementing mindset*
H_{2b}: *There is a positive relationship between entrepreneurial creativity and implementing mindset*
H_{3b}: *There is a positive relationship between opportunity recognition capability and implementing mindset*
H_{4b}: *There is a positive relationship between risk management capability and implementing mindset*

RESULTS

Measurement Item Evaluation

The first component of measurement item evaluation was the reliability of each statement that corresponds a construct. Factor loading value was representative of statement strength to explained variables Table 1. Factor loading represents indicator's variance explained by the variables. Hair et al. (2012) argue that factor loadings value greater than 0.7 have represented at least 50% of the indicator's variance and have to be explained. This study deleted statements with <0.7 due to weak statements capability to represents variables. Three statements were deleted, one statement regarding elaborating mindset model and two statements regarding implementing mindset model Table 1. Statement "*I can distinguish between profitable opportunities and non-profitable opportunities*" was deleted from Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC) variable within elaborating model. Statement "*Learn from & adapt to the best solutions*" and "*My ability to think creatively is good*" were deleted from Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC) variable within implementing model.

The second component of measurement item evaluation was reliability of each variable with at least 50% represented from indicator`s variance. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α) and Composite Reliability (CR). The α values for constructs are all more than 0.8 with the highest 0.912 indicating the measurement is reliable (Nunnally, 1978). The CR value for each scale exceeds the acceptable level of 0.6 (Bagozzi & Youjae, 1988) ranging from 0.891 to 0.935, which indicated the measures for these constructs were highly reliable.

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

Table 1
RELIABILITY OF VARIABLES WITHIN ELABORATING MINDSET & IMPLEMENTING MINDSET MODELS

Entrepreneurial Mindset			Enterprising Mindset			
Variable of Entrepreneurial Mindset	**Queries**	**Items**	**Elaborating Mindset Model**		**Implementing Mindset Model**	
			Factor Loading	**Reliability**	**Factor Loading**	**Reliability**
Distinctive Profession (DP)	Way of thinking as entrepreneur must be different from worker	DP1	0.841		0.829	AVE = 0.622
	Leadership of entrepreneur must be different from worker	DP2	0.81	AVE = 0.626	0.832	**α** = 0.850
	Responsibility of entrepreneur must be different from worker	DP3	0.805	**α** =0.850	0.788	CR= 0.891
	Entrepreneur has their own idealism	DP4	0.717	CR=0.893	0.754	
	Entrepreneur has different impact from worker	DP5	0.776		0.737	
Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC)	Be able to generate various ideas	EC1	0.837		0.863	AVE = 0.770
	Recognize patterns and think differently	EC2	0.861	AVE = 0.691	0.881	**α** =0.851
	I can bring something new and original into existence	EC3	0.794	**α** = 0.891	<0.700*	CR= 0.909
	My ability to think creatively is good	EC4	0.832	CR= 0.920	<0.700*	
Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC)	Learn from and adapt to the best solutions	OIC1	0.795	AVE = 0.657	0.784	AVE = 0.624
	I can evaluate multiple ideas to	OIC2	0.811	**α** = 0.870	0.809	**α** = 0.880
	determine the true opportunities			CR= 0.905		CR=0.909
	I often find potential opportunities to improve	OIC3	0.8		0.776	
	I can distinguish between profitable opportunities and non-profitable opportunities.	OIC4	<0.700*		0.748	
Risk Management Capability (RMC)	I accustomed to making decisions from limited data	RMC1	0.867	AVE = 0.735	0.884	AVE = 0.735
	I can measure business risk	RMC2	0.86	**α**=0.880	0.864	**α**=0.880
	I can analyze the experience to develop new strategies to anticipate disadvantage in the future	RMC3	0.865	CR=0.917	0.856	CR=0.917
	I will do the plan although the condition is uncertain	RMC4	0.836		0.825	
Elaborating Mindset (EM)	I still imagine myself as entrepreneur	EM1	0.833	AVE = 0.691		
	I'm looking for both positive and negative information about starting my own business	EM2	0.819	**α**=0.888		
	I'm considering whether I have the time to run my own business	EM3	0.859	CR=0.918		
	I`m considering whether I can establish the venture	EM4	0.829			
	I'm considering whether I have the opportunity financially to start my own business	EM5	0.814			
Implementing Mindset (IM)	Accumulated knowledge & skills make me start and plan a business	IM1			0.812	AVE = 0.741
	I have decided to start my own business	IM2			0.864	**α**=0.912
	I have a plan/strategy for how to start my own business	IM3			0.885	CR=0.935
	When I perceive an opportunity, I will size up the opportunity and start my own business	IM4			0.887	
	I'm determined to become engaged in entrepreneurial activities. When I perceive an opportunity, the strategy for goal attainment will be released	IM5			0.854	

<.700* = deleted statements due to below threshold value

Third component of measurement item was validity. With validity, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values exceeded the threshold criterion of 0.5 (Bagozzi & Youjae, 1988), which indicates convergent validity for each indicator (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The square roots of the AVE (the diagonal elements in Tables 2&3) are larger than the off-diagonal elements

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

at the level of significance (Hulland, 1999), meeting the criterion for discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2
DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY OF ELABORATING MODEL VARIABLE

	DP	EM	EC	OIC	RMC
Distinctive Profession (DP)	0.791				
Elaborating Mindset (EM)	0.536	0.831			
Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC)	0.637	0.542	0.834		
Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC)	0.699	0.627	0.799	0.811	
Risk Management Capability (RMC)	0.654	0.555	0.776	0.803	0.857

Table 3
DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY OF IMPLEMENTING MODEL VARIABLE

	DP	EC	IM	OIC	RMC
Distinctive Profession (DP)	0.789				
Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC)	0.603	0.877			
Implementing Mindset (EM)	0.303	0.392	0.861		
Opportunity Identification Capability (OIC)	0.696	0.756	0.468	0.790	
Risk Management Capability (RMC)	0.652	0.721	0.721	0.821	0.857

The next step in the data analysis is theoretical model evaluation. The procedure estimates the measurement and theoretical model simultaneously. PLS software was used to test research hypotheses and assess direction, strength, and level of significance of the path coefficient. In examining the theoretical model, R^2 value is considered to measure the extent to which the dependent variable is explained through the associated independent variable (Ramayah et al., 2016). Sanchez (2013a) categorized the level of ability of the independent variable to define the variability of the dependent variable. R^2 values >0.60 are considered to have a high level of accuracy in predicting the dependent variable, $0.3<R^2<0.6$ is considered as moderate level, and $R^2<0.3$ is considered as low level. Based on Table 4, the R^2 value that represents elaborating mindset was 0.416 and R^2 value that represents implementing mindset was 0.227. These R^2 values indicate two perceptions:

1. Distinctive profession, entrepreneurial creativity, opportunity identification recognition, and risk management capability perceived moderate ability to predict elaborating mindset.
2. Distinctive profession, entrepreneurial creativity, opportunity identification recognition, and risk management capability perceived weak ability to predict implementing mindset.

A significant relationship among the variables in the research hypotheses was represented by a path coefficient with a significant level of p-value. Based on the hypothesis testing, two hypotheses (H_{1a} & H_{3a}) in elaborating mindset were accepted and only one hypothesis (H_{3b}) was accepted in implementing mindset. A level of significance in $p<0.01$ was represented in H3a and smaller significance level ($p<0.5$) was represented in H_{1a} and H_{3b}.

Table 4
HYPOTHESIS TESTING REPRESENTING ELABORATING MODEL AND IMPLEMENTING MODEL

Model 1 (Elaborating Mindset)	T values	Result	Model 2 (Implementing Mindset)	T values	Result
DP→EM (H1a)	2.310**	Accepted	DP→IM (H1b)	0.945	Rejected
EC→EM (H2a)	0.623	Rejected	EC→IM (H2b)	0.837	Rejected
OIC→EM (H3a)	3.620*	Accepted	OIC→IM (H3b)	3.670**	Accepted
RMC→EM (H4a)	1.117	Rejected	RMC→IM (H4b)	1.087	Rejected
$R^2 = 0.416$			$R^2 = 0.227$		
Significant at: *p<0.01, **p<0.05					

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

DISCUSSION

The objective of this study was to capture how EM built from education influences two dimensional mindsets on decisiveness of being an entrepreneur: elaborating & implementing. In general, the result provides significant perception on how EM attribute can influence analytical thinking oriented (elaborating) & action oriented (implementing). With this study, we integrated three rarely intersecting fields: entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial mindset, and intention-action relationship.

The significant EM has been illuminated by how entrepreneur is truly distinct from other perceptions (Robinson & Gough, 2020) and how students perceive EM within themselves, i.e. EC, OIC, and RMC (Hulten & Tumunbayarova, 2020; Lindberg et al., 2017a), but the stage of becoming real entrepreneur is probably still puzzling (Mathisen & Arnulf, 2013). This study found unbalanced perception regarding the indicator of EM in forming elaborating and implementing mindsets. First, OIC indicators were not as fully represented in elaborating mindset as in implementing mindset. OIC4 indicates alertness opportunity, retrieved from Cui et al. (2019) study, which has weak representation to construct OIC in elaborating mindsets. This study placed emphasis on alertness related to bad and good opportunity showed weak to influence elaborating mindset. The result reinforced contrast view on EM targeted building enteprise and confirm Shane et al. (2010) study who found that the tendency to establish company will be different in recognizing business opportunities to make wealth where entrepreneur have instinct what will be profitable or not. The transition from the stage of entrepreneurial alertness into entrepreneurial action needs proactive personality (Neneh, 2019). In addition, the insignificant perception on elaborating mindset reminds procastination association with excessive thinking. Procastination will be emerged if someone to much thinking about opportunities (Mathisen & Arnulf, 2013). All perception reflecting opportunity recognition was relatively found stronger in forming implementing mindset. This reflection probably reminded that entrepreneurs are excellent in identifying the sensitivity of opportunity responding market and non-market dynamics (Clydesdale, 2012). Thus, OIC indicator in this study expresses strong representation on action-oriented rather than on intention.

According to Hulten & Tumunbayarova (2020), opportunity identification recognition is (OIC) closely connected with Entrepreneurial Creativity (EC). However, this study contradicts previous perspective regarding EC indicators which stated that EC was not as fully represented in implementing mindset as in elaborating mindset. The perception of inventive thinking (EC3) from Boyles' (2012) study and creative thinking ability (EC4) from Lindberg et al. (2017b) study have weak representation to construct EC in implementing mindset. The finding reflects different spectrum of how creativity can differentiate between analytical orientation & decisive action. According to Clydesdale (2012), creativity spectrum which enables opportunity into reality will be differentiated between where entrepreneurs work & how the surrounding environment stimulates them. Thus, external factor where individuals interact probably influences how creativity is involved in identifying opportunity.

Following the example used by Lindberg et al. (2017a), the intervention of action-oriented approach results in the change of students` self-efficacy with regard to OIC, EC, RMC. This study improves these perceptions into decisiveness level of being an entrepreneur, i.e. analytical and decisive actions. Theoretical model evaluation emphasizes different strength of EM on explaining decisiveness level of being entrepreneur. The result found weak to moderate ability to predict implementing and elaborating mindsets, respectively. The main implication of this study is that entrepreneurial mindset appears stronger to predict elaborating mindset. This

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

means that students pretend to still consider becoming an entrepreneur rather than having the tendency to act. In this study, elaborating mindset consists of desirability and feasibility perception. Both perceptions is confirmed as one of the antecedent of entrepreneurial intention factor (Celuch et al., 2017). According to Bernstein & Carayannis (2012), high intention of being entrepreneur does not lead to action. Similarly, self-control including action-related fear, doubt, and aversion will moderate the interaction between intention and action to become entrepreneur (Van Gelderen et al., 2015). The prediction also recall Bernstein & Carayannis (2012) study which identified the value of education to bring success appears weak in high level entrepreneurial self-efficacy. This means that there is no one-size-fits-all approach in delivering entrepreneurship education and the prediction between intention-action transitions is not simple to unfold.

Previous study identifies intention of being entrepreneur can appear when education effectively improves some entrepreneurial characteristics such as internal locus of control, need for achievement, risk taking propensity, creativity (Kusmintarti et al., 2018). However, this study contradicts in some attributes such as risk management capability and entrepreneurial creativity. This probably appears due to perception of students to view themselves as entrepreneur is relatively influenced by other factors such as salience of social culture (i.e. individualistic vs collectivistic), social influence, and how they practiced knowledge beyond classroom (Celuch et al., 2017). Thus, EE should promote and boost risk taking and taking the initiative, whereas less emphasis should be made on competences such as planning, which seem to have been adequately acquired by future teachers (Arruti & Panos-Castro, 2020; Kusmintarti et al., 2018). Despite of all aspects, the understanding of what creates and shapes decisiveness of being entrepreneur would then contribute largely to the EE. Furthermore, strategic ways of doing entrepreneurship in the life of entrepreneur have been influenced by effective entrepreneurship education (Naumann, 2017).

This study confirmed that Distinctive Profession (DP) was significantly influence elaborating mindset (H). Hypothesis 1 is partly supported. This means that the step of EE method in this study effectively helps student to understand what an entrepreneur is. Having direct experience, which was performed in the sample of this study, highlights same perception with Geho & Lewis (2010) who found that direct experience of acting like an entrepreneur was the most efficient and effective way to help students understand what an entrepreneur is. However, the knowledge probably reveals negative effect. The decrease in student's intention on creating their own business could be influenced by student lack of readiness/unsuited expectation regarding reality entrepreneurs` life (Josien & Sybrowsky, 2013). In addition to educational influence, entrepreneurial family background will influence relation between attitude toward entrepreneurship education and intention (Jena, 2020). Hence, having family member as an entrepreneur will affect the way of thinking which eventually influences the students' decision. Contrasting effect of DP reminds the important of teacher-student interaction that establishes openness, confidence, and trust, while also enriches learning principles and reflection (Elmuti et al., 2012).

The strong representation of EM which effectively influences both entreprising mindset was Opportunities Identification Capability (OIC). The finding supports Ozgen & Minsky (2013) and Van de Sandt & Mauer (2019) that entrepreneurship education should trigger students to recognize opportunities and teachers facilitate students to evaluate manifestation of opportunities into venture idea. This study highlights that people who embedded entrepreneurial mindset are also often drawn to opportunities (Vij & Farooq, 2017; Mitchell, 2004). The finding also rejects

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

the myth of appropriateness of entrepreneurship education in teaching business creation. Lautenschlager & Haase (2011) argue deficit entrepreneurial interest and raising number of start-up are probably due to educational systems which do not promote opportunity recognition.

CONCLUSION

Findings show that there was significant variation in entrepreneurial mindset toward enterprising mindset. This was directly attributable to the particular self-concept and entrepreneur profession to strength intention-action orientation from educational setting. However, this variation was contextual. These findings suggest two aspects. First, there is the need to create conducive entrepreneurial teaching strategy to develop particular self-efficacy, i.e. risk-management capability and entrepreneurial creativity, to improve both analytical-orientation (elaborating mindset) and action-orientation (implementing mindset). Second, there is the need to anticipate doubt of being an entrepreneur when students experience entrepreneurial action. Regarding this issue, this study revisits status quo of entrepreneurship education impact on intention and how intention differs from action orientation. Since few studies performed exploration on intention-action interaction, this study has done a reconstruction on how self-concept regarding entrepreneurship differentiates between analyzing (elaborating mindset) and action (implementing mindset). Finally, this study filled in the gap of study regarding how the effect of entrepreneurship education differentiates elaborating and implementing mindsets.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE STUDY

In moving forward, this study acknowledges certain limitations. As explained early in the paper, this study confines the discussion to answer the research gap in the status quo of entrepreneurship education. This study also notes that the review of several previous studies is limited on self-conception impact from particular interventions of entrepreneurship education which is strongly associated to entrepreneurial mindset. The consideration is believed to be particularly informative to this research. However, acknowledges that entrepreneurial mindset literature is richer than what this study could capture. Therefore, an area of interest for future research is the development of wider entrepreneurial mindset and specific constraint that eventually influences how an individual possesses entrepreneurial mindset. The constraint of individual personality and family background in founding companies is important avenue for future studies.

REFERENCES

Adeniyi, A.O. (2011). Contemporary marketing strategies and performance of agricultural marketing firms in South-West Nigeria.

Akhmetshin, E.M., Mueller, J.E., Yumashev, A.V., Kozachek, A.V., Prikhodko, A.N., & Safonova, E.E. (2019). Acquisition of entrepreneurial skills and competences: Curriculum development and evaluation for higher education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 22*(1), 1-12.

Arruti, A., & Panos-Castro, J. (2020). How do future primary education student teachers assess their entrepreneurship competences? An analysis of their self-perceptions. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 23*(1), 1-13.

Asenge, E.L., Diaka, H.S., & Soom, A.T. (2018). Entrepreneurial Mindset and Performance of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Makurdi Metropolis, Benue State-Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovation, 6*(2), 124-146.

Bagozzi, R.P., & Youjae, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of*

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

Marketing Science, 1(16), 74-94.
Baum, J.R., & Locke, E.A. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 587-598.
Benedict, E.A., & Venter, P.F. (2010). Education, entrepreneurial mindset and innovation: Necessary ingredients for increasing entrepreneurial activity in South Africa. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, 11*(2), 239-253.
Bernstein, A.T., & Carayannis, E.G. (2012). Exploring the Value Proposition of the Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Major and Elective Based on Student Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectations. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*.
Bogatyreva, K., Edelman, L. F., Manolova, T. S., Osiyevskyy, O., & Shirokova, G. (2019). When do entrepreneurial intentions lead to actions? The role of national culture. *Journal of Business Research, 96*, 309-321.
Boyles, T. (2012). 21st Century Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities and Entrepreneurial Competencies: A Model for Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 15*, 41-55.
Celuch, K., Bourdeau, B., & Winkel, D. (2017). Entrepreneurial identity: The missing link for entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 20*(2), 1-20.
Chang, H.J., & Wang, H.B. (2013). A Case Study on the Model of Strategic Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation, 5*(4), 30-44.
Clydesdale, G. (2012). Entrepreneurial opportunity: a framework for teaching. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 15*(SI), 15-38.
Cui, J., Sun, J., & Bell, R. (2019). The impact of entrepreneurship education on the entrepreneurial mindset of college students in China: The mediating role of inspiration and the role of educational attributes. *The International Journal of Management Education, 19*(1), 100296.
Davey, T., Hannon, P., & Penaluna, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship education and the role of universities in entrepreneurship. *Industry and Higher Education, 30*(3), 171-182.
Elmuti, D., Khoury, G., & Omran, O. (2012). Does Entrepreneurship Education Have a Role in Developing Entrepreneurial Skill and Ventures` Effectiveness? *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 15*, 83-98.
Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39-50.
Freitas, A.L., Gollwitzer, P., & Trope, Y. (2004). The influence of abstract and concrete mindsets on anticipating and guiding others' self-regulatory efforts. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, *40*(6), 739-752.
Geho, P.R., & Lewis, S.D. (2010). Teaching Entrepreneurship: The Importance of Noncompete Agreements to the Viability of The Enterprise. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 13, 1-8.
Gollwitzer, P.M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation Intentions and Goal Achievement: A Meta-analysis of Effects and Processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 69-119.
Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., & Mena, J.A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, (40), 414-433.
Hayes, D., & Richmond, W. (2017). Using an online assessment to examine entrepreneurship student traits and to measure and improve the impact of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 20*(1), 88-107..
Haynie, J.M., Shepherd, D., Mosakowski, E., & Earley, P.C. (2010). A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Business Venturing, 25*(2), 217-229.
Hulland, J. (1999). Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: A review of four recent studies. *Strategic Management Journal, 20*(2), 195-204.
Hulten, P., & Tumunbayarova, Z. (2020). Building students' entrepreneurial mindsets: Results from an intervention at a Russian university. *International Journal of Management Education, 18*(2), 100380.
Jena, R.K. (2020). Measuring the impact of business management Student's attitude towards entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intention: A case study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 107.
Jones, C., Matlay, H., & Maritz, A. (2012). Enterprise education: For all, or just some? *Education and Training, 54*(8), 813-824.
Josien, L., & Sybrowsky, J. (2013). Teaching Entrepreneurship in Action: Using EBAY as An Educational Tool. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 16, 1-13.
Jusoh, R., Ziyae, B., Asimiran, S., & Kadir, S.A. (2011). Entrepreneur Training Needs Analysis: Implications On The Entrepreneurial Skills Needed For Successful Entrepreneurs. *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER), 10*(1), 143-148.
Karlsson, T., & Moberg, K. (2013). Improving perceived entrepreneurial abilities through education: Exploratory

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

testing of an entrepreneurial self-efficacy scale in a pre-post setting. *International Journal of Management Education, 11*(1), 1-11.

Karwowski, M. (2014). Creative mindsets: Measurement, correlates, consequences. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 8*(1), 62-70.

Kautonen, T., van Gelderen, M., & Fink, M. (2015). Robustness of the Theory of Planned Behavior in Predicting Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 39*(3), 655-674.

Kuratko, D.F., & Morris, M.H. (2018). Examining the Future Trajectory of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management, 56*(1), 11-23.

Kusmintarti, A., Anshori, M. A., Sulasari, A., & Ismanu, S. (2018). Student's entrepreneur profile: A cluster of student's entrepreneurial characteristics. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21.

Lautenschlager, A., & Haase, H. (2011). The Myth of Entrepreneurship Education: Seven Arguments against Teaching Business Creation at Universities. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 14, 147-161.

Lindberg, E., Bohman, H., & Hultén, P. (2017a). Methods to enhance students' entrepreneurial mindset: a Swedish example. *European Journal of Training and Development, 41*(5), 450-466.

Lindberg, E., Bohman, H., Hulten, P., & Wilson, T. (2017b). Enhancing students' entrepreneurial mindset: a Swedish experience. *Education and Training, 59*(7-8), 768-779.

Mathisen, J.E., & Arnulf, J.K. (2013). Competing mindsets in entrepreneurship: The cost of doubt. *International Journal of Management Education, 11*(3), 132-141.

Mitchell, G.R. (2004). Instill the entrepreneurial mindset. *Industrial Research Institute*, 11-14.

Morselli, D., & Ajello, A. (2016). Assessing the sense of initiative and entrepreneurship in vocational students using the European qualification framework. *Emerald Insight, 58*(7/8), 797-814.

Mwasalwiba, E.S. (2010). Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. *Education and Training, 52*(1), 20-47.

Naktiyok, A., Nur Karabey, C., & Caglar Gulluce, A. (2010). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention: The Turkish case. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 6*(4), 419-435.

Nasr, K., & Boujelbene, Y. (2014). Assessing the Impact of Entrepreneurship Education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 712-715.

Naumann, C. (2017). Entrepreneurial mindset: A synthetic literature review. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review, 5*(3), 149-172.

Neneh, B.N. (2019). From entrepreneurial alertness to entrepreneurial behavior: The role of trait competitiveness and proactive personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 138, 273-279.

Newman, A., Obschonka, M., Schwarz, S., Cohen, M., & Nielsen, I. (2019). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: A systematic review of the literature on its theoretical foundations, measurement, antecedents, and outcomes, and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 110*(2017), 403-419.

Ozgen, E. (2011). Porter's diamond model and opportunity recognition: A cognitive perspective. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 17*(2), 61-76.

Ozgen, E., & Minsky, B.D. (2013). Why Some College Students Engage in Entrepreneurial Activities While Others Do Not. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, (16), 45-58.

Papagiannis, G.D. (2018). Entrepreneurship education programs: The contribution of courses, seminars and competitions to entrepreneurial activity decision and to entrepreneurial spirit and mindset of young people in Greece. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 21*(1), 1-21.

Ramayah, T., Chuah, F., Hwa, C.J., & Ting, H. (2016). Partial least squares structural equation modeling with R. Practical Assessment, *Research and Evaluation, 21*(1), 1-16.

Robinson, P.B., & Gough, V. (2020). The right stuff: Defining and influenceing the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 23*(2), 1-16.

Sanchez, G. (2013a). PLS Path Modeling with R. *R Package Notes*, 235.

Sanchez, J.C. (2013b). The impact of an entrepreneurship education program on entrepreneurial competencies and intention. *Journal of Small Business Management, 51*(3), 447-465.

Schlaegel, C., & Koenig, M. (2014). Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intent: A Meta-Analytic Test and Integration of Competing Models. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38*(2), 291-332.

Shane, S., Nicolaou, N., Cherkas, L., & Spector, T.D. (2010). Do openness to experience and recognizing opportunities have the same genetic source? *Human Resource Management, 49*(2), 291-303.

Shinnar, R.S., Hsu, D.K., Powell, B. C., & Zhou, H. (2018). Entrepreneurial intentions and start-ups: Are women or men more likely to enact their intentions? *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship, 36*(1), 60-80.

Shirokova, G., Osiyevskyy, O., & Bogatyreva, K. (2016). Exploring the intention-behavior link in student

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.

entrepreneurship: Moderating effects of individual and environmental characteristics. *European Management Journal, 34*(4), 386-399.

Susilo, W. (2014). An Entrepreneurial Mindset and Factors' Effect on Entrepreneur's Spirit in Indonesian. The SIJ Transactions on Industrial, *Financial and Business Management (IFBM), 2*(4), 227-234.

Teerijoki, H., & Murdock, K. A. (2014). Assessing the role of the teacher in introducing entrepreneurial education in engineering and science courses. *International Journal of Management Education, 12*(3), 479-489.

Tretyakova, N.V., Lyzhin, A. I., Chubarkova, E.V., & Lukiyanova, M.N. (2020). Focus on practical disciplines as a method of developing entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 23*(1), 1-9.

Ustyuzhina, O., Mikhaylova, A., & Abdimomynova, A. (2019). Entrepreneurial competencies in higher education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 22*(1), 1-14.

Van de Sandt, N., & Mauer, R. (2019). The effects of action-based entrepreneurship education on ambiguity tolerance and entrepreneurial alertness. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 22*(4), 1-13.

Van Gelderen, M., Brand, M., Van Praag, M., Bodewes, W., Poutsma, E., & Van Gils, A. (2008). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of planned behaviour. Career Development International, 13(6), 538-559.

Van Gelderen, M., Kautonen, T., & Fink, M. (2015). From entrepreneurial intentions to actions: Self-control and action-related doubt, fear, and aversion. Journal of Business Venturing, 30(5), 655-673.

Vasiliev, A. (2020). Entrepreneurial education quality management to improve university competitiveness. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 23*(1), 1-9.

Vij, S., & Farooq, R. (2017). Moderating variables in business research. *The IUP Journal of Business Strategy, 14*(4), 34-54.

Welsh, D.H.B., Tullar, W. L., & Nemati, H. (2016). Entrepreneurship education: Process, method, or both? *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge, 1*(3), 125-132.

Zellweger, T., Sieger, P., & Halter, F. (2011). Should I stay or should I go? Career choice intentions of students with family business background. *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(5), 521-536.

Zur, A., & Naumann, C. (2018). Blending Conflicting Logics by Social Entrepreneurs - The Role of Entrepreneurial Mindset. *Management Issues-Problemy Zarzadzania*, (73), 240-257.

Received: 09-Aug-2022, Manuscript No. AJEE-22-12438; **Editor assigned**: 11-Aug -2022, Pre QC No. AJEE-22-12438(PQ); **Reviewed**: 25-Aug-2022, QC No. AJEE-22-12438; **Revised**: 01-Sep-2022, Manuscript No. AJEE-22-12438(R); **Published**: 07-Sep-2022

Citation Information: Kania, R. (2022). From Entrepreneurial Mindset to Enterprising Mindset: Analyses in Entrepreneurship Course. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 25*(6),1-15.