

MANAGEERING UNIVERSITY STARTUPS: THE ROLE OF SELF- AND COLLECTIVE-EFFICACY IN MANAGING AND ENGINEERING STARTUPS

Dr. Imran Khan

Manageering Inc., Winnipeg, Canada.
Corresponding Email: imran.khan@manageering.ca

Dr. Youssef Bezzahou

Université de Saint-Boniface, Winnipeg, Canada.
Email: bezzahou@ustboniface.ca

ABSTRACT

Universities are increasingly expected to launch successful startups which are critical for national economic competitiveness because it helps generate jobs, economic growth, and prosperity. Although management theories are essential to engineer and manage startup tasks, the problem is that management theories are not sufficient for startup success. Rather, it is also essential that entrepreneurs believe both in their individual capabilities and team capabilities to successfully execute startup tasks. To help university stakeholders enhance startup survival, the research investigates three questions. Does expert entrepreneurship advice always enhance startup survival? Can self-efficacy and collective-efficacy theories enhance startup survival? How to build self-efficacy and collective-efficacy scales to enhance startup survival? To investigate these research questions, the research methodology: (i) conducts a literature review on entrepreneurship advice; (ii) conducts a literature review on self-efficacy, collective-efficacy, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy; and (iii) conducts a two-month pilot implementation of the Manageering University Startups program at a French speaking university in North Africa during October to December 2022. Finally, university stakeholders are encouraged to adopt three recommendations. First, entrepreneurs should continuously adopt well-known strategy frameworks, operational best practices, and entrepreneurship advice so they know what startup tasks to do. Second, entrepreneurs should also continuously enhance their individual self-efficacy and team collective-efficacy so they are more likely to successfully execute startup tasks. Third, entrepreneurs should also measure at least semi-annually their individual self-efficacy and team collective-efficacy using the Manageering University Startups Self-Efficacy and Collective-Efficacy scales so they are aware of individual and collective areas that need to be improved.



© 2023 The authors. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License.

Keywords:

Collective-efficacy,
entrepreneurship, self-efficacy,
university startup

Article History:

Received: 28 Jul 2023
Accepted: 15 Dec 2023
Available Online: 05 Feb 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

Universities are increasingly expected to contribute to innovation and entrepreneurship by directly and indirectly facilitating the launch of startups which is critical for national economic competitiveness because it helps generate jobs, economic growth, and prosperity. However, the process to engineer and manage a new startup is complex and involves decision making under deep uncertainty. Even the best startup incubators cannot guarantee that a startup will succeed in the long term despite their specialized network of programs, mentors, and capital (Kawasaki, 2004). To enhance startup survival, entrepreneurs use management strategy frameworks (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 2009) and management best practices (Drucker, 2012) to help make decisions that lead to sustained superior performance. As well, to enhance startup survival, universities also use management cluster frameworks (Khan & Bezzahou, 2020) to make sustained, heavy, and specialized investments to develop and maintain a sophisticated entrepreneurship ecosystem. Although these management frameworks are essential for startup success because they help formulate strategy and execute operational tasks, the problem is these management frameworks are not sufficient for startup success because they cannot guarantee the entrepreneurs will successfully execute the startup tasks. As such, to enhance startup survival, it is also essential that entrepreneurs believe in their individual capabilities and team capabilities to successfully execute startup tasks. To help university stakeholders like administrators, faculty, students, and alumni enhance startup survival, the research problem being studied is how to better understand the role of management and non-management frameworks in managing and engineering startups. In particular, the research investigates three questions. First, does expert entrepreneurship advice always enhance

startup survival? Second, can self-efficacy and collective-efficacy theories enhance startup survival? Third, how to build self-efficacy and collective-efficacy scales to enhance startup survival? Finally, to investigate these three research questions, the research methodology and paper structure are as follows. First, conduct a literature review on entrepreneurship advice to answer research question one. Second, conduct a literature review on self-efficacy, collective-efficacy, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy to answer research question two. Third, conduct a two-month pilot implementation of the Manageering University Startups program at a French speaking university in North Africa during October to December 2022 to answer research question three. Finally, make recommendations based on the research results.

2. DOES EXPERT ENTREPRENEURSHIP ADVICE ALWAYS ENHANCE STARTUP SURVIVAL?

Establishing a successful startup is a complex endeavor that involves processing conflicting advice from multiple stakeholders (Bhide, 1996). Specifically, the high startup failure rate exists because entrepreneurs have to continuously make unstructured decisions to engineer the appropriate strategy and manage the day-to-day operations using management best practices. As such, there is no single decision or framework that will guarantee to prevent a startup failure; instead, there is a lot of diverse and sometimes conflicting advice claiming to increase the chance of startup survival. This section summarizes and comments on some of the diverse advice for startup survival published in the well-known Harvard Business Review.

2.1 Eliminate Avoidable Errors

According to Eisenmann (2021), entrepreneurship is doing something new with limited resources which is inherently risky. His

research shows many startups never launch and those that do launch, two-thirds never show a positive return. He also claims that many startup failures are avoidable because they follow the same trajectory and thus eliminating these avoidable errors can reduce the number of failures and frequency which will result in a more productivity, more diversity, and less volatile entrepreneurial economy. In particular, his research shows common patterns leading to startup failure are: (i) choosing the wrong stakeholders; (ii) not developing a unique value proposition; (iii) misinterpreting demand signals; (iv) not transitioning from initial adopters to mainstream; (v) pursuing an attractive opportunity with rapid growth but leads to market saturation; (vi) lacking funding and/or management; and (vii) dealing with multiple cascading do-or-die challenges. In our opinion, most management academics and practitioners would agree that eliminating these seven common errors should help increase the survival rate of startups however these common errors may not necessarily be fully avoidable. In particular, although it is necessary to know that these common errors exist, that knowledge is not sufficient to help make real-time decisions in a complex entrepreneurial environment that will fully eliminate the common errors. As such, perhaps the advice should be to reduce rather than eliminate avoidable errors.

2.2 Adopt Lean Startup Model

According to Blank (2013), the Lean Startup model favors: (i) experimentation over elaborate planning; (ii) customer feedback over intuition; and (iii) iterative design over upfront big design. Blank claims the Lean Startup model iterates through different versions of the unique value proposition using feedback from a series of minimum viable products, which reduces time and money spent on value propositions that no one will pay for thus reducing the failure rate. In our opinion, an ever-increasing number of management academics and practitioners are adopting some version of the Lean Startup model. Interestingly, Blank (2013) reported that the non-lean startup methods to launch startups yields 75% of startups failure; whereas Eisenmann (2021) reported that the lean startup method to launch startups yields 66% of startup failure. As such, after about 10-years of introducing the Lean Startup model, the startup failure rate fell by almost 10%, which may or may not be fully attributed to the Lean Startup model. As such, although it may be necessary to adopt some version of the Lean Startup model, adopting the model may not be sufficient to guarantee startup survival.

2.3 Choose Generic Entrepreneurial Strategy

Gans et al. (2018) introduce their Entrepreneurial Strategy Compass model that allows entrepreneurs to make four decisions to adopt a generic strategy: (i) collaborate or compete; and (ii) build a moat or storm a hill. They claim their 2x2 matrix model helps entrepreneurs operate in a state of uncertainty by helping startups choose one of four generic strategies (Intellectual Property, Disruption, Venture Capital, or Architectural) rather than choose an ad hoc approach to adopt the first strategy that comes to mind, which will lead to startup success. In our opinion, management models are essential for helping make good decisions in a complex business environment, but an oversimplified model may have limited benefits and may in fact do more harm as it may hide some of the essential complexities necessary to make successful decisions. Interestingly, many would agree that Porter (2008) has made seminal contributions for over four decades with his management and strategy models/frameworks but his 2x2 matrix model for generic strategies (Porter, 1998) introduced in the 1980s consistently met with resistance from many academics and practitioners because it was claimed to be over simplifying the vast range of available strategies thus even Porter to some degree has stepped away from discussing his 2x2 generic strategies model in recent years. As such, perhaps a generic model that may be oversimplified may not provide the best advice.

2.4 Build Overwhelmingly Aggressive Team

Gompers et al. (2021) conducted a comprehensive survey of Venture Capital (VC) firms to show how VCs help create value for startups. They claim successful startups always seem to have founders who successfully build overwhelmingly aggressive teams. In particular, their research shows that VCs help build these teams by providing: (i) guidance for strategy and operations; (ii) connections to investors and customers; and (iii) help hiring board members and employees. In our opinion, many management academics and practitioners would agree that VCs prefer overwhelmingly aggressive teams, and these teams can be useful for startup success, but these overwhelmingly aggressive teams are not necessary for success as ordinary teams have been known to achieve extraordinary success (Mintzberg et al., 1996). As such, the advice does not necessarily apply in every situation.

3. CAN SELF-EFFICACY THEORY ENHANCE STARTUP SURVIVAL?

As expected, the field of management has helped tremendously to decrease the failure rate of startups, however, other fields may provide non-management theories to complement our understanding of why some startups succeed while others fail. In particular, Bandura (1997) is regarded as the father of self-efficacy in the field of psychology, which we believe can help contribute to better understanding why some entrepreneurs are more successful at engineering and managing startups.

3.1 What is self-efficacy and how do you measure it?

According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is a measure of your belief in your capabilities to execute specific tasks. He claims self-efficacy is important because it affects human behavior including "the courses of action people choose to pursue, the challenges and goals they set for themselves and their commitment to them, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, the outcomes they expect their efforts to produce, how long they persevere in the face of obstacles, their resilience to adversity, the quality of their emotional life and how much stress and depression they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands, and the life choices they make and the accomplishments they realize". Furthermore, Bandura (Urdan & Pajares, 2009) claims self-efficacy beliefs differ in generality and strength. With respect to generality, people may believe they have high self-efficacy in a wide range of task domains or only in specific domains. As such, each person has a network of efficacy beliefs where people structure their lives around those that are of greater importance than others. With respect to strength, weak efficacy beliefs are easily dismissed by difficult situations, whereas strong efficacy beliefs allow the person to persevere despite countless difficulties. Furthermore, there is a threshold of self-efficacy strength needed to attempt a task whereas higher strengths above the threshold will result in the same attempt at the task but with greater perseverance and higher likelihood that the task will be performed successfully.

According to Bandura (Urdan & Pajares, 2009), there are five aspects to construct an accurate self-efficacy assessment: (i) domain specification with multicausality; (ii) gradations of challenge; (iii) response scale; (iv) minimize response biases; and (v) item analysis in scale construction.

First, to construct an accurate self-efficacy assessment, not only must it be domain specific, but the scale must be linked to behavioral factors over which people can exercise some control. For instance, the personal influence exercised can include among others regulating one's own motivation, thought processes, performance level, emotional states, or altering environmental conditions. Furthermore, the assessment scale will produce more accurate results if it includes perceived capability to control multiple items in the domain than if it is confined solely to one task in the domain.

Second, self-efficacy assessment scales should measure the level of difficulty individuals believe they can overcome to accomplish a task otherwise the task is easily performable, and everyone has high self-efficacy in the task. Although the level of difficulty to accomplish a task depends on the nature of the task, the task may be graded in terms of level of ingenuity, exertion, accuracy, productivity, threat, self-regulation, or other dimensions of performance. As well, since many tasks involve self-motivation to do things, self-regulation is the capability of interest in the face of different types of challenges, such as pressure, tiredness, depression, or other commitments.

Third, to measure self-efficacy for a task, individuals are presented with situations that include different levels of task difficulty and they rate the strength of their belief in their ability to execute the task. A 100-point scale is used with 10-unit intervals where 0 corresponds to cannot do the task, 50 corresponds to moderately certain can do task, and 100 corresponds to highly certain can do task.

Fourth, self-efficacy assessments should be recorded anonymously without personal identification to reduce social evaluative concerns. As well, to encourage honest answers, it is important to explain how the assessment will help develop programs that allow people to better manage daily tasks.

Finally, items in the self-efficacy assessment should be analyzed to reword ambiguous items. As well, those items where most respondents are checking the same response point should be removed. Furthermore, items where most respondents are checking the maximum efficacy should be rewritten to incorporate a larger range of difficulty to distinguish between levels of efficacy.

3.2 What is collective-efficacy and how do you measure it?

Although self-efficacy is important because it helps understand why some individuals believe strongly in their ability to execute individual tasks and can lead to more successful individual outcomes, many tasks can only be executed through interdependent group collaboration. As such, Bandura (2000) claims collective-efficacy is an extension to self-efficacy which measures the collective belief in their collective ability to execute a collective task. Nevertheless, Bandura (Urdan & Pajares, 2009) states collective-efficacy is not simply the sum of the efficacy beliefs of individual members, instead, it is an emergent group-level property because collaborative work involves interactive and synergistic dynamics between group members. Furthermore, he states "a group operates through the behavior of its members who are acting coordinatively on a shared belief not an emergent entity that operates independently of the beliefs and actions of the individuals. As such, although beliefs of collective efficacy include emergent aspects, they serve functions similar to those of personal efficacy beliefs and operate through similar processes". With respect to measuring collective-efficacy, Bandura (Urdan & Pajares, 2009) states there are two main approaches. The first approach aggregates each individual group members' belief of their personal ability to execute their portion of the collective task. The second and recommended approach aggregates the group's belief of the group's ability to execute the group tasks, which takes into consideration the emergent group-level property. As such, "the higher the perceived collective efficacy, the higher the groups' motivational investment in their undertakings, the stronger their staying power in the face of impediments and setbacks, and the greater their performance accomplishments".

3.3 What is entrepreneurial self-efficacy and how do you measure it?

According to Jung et al. (2001), entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) measures a person's belief in their own abilities to execute the tasks necessary to pursue a new venture opportunity. They claim the ESE has a significant and positive effect on the likelihood of being an entrepreneur because the entrepreneurial literature shows individuals might be more inclined to pursue entrepreneurship if they believe they possess the necessary skills. However, they believe the existing literature is too narrowly focused on managerial, technical, or functional skills as opposed to specific skills that comprise the entrepreneurial startup experience. As such, they claim their ESE scale uses tasks uniquely residing in the domain of entrepreneurs rather than a combination of entrepreneurs and managers, which are: (i) developing new product or market opportunities; (ii) building an innovative environment; (iii) initiating investor relationships; (iv) defining core purpose; (v) coping with unexpected challenges; and (vi) developing critical human resources. Finally, they believe their ESE scale can provide several benefits. First, venture capitalists can use it to evaluate the management team at startups. Second, existing corporations can use it to identify individuals to champion new products or market opportunities. Third, entrepreneurship educators can use it to better design course content and overall curriculum to build confidence in students and nurture those skills essential to the entrepreneurial process.

Ever since Jung et al. (2001) published their ESE scale, many researchers continue to work on either creating a more focused ESE scale or creating a more comprehensive ESE scale. For instance, Lang & Liu (2023) developed the first ESE scale for the fashion industry, which consists of 21 items across four distinct dimensions: passion for fashion business, marketing and branding, financial management, and creativity. As well, Wang et al. (2020) developed an internet ESE scale that uses 16 items across three dimensions: leadership, technology utilization and internet marketing, and e-commerce. Whereas Taneja Chawla & Bhatia (2021) created a comprehensive ESE scale but tailored it to India. As well, Bakkar et al. (2021) applied the Jung et al. (2001) ESE scale to students at the Sultan Qaboos University to investigate the impact of cultural differences.

4. HOW TO BUILD SELF-EFFICACY & COLLECTIVE-EFFICACY SCALES TO ENHANCE STARTUP SURVIVAL?

With respect to self-efficacy and collective efficacy, in our opinion, the theories can contribute to understanding, measuring, and building the individual and collective motivation and performance when creating a university startup. Specifically, we believe when individual entrepreneurs and the startup team build a high level of startup self-efficacy and startup collective-efficacy respectively, they will not only raise their individual and team motivation but will also have a higher chance of engineering and

managing a successful startup because the individuals and team will not only be more capable to execute the startup tasks but they will be able to overcome larger obstacles and setbacks for a longer period.

With respect to entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE), in our opinion, over the past 25 years, no universally accepted ESE scale has emerged, nor should we expect a universal ESE scale to emerge in the near future. Furthermore, unlike Jung et al. (2001), we do not believe the startup tasks are different than management tasks at an existing corporation. Recall, they claim their ESE scale uses tasks uniquely residing in the domain of entrepreneurs rather than a combination of entrepreneurs and managers, which are: (i) developing new product or market opportunities; (ii) building an innovative environment; (iii) initiating investor relationships; (iv) defining core purpose; (v) coping with unexpected challenges; and (vi) developing critical human resources. However, in our opinion, many academics and practitioners would agree that these six areas are not exclusive to startups, instead, most corporations deal with all of these six areas throughout the year. Although we believe the management tasks required to engineer and manage a new startup are the same management tasks required to manage an existing corporation, we do agree that startups and existing corporations are different. Specifically, the difference is that existing corporations have many people and many resources to help with the day-to-day management tasks using best practices in order to execute a relatively stable and proven strategy; whereas in a startup there are generally fewer people and fewer resources to not only manage the day-to-day operations by learning how to adopt best practices but to engineer a new strategy that has not been fully proven to provide a unique value proposition. In addition, we believe each university with entrepreneurship courses, programs, business plan competitions, incubators, and other activities will customize the most comprehensive and generic management self-efficacy scale available to their own unique needs. As such, we believe startups should use a comprehensive and generic management self-efficacy scale rather than a limited and artificially narrow ESE scale, which is especially important for university startups as most students early in their career do not have all the skills necessary to accomplish all the startup tasks.

Finally, although we recognize that self-efficacy and collective-efficacy are not the only factors affecting university startup success, we believe a comprehensive and generic management self-efficacy scale will integrate strategy theories, operational best practices, and self- and collective-efficacy theories. Thus, in this section, we first highlight the Manageering University Startups program then present its related self-efficacy and collective-efficacy scales, which can be used by university stakeholders like administrators, faculty, students, and alumni to measure and enhance self- and collective-efficacy in their entrepreneurship ecosystems to complement existing entrepreneurship activities and help increase the chance to successfully engineer and manage university startups.

4.1 Manageering University Startup Program

The Manageering University Startup Program facilitates a 6-person university startup team made of students, faculty, staff, alumni, and/or partners to engineer and manage a financially sustainable startup that solves social issues, generates local jobs, and builds economic growth. In particular, the startup program uses a cost leadership business model so university team members do not have to pay program fees or initial startup funds because they are creatively funded with external endowments, government support, and strategic investors. As well, the startup program facilitator, has over 20-years of experience as a Business Analyst, Project Manager, Venture Capital Investments Manager, and Consultant. The facilitator also has over 20-years of teaching experience at an AACSB accredited business school in Strategy, Finance, Investments, Operations, and Management of Information Systems. In particular, the facilitator creates an intense micro-entrepreneurship environment for the university team then collaborates with the university team to launch a new startup using a 3-iteration process. Iteration 1 involves 20-hours of facilitation to collaborate with the team to create a draft business plan presentation; while iteration 2 involves 40-hours to refine the business plan presentation and conduct market research; and finally, iteration 3 involves 60-hours to finalize the business plan presentation and create a minimal viable prototype.

The Manageering University Startup facilitator uses a 5-stage process in each of the 3-iterations to seamlessly apply world-renowned management techniques and frameworks. Stage 1 defines the issue being solved using critical thinking to develop a deeper understanding of the issue through brainstorming ideas and using secondary data. Stage 2

analyzes the existing industry using Porter (2008) Strategy Models to understand how current companies compete to solve the issue. In particular it involves using the Five Forces, Value Chain, Generic Strategies, and Strategy Tests models. Stage 3 engineers a new competitive strategy using Porter (1998) Strategy Tests to successfully compete in the existing industry. In particular to design: unique value proposition; tailored value chain; tradeoffs in value proposition and value chain; fit between value chain activities; and continuity to get good at value proposition, value chain, and fit. Stage 4 manages ongoing operations using management best practices to deliver above average profitability. In particular it involves managing value chain activities for: human resources, marketing, technology, operations, and finance. Finally, stage 5 compiles the business plan presentation to explain to stakeholders: why the issue is important, how the existing industry does not solve the issue, how the new startup will solve the issue, and what are the next steps for the new startup.

4.2 Manageering University Startups Self- and Collective-Efficacy Scales

The Manageering University Startups self-efficacy and related collective-efficacy scales are presented in Figure 1 (see annexures), where the self-efficacy wording is shown in normal font while the collective-efficacy wording is shown in white font with black background. The scales were developed applying the guidelines provided by Bandura (Urdan & Pajares, 2009) to the two-month pilot implementation of the Manageering University Startups program at a French speaking university in North Africa during October to December 2022. For instance, the scales use multiple efficacy items from the management subdomains of strategy and operational best practices. As well, the items are linked to behavioral factors which the entrepreneurs exercise control, such as thought processes and performance level. As well, to prevent respondents from rating each task with high efficacy, each task is associated with three levels of difficulty in terms of level of ingenuity and quality.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The objective of this research was to generate information for university administrators, faculty, students, and alumni, along with local business community and national policy makers on how the Manageering University Startups program, and by implication other similar startup programs, could be incorporated into existing university entrepreneurship ecosystems to not only use proven strategy and management frameworks to successfully engineer and manage startups but to also enhance self- and collective-efficacy of entrepreneurs which is also essential for startup success. This insight is needed at a time when university administrators and faculty are increasingly incorporating entrepreneurship into classroom instruction and faculty-level programs but often lack the experience needed to anticipate all of the challenges and opportunities involved in incorporating an external entrepreneurship program. As such, university stakeholders like administrators, faculty, students, and alumni are encouraged to adopt the following recommendations to enhance startup survival. First, university entrepreneurs should continuously develop a broad and deep understanding of well-known strategy frameworks, operational best practices, and entrepreneurship advice so they know what startup tasks to do. Second, university entrepreneurs should also continuously enhance their individual self-efficacy and team collective-efficacy so they are more likely to successfully execute startup tasks. Third, university entrepreneurs should also measure at least semi-annually their individual self-efficacy and team collective-efficacy using the Manageering University Startups Self-Efficacy and Collective-Efficacy scales so they are aware of individual and collective areas that need to be improved through professional development for existing members and selection of new team members respectively.

REFERENCES

Bakkar, AL-Sheikh Hammoud, M., AL Shayeb, M., AL-Zoubi, S., & Shendi, Y. A. A. (2021). The Psychometric Characteristics Of The Omani Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Scale. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 24, 1–12.

Bandura. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.

Bandura. (2000). Exercise of Human Agency through Collective Efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science: a Journal of the American Psychological Society*, 9(3), 75–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00064>

Bhide. (1996). The questions every entrepreneur must answer. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(6), 120–130.

Blank. (2013). Why the lean start-up changes everything. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(5), 64–.

Drucker. (2012). *The frontiers of management: where tomorrow's decisions are being shaped today*. Butterworth-Heinemann.

Eisenmann. (2021). Why Start-ups Fail. *Harvard Business Review*.

Gans, Scott, E. L., & Stern, S. (2018). Strategy for start-ups. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(3), 44–.

Gompers, Gornall, W., Kaplan, S. N., & Strebulaev, I. A. (2021). How Venture Capitalists Make Decisions: An inside look at an opaque process. *Harvard Business Review*, 99(2), 70–.

Jung, Ehrlich, S. B., De Noble, A. F., & Baik, K. B. (2001). Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and its Relationship to Entrepreneurial Action: A Comparative Study Between the US and Korea. *Management International (Montréal)*, 6(No 1), 41–.

Kawasaki. (2004). *The Art of the Start: The Time-Tested, Battle-Hardened Guide for Anyone Starting Anything*. New York: Portfolio.

Khan, & Bezzahou, Y. (2020). Manageering Balanced Way of Life: Managing and Engineering Community Platforms Using Endowments, Marketplaces and Incubators. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business & Management Review*, 9(3), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0059068>

Lang, & Liu, C. (2023). Fashion entrepreneurial self-efficacy: development and validation of a domain-specific scale. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 27(1), 118–137. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-05-2021-0111>

Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, B. W., & Lampel, J. (2009). *Strategy safari: the complete guide through the wilds of strategic management* (2nd ed.). FT Prentice Hall.

Mintzberg, Pascale, R. T., Goold, M., & Rumelt, R. P. (1996). The “Honda Effect” Revisited. *California Management Review*, 38(4), 78–117.

Porter. (1998). *Competitive strategy: techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. Free Press.

Porter. (2008). *On competition (Updated and expanded ed.)*. Harvard Business School Press.

Taneja Chawla, & Bhatia, H. (2021). Measuring Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy: A Comprehensive Scale. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies*, 7(2), 194–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23939575211019605>

Urdan, & Pajares, F. (2009). Guide For Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales. In *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*. Information Age Publishing, Incorporated.

Wang, Tseng, T. H., Wang, Y.-M., & Chu, C.-W. (2020). Development and validation of an internet entrepreneurial self-efficacy scale. *Internet Research*, 30(2), 653–675. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-07-2018-0294>

Annexure – I

Figure 1. Manageering University Startups Self-Efficacy & Collective-Efficacy Scales

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for university startup entrepreneurs. Please rate how certain you are that you can do the things discussed below by writing the appropriate number. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will not be identified by name.

Rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 to 100 using the scale given below:

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Cannot					Moderately				Highly certain	
do at all					can do				can do	

STARTUP SELF-EFFICACY ITEMS	STARTUP COLLECTIVE-EFFICACY ITEMS	CONFIDENCE (0-100)
Efficacy to select big issue to solve		
- Brainstorm big issues to solve which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Find secondary data to support the big issue which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)		_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to analyze existing industry		
- Determine competitive industry structure which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Identify industry value chain activities which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Apply strategy tests to competitors which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)		_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to engineer new competitive strategy		
- Design unique value proposition which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Design tailored value chain which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Design tradeoffs in value proposition and value chain which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Design fit between value chain activities which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Design continuity to get good at value proposition, value chain, and fit which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)		_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to manage human resources value chain activities with best practices		
- Plan what work must be done which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Organize who will do the work which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Lead team to complete work which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)		_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

- Control timeline of work which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)	
Efficacy to manage marketing value chain activities with best practices - Develop functional appeal which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Develop emotional appeal which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Develop spiritual appeal which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to manage technology value chain activities with best practices - Choose software development platform which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Choose software services providers which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)	_____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to manage operations value chain activities with best practices - Forecast demand which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Match capacity to demand which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)	_____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to manage finance value chain activities with best practices - Forecast budget for worst-case scenario which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Forecast budget for likely-case scenario which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Forecast budget for best-case scenario which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Efficacy to deliver business plan presentation - Articulate big issue being solved which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Articulate why existing industry is not solving the big issue which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Articulate why new startup will solve the big issue which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept) - Articulate to stakeholders the next steps which ... - you believe in (your team believes in) - your team members will consider (your stakeholders will consider) - your team members will accept (your stakeholders will accept)	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____