


“Small business and entrepreneurial venture in an economic conundrum”

AUTHORS	John Amolo Stephen O. Migiro
ARTICLE INFO	John Amolo and Stephen O. Migiro (2017). Small business and entrepreneurial venture in an economic conundrum. <i>Problems and Perspectives in Management</i> , 15(1-1), 271-279. doi: 10.21511/ppm.15(1-1).2017.14
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15(1-1).2017.14
RELEASED ON	Thursday, 11 May 2017
RECEIVED ON	Tuesday, 09 February 2016
ACCEPTED ON	Tuesday, 24 January 2017
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
JOURNAL	"Problems and Perspectives in Management"
ISSN PRINT	1727-7051
ISSN ONLINE	1810-5467
PUBLISHER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”
FOUNDER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

55



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

0

© The author(s) 2025. This publication is an open access article.

John Amolo (South Africa), Stephen O. Migiro (South Africa)

Small business and entrepreneurial venture in an economic conundrum

Abstract

Does small business add the same value as entrepreneurial venture to an economy? Entrepreneurial ventures are resilient to economic duress, while providing higher quality and quantity of jobs, products and services. A needed entrepreneurial economic omnipresence pervasively stimulates socio-economic mindset in opportunity, rather than resource pursuit. A managed economy is under challenge by a knowledge economy and the policies of the former have become irrelevant for the latter. The unpredictable economic times call for a flexibility associated with an entrepreneurial economy. In this presentation, a literature review was conducted to highlight this conundrum in an economy. The findings are that entrepreneurial ventures have their distinctive features from simply small business enterprise and are better served in an entrepreneurial economy than a managed economy.

The significance of an entrepreneurial business and economy for individuals and policy makers alike has never needed an emphasis as in the days of our economic volatility.

Keywords: economy, employment, entrepreneurial, managed, policy.

JEL Classification: L26, F24.

Received on: 9th of February, 2016.

Accepted on: 24th of January, 2017.

Introduction

This paper has been realized by the use of literature review on the features of small business venture and an entrepreneurial venture. It is known that entrepreneurship is accepted in many settings as something good. The role of small business is notable to the economies at a glance. It is noted that 99% of businesses in developed economies is small business and provides half of employment needs at any given point (Bennet, 2008). Whereas this position of employment provision is well celebrated, Reylands and Lancaster (2007) have reported that this sizeable employment provision, which is, thus celebrated is mainly due to the large number of small businesses. Audrestch (2012) points that in UK alone, there are 4.8 million small businesses. It, therefore, comes as no surprise that a number of people get employed through small business ventures. Small business, however, is often associated with the problem of growth interest, as opposed to entrepreneurial ventures. Gray (1998) and Chaston (2008) have reported that small businesses don't embed growth interest in their operations. This understanding is well supported by McKelvie and Wiklund (2010) who affirm that most small businesses don't grow beyond very small. As to whether a large number of businesses are entrepreneurial remains a matter in its right for further study. The policy makers also operate in an understanding that entrepreneurial development is of great importance, however, as to

whether the economy in which they operate in is entrepreneurial, remains a bone of contention that needs analysis by the features stated herein. Spiropoulos (2014) states that the main aspect that differentiates entrepreneurs from small business owners is the level of risk the entrepreneurs are willing to undertake. Entrepreneurs are often noted for substantially taking a higher level of risk, as opposed to small businesses owners. They tend to undertake a higher amount of risk and it explains why after many failures, they end up succeeding. Herenkson and Sanandaji (2014) have recorded in their study that small business activity does not measure the Schumpeterian entrepreneurship related to innovation and growth. Their findings underscore that countries that have higher entrepreneurship rates are often associated with higher trust, regulatory burdens that are lower, venture capital that is high, as well as lower taxes coupled with less self-employment. Thurick and Wenckers (2004) express the similarity of the terms entrepreneurship and small business, whilst denoting that they are not the same concepts. Entrepreneurship has been noted as opportunity seeking behavior rather than resource seeking (Pate and Wankel, 2014). This tendency, nonetheless, can be reported in both small businesses and big business. This, therefore, points that entrepreneurial behavior can be found both in small business and big business. The main focus, however, is that there is an aspect of innovation, as well as growth in an entrepreneurial business. Schumpeterian's view that small business entrepreneurs introduce change to the industry by the new processes and products they bring forth in addition to income and employment emanating from small business is more descriptive of an active entrepreneurial venture. It should be noted that there are persons who run a business just for a living (Wenckers and Thurik, 1999). It is this group (those that run a business for a living) that others

© John Amolo, Stephen O. Migiro, 2017.

John Amolo, Dr., UKZN Graduate School of Business and Leadership, South Africa.

Stephen O. Migiro, Professor, UKZN Graduate School of Business and Leadership, South Africa.

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license, which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

have termed as necessity based entrepreneurs (Scheepers, Solomon, and De Vries, 2009). This understanding is limited to the event of starting a business venture, but the entrepreneurial venture continues in the risk zone in search of growth and uniqueness regardless of business size. Small business has, however, operated under different periods and has served in different circumstances. During the post war period, small business mattered more on social and political grounds, but its economic efficiency for survival was doubted. As to whether small business would have had any future existence was subject to the understanding that only big business had the capacity for existence on economic efficiency grounds. It may be noted that in the 60's and 70's before big businesses gained great prominence, small business provided jobs and, hence, the social and political stability element, thus, nurtured. Nonetheless, policy was influenced by the reasoning of Schumpeter (1942), Galbraith (1967) and Chandler (1977) that the future lay in the hands of big businesses, since small business would be annihilated by its own inefficiencies. It was for this reason that the US policy was in a predicament of either permitting the demise of small business on economic grounds or for social and political grounds enable its survival. Thurick and Wennerkers (2004) state how it had been argued that small business was a necessity in maintaining the democracy in the US following the Jeffersonian tradition. Is it any wonder that the Robinson-Patman Act (Foer, 2001) was accused of competitor protection rather than competition (Bork, 1978)? The viability of small business depended on the establishment of the small business administration in the US and this could be termed as a protective attempt for the less efficient small businesses (Thurick and Wennerkers, 2001). It is clear that the internal potential and focus of the small business wasn't based on its capacity and calculated risk-taking, which is entrepreneurial. Business capacity in developing calculated risk is indeed good for business itself, as well as an economy.

The organizational economies upon which small and large businesses operate have been broadly categorized as either a managed economy or an entrepreneurial one. The dominant inputs of the managed economy include land, labor and capital. The certainty of outputs mainly from manufactured products was assured under the managed economy. The high costs associated with economic activities have nearly been done away with through the revolution of telecommunications and computer networks. It is in this context that high cost production can be done in low cost settings as far as a globalized economy is concerned. The costs of production helped in the certainty of outputs of production. There is, however, an element associated with entrepreneurial economy, which has been so much under use

through globalization – the knowledge factor. Knowledge as a factor of production is characterized by high uncertainty unlike land, labor and capital and at the same time costly to transact (Audrestch and Thurik, 2004). It is important to underscore the fact that a number of economies, especially less developed economies, will operate under certainty, where outputs are easily determinable as opposed to the volatility associated with the knowledge factor. The certainty of outputs in a managed economy is likely to be cherished right from small business to the entire economy given that the investment costs are less. This understanding is possible even in small business, but at the same time it limits capacity to operate entrepreneurially in investment decisions with greater returns.

The role of small business is to be seen within the entrepreneurial dimensions other than social or political overtones, if a nation is to thrive in its economic development. A wide range of evidence has recently suggested that entrepreneurship as economic growth determinant is vitally significant (Audrestch and Thurik, 2000; Audrestch et al., 2001; Carree and Thurik, 1999; Audrestch et al., 2002b; Carree et al., 2002; Stephens, Partridge and Faggian, 2013). With the consequences of economic recession, where companies were closed down in a number of areas, as well as massive job losses, it becomes imperative to deliberate on the distinction between a small business and an entrepreneurial one. This is more relevant in that entrepreneurial businesses have been known to exhibit survival capacity, as compared to ordinary businesses. A catalyst that has been associated with the entrepreneurial economy has also been termed as the change that is technological in nature. A multitude of factors beyond the technological change has, however, been associated with the upcoming changes, and this has included the corporate world getting reorganized, political systems like communism falling off, the levels of prosperity increasing and knowledge production becomes evidently oversurpassing (Thurik, Stam, and Audrestsch, 2013).

As part of a commercial environment, the two economies are fully addressed in terms of a managed economy and an entrepreneurial economy in order to have a clear view if policy is to be adopted towards a full support of an entrepreneurial flair. The environment will spur up the business venture. It is clear that a small business can operate in both the managed economy and entrepreneurial one. However, it takes painful strides for an entrepreneurial business to operate under a managed economy. Whereas the policy makers of a managed economy will desire the benefits of entrepreneurial ventures, the realization of the need for an entrepreneurial economy in order to enhance the desired benefits becomes a yardstick of seriousness in a managed economy.

The sections below discuss the distinctions between small business and entrepreneurial venture, as well as a managed economy and an entrepreneurial one. Whereas any business has often been termed as entrepreneurial, and any economy that pledges support to entrepreneurship is said to be entrepreneurial, this presentation hopes to achieve the clarity for decision making both at individual level of business ownership, as well as policy makers enhancing economic efforts for economic excellence.

1. Small business and an entrepreneurial venture

The need to understand the difference between small business and entrepreneurial ventures is captured by Nieman, Hough, and Nieuwenhuizen (2008, p. 10), who argue that though both are important for the development of the economy, yet, there is a need to distinguish the two. The pursuit and creation of new opportunities is not the same in each case, as supported by Wickham (2008), and this presents different challenges to policy makers. Whereas both need entrepreneurial start up, yet, unlike entrepreneurial ventures, small business ventures stabilize at a certain stage and, then, end up growing with inflation. Small business owners have also been noted for the personal goals and security aspiration in furthering their business. Examples of small business ownership can be noted in characteristics of artisans, manager, craftsman and administration and family businesses among others (Watson, 2001, p. 50). In understanding the difference, Carland, J.W., Hoy, Boulton & Carland, J.C. (1984, p. 358) assert that small business can be generally termed as any business owned and operated independently, and yet it is not dominant in its field of speciality and at the same time does not engage in new marketing and innovative practices. If this perception of small business is taken to exclude entrepreneurial activity, then, this understanding will imply that for a business to be entrepreneurial, it has to be big or large business. This would be a disfavor to small businesses that are entrepreneurial, as well as large businesses that are not necessarily entrepreneurial. The main aspect should be the entrepreneurial behavior rather than the size of the business. There is no given guarantee that if the business is growing, it is necessarily entrepreneurial, although entrepreneurial businesses through innovative marketing have this embedded as their goal. The growth of a business can as well be spontaneous as a result of other economic factors such as increase in population in a given area. The challenge to this growth is that since it is not planned, it may dwindle if substitutes or competitors arise, due to lack of a sustainability foresight as an entrepreneurial goal. It is equally important to record the defining characteristics of the South African small business in the National Small Business Act, Act 102, of 1996. The definition provided covers all sectors of the economy and

covers all types of enterprises, while focusing mainly on two sections: the qualitative and quantitative criteria.

The qualitative criterion does relate to the ownership structure of the business and consists of the following:

- ◆ it has to be a distinct and separate business entity;
- ◆ it includes any subsidiaries and branches when measuring the size;
- ◆ it is not part of a group of companies;
- ◆ has to be managed by the owners;
- ◆ it has to have a natural person in the form of sole proprietorship, partnership and yet at the same time it can be a legal person, such as a close corporation or a company (Nieuwenhuizen, Machado, Jacobs et al., 2004, p. 9).

The quantitative criterion categorize businesses into very small, small and medium in accordance with the different sectors of the economy. The guidelines dealing with this area are pointed out by Nieuwenhuizen, Machado, Jacobs et al., (2004, p. 9) as follows:

- ◆ the total asset value, which is calculated in exclusion of fixed asset value;
- ◆ the total number of fulltime employees; and
- ◆ the annual total turnover.

The small businesses are said to support the lifestyle of the owner and, therefore, the issue of security and autonomy is much more emphasized. Growth as an objective is not the primary goal of small businesses. It is also considered that if the earning is smaller even when it could be lower than when they were employees, this may be satisfactory to the business owners.

Entrepreneurial ventures, on the other hand, express a fundamental objective of profitability and growth. According to Nieuwenhuizen, Machado, Jacobs et al. (2004, p. 9), one of the objectives of an entrepreneur is the favorable difference between expenses and income referred to as profit. This is the cornerstone of a free market system. Wickham (2008, p. 24) points out three characteristics that distinguish entrepreneurial ventures from small business as follows:

Entrepreneurial ventures set out *strategic objectives* regarding the target markets, market share, market position and market development. Small business is often limited to profit target, sales and survival. It is for this reason that entrepreneurial ventures end up creating employment.

The second aspect by which entrepreneurial ventures are distinguished from small business is the area of *innovation*. Entrepreneurial ventures thrive on innovation. Innovation can be described as a new way of producing or the new product itself, the service offering, marketing or distribution and, at times, it can be a way in which the organization is managed or structured. Small business is mainly

involved in delivering an established product or service without the consideration of the above. It is equally important to note that innovation may be erroneously termed as the new product development only. However, the various aspects noted in this understanding are worth taking into account, namely that it can be innovation in terms of service offering, or marketing, or distribution let alone organizational management or structure. Organizational structure may, for example, limit or enhance the productivity and perhaps the profitability of an enterprise and so could other factors like service offering and distribution channels.

The third area characteristic of entrepreneurial ventures is the *growth potential*. These ventures have a potential for growth, as compared to small business, due to their innovative approaches. Not only does it create a niche in the market, but also it has the potential to create its own market. Venter, Urban, and Rwigema (2011) consider that traditional management is functional in design, whereas entrepreneurship entails a discovery of new skills for organizational development. The emphasis on growth and new venture creation becomes the fundamental principle of entrepreneurship. While the venture is still small, an entrepreneur plays the roles of management. However, after attaining growth, professional managers are hired to deal with the functional design of the organization. Gorman, Hanlon, & King (1997) have stipulated that business entry is an entrepreneurial activity. Its scope does include the following:

- ◆ the exploitation and detection of opportunity;
- ◆ tendency to exercise more creativity;
- ◆ developing self-reliance;
- ◆ the bridging of gaps in functional areas;
- ◆ the fostering of entrepreneurial behavior;
- ◆ process-oriented and multidisciplinary approaches; and
- ◆ projecting into the future and so plan in detail to a greater extent.

2. The concept of a managed economy vs. entrepreneurial economy

In underscoring this section, the understanding of an entrepreneurial economy vs. the managed economy is addressed. The background of entrepreneurial intentions is on the understanding that the prevailing environment is understood on the grounds that the present economy is either managed or entrepreneurial. The economy till the 80's was dominated by the capacity of capital and labor (Coarse, 1937). The future of the world economy according to statistical evidence was supported by the existence of large scale enterprises in accordance with the procurement costs, predictable technological advances and consumer preferences (Caves, 1982, Tees, 1993; Brook and Evans, 1983). The visibility of large scale giants in enterprise development associated

with the managed economy pointed out the vulnerability of self-employment, as well as the waning of small business enterprise. The managed economy known for its stability in managing capital, labor, as well as exploitation of resources gave economic assurance for those with capital and higher levels of investment in developed and developing economies. Solow (1956; 1957) even developed models that supported the understanding that capital and labour were the main economic drivers for economic efficiency. However, Romer (1986, 1990) and Lucas (1988) discovered that in explaining the long term growth, labor and capital were not the sufficient factors required. At a later development, Jones (1995) and Young (1998) agreed to this proposition. These discoveries led to the understanding that long-term growth was embedded in endogenous growth models, where knowledge was crucially significant. In the neoclassical theory, the development of technology was only seen as an exogenous factor. This also pointed out the failure of explaining long-term labor productivity in an economy.

The futility of small business had already received its unfavorable predictions from academia on the basis that further development in knowledge as a component of global competitiveness in global markets would unfavorably point to the futility of small business and self-employment. Knowledge, which has been measured by research and development, patents and human capital would energize those in control of managed economies was the understanding. Conclusions by Chandler (1990) indicated that for one to compete globally, one had to be a big business. This was in conformity with the writings of Vernon (1970) whose prediction was that an increased globalization would create a very hostile environment for small business. The firms that would be dominant would basically deal with the exports and would drive small business into a hiding. The number of global players would as well be reduced, as the consolidation through mergers and acquisitions took place. Contrary to this understanding, a small business has turned out to be an engine for economic development and growth. The sources of competitive advantage in a managed economy were the political, economic and social aspects of production with large scale production with mainly unskilled labor and capital, whereas the entrepreneurial economy is not dominated by capital, but knowledge in a social, economic and political platform with the previously overlooked complementarities of entrepreneurial capital (Audrestch and Thurick, 2001a, 2004).

An entrepreneurial economy, as considered by some analysts, is not limited to small business or its ownership. Its omnipresence provides a socio-economic mindset that is pervasive and calls for the thinking aligned to opportunities than resources. The basis of an entrepreneurial economy is linked to the concept of absorbing uncertainty. Knowledge and ideas form its

foundations such as investment may and it's not organizationally based, but upon persons or individuals. Whereas the managed or planned economy is based on exploitation, the entrepreneurial economy is based on exploration. The thriving of an entrepreneurial economy is engendered on the development of an entrepreneurial culture rather than regulation.

The characteristic elements of a managed economy have often included the hierarchical, bureaucratic structures in organizations. Organizations created varieties with predictability of future changes, life time employment was available and good relations were enjoyed with the gigantic trade unions. Although business schools have been busy training their learners for corporate organizations, it was discovered that interesting data existed in favor of small business and its role in the economy. In the United States alone, it had been observed that the average real GDP per firm had increased by nearly two-thirds from 1947-1989, as evidenced by the monetary value of \$ 150,000-\$245,000, this, in essence, reflected on the fact that firms were growing larger and bigger and at the same time providing no room for small enterprises. However, in a seven year period, there was a sharp decline of no less than 14% leading to a value of \$210,000 (Brock and Evan, 1989). The rising of the small firms was also noted, for example, in 1976, the small firms had risen to a fifth of manufacturing sales in the United States. This growth continued and by 1986, it had risen to over a quarter (Acs and Audretsch, 1993). Further research to this effect is confirmed by a study in which the 2007 observations were taken into consideration using the per capita income and the innovation index and it was discovered that there were strong U-shaped relations between entrepreneurship and economic development (Thurick and Reynolds, 2007).

The dominant factors for the managed economy, as mentioned above, are capital and labor. The mobile capital moves to where labor is considered cheaper and such labor can be in the form of hardware. This is very well contrasted with the entrepreneurial economy, where knowledge is the dominant production factor. Such knowledge is not confined to technical and scientific categories. This kind of knowledge may include creativity, communication and emotional intelligence abilities. The knowledge thus acquired can lead to innovative activity. Entrepreneurial economy is known to thrive on change and strives towards it, as opposed to managed economy that envisages continuity. In both economies, the aspect of innovation is observed, however, in a planned economy, it is gradual, whereas in entrepreneurial economy, it is radical with the creation of new start-ups. The aspect of new innovations can take the trend of going beyond the boundaries considered as core to the business or organization even on the existing technological boundaries of an organization.

Another aspect of an entrepreneurial economy is that high employment levels can be coupled with high wages, as opposed to the managed economy, where high employment results on lower wages. Small firms have been known for their productive ability, as well as their ability to create employment (Erken, Donselaar, and Thurik, 2008). It has also been observed that the creation of new enterprise has been associated with high wages. In the managed economy, job creation by smaller firms is also associated with lower wages, as opposed to an entrepreneurial economy, where jobs and higher wages can be created together (Acs, Fritzoy, and Smith, 2002; Scarpetta, Hemmings, Tressel, and Woo, 2002).

The observation of firms in both economies and the modalities of their operations is of note. For example, the managed and entrepreneurial economies have characterizing traits for firm operations, as evidenced in either control vs. motivation, firm transaction vs. market exchange, the competition, as well as corporation, as opposed to complements, finally scale vs. flexibility. The former of the characteristics is attributed to the managed economy and the latter to an entrepreneurial economy. Labor is considered as one of the factors of production that is replaceable under the managed economy and, therefore, it is under the managed and control approach of management, whereas, in an entrepreneurial economy, motivation of labor is necessary for the creation and implementation of ideas. For this reason, the nurturing of relationships becomes important.

Due to high uncertainty, firms tend to be more efficient in entrepreneurial economies than in managed economies. Coase (1937) and Williamson (1975) point out that the intra firm transactions costs increase through uncertainty and imperfect information. However, Knight (1921) argues that intra firm transactions become efficient when low uncertainty is combined with information predictability and transparency. From the mid 70's, the economic landscape has become uncertain and unpredictable, which has led to a decrease in firm size and conglomerations (Carlsson, 1989).

The pervasive linkages are presumed in a managed economy among firms, competition and collaboration and, therefore, serve as substitutes in moments of uncertainty. In the entrepreneurial economy, the firm's independence is considered, since each firm specializes in the market product. Substitution is the major motivation for the entrepreneurial economy, rather the competition is and cooperation is high. This is due to the fact that there are many firms and the interface or competition is high. The managed economies curb their costs of production through the economies of scale that are associated with the large scale production associated with the predictable demands and consumer tastes and so the exploitation of resources serves the purpose (Chandler, 1977). How-

ever, under the entrepreneurial economy, the available option to lower the cost of production is the flexibility (Teece, 1993). The changing demand of products can best be addressed by flexibility.

The entrepreneurial economy has been known to thrive on turbulence, diversity, innovation, flexibility, linkages and clustering, whereas the managed economy, on the other hand, is focused on specialization, scale, homogeneity, predictability and stability. It is, therefore, no wonder that the entrepreneurial economic environment is occupied with heterogeneity, diversity and turbulence, which is in contrast to the managed economy, which has stability, homogeneity and specialization. The homogeneous product demand in the managed economy leads to the stability in the context and along with that comes the issue of jobs and firms having a low turnover. This is unlike the entrepreneurial economy, where the degree of turbulence is high. Though many firms are started each year, only a few survive (Nelson and Winter, 1982).

Although a number of aspects seem to be shared in both the entrepreneurial economy and a managed economy, it should be understood that aspects such as the diversity and selection, which are at the heart of change, are done differently. For example, Nelson and Winter (1982) argue that under a managed economy, a firm may have research and development department, the research activities are scheduled to take place in the routinized firm environment and, therefore, the findings must conform to the accepted norm. This may not be compared to an entrepreneurial economy, where managing such a venture leads to start-ups, as opportunities emerge.

On the other hand, schools of thought have been advancing with arguments related to the specialization efforts of the managed economy, as well as the diversity standpoint of the entrepreneurial economy. Specialization in production has been associated not only to lower costs, but also efficiency in firm production, whereas the dynamism of diversity in entrepreneurial economy has also been advocated to enable heterogeneity of ideas to be developed and, thus, a level of efficiency, as this ideas turn into innovation through the spillovers of opportunities. The lower transactions costs are, therefore, given up for the sake of knowledge spillovers of knowledge generated through diversity that is permitted.

In homogeneous settings associated with a managed economy, communication is simplified between individuals, as opposed the entrepreneurial economy, where communication based on heterogeneity is costly. This leads to the understanding that the transaction costs are likely to be higher and the efficiency power is lower. Yet, at the same time the ideas generated in the heterogeneous settings associated with the entrepreneurial economy have a

novelty and innovation unequalled in the homogeneous setting of a managed economy (Acs, Fitzroy, and Smith, 2002).

The area of government policy is also an important area, where the two economies are not the same. In the managed economy, the government develops constraining other than enabling policies. This is much evidenced as in the case of public policy towards business, encapsulated in the three aspects of the anti-trust policy dealing mainly with the competitive behavior of entities, public ownership and regulation. The main government question directing policy in these contexts is how can the government help to stop the abuse of market power by the players. The making of excessive profits and the abuse of market dominance feature the question policy of government in a managed economy. The guiding question for a government under the entrepreneurial economy is how can the government create and foster the viability of firms.

The stimulation of the firms, with the intent of creating international opportunities, growth and employment is the guiding question in this context. The targeting of the knowledge inputs is characteristic of entrepreneurial economies, as opposed to managed economies, where emphasis is on capital, land and labor. In the process, the managed economies also face the situation where the government is grappling in the uncertain issues of what to produce, who to produce it and how it should be produced. This is likely to lead to wrong firms being targeted with government policy. The outputs are targeted in a managed economy. Entrepreneurial economy policy targets the inputs and such inputs will target the creation and commercialization of knowledge. It is within this circumstance that the government becomes the facilitator for networks, leading to form social innovation, incentivizing firms and knowledge institutes and more so, encouraging the flexibility of labor functionally.

The managed economy has been characterized by a national locus for its control in the policy function. However, at times, the policy making institutes may be localized at regional level, this contrasts with the entrepreneurial economy, where the decentralization of policy is operationalized at regional and local levels. The need to understand the characteristics that are region specific is said to motivate the decentralized policy approach for the entrepreneurial economy, as well as the job creation prerogative and growth.

Another important factor differentiating the two economies is related to the financing policy. The policy in a managed economy is targeted at financing institutions providing mainly liquidity and investment to existing companies, since there is certainty in the outputs and inputs in the economy. Firms and banks have a direct link in growing the economy and this is different in entrepreneurial

economy, where uncertainty calls for various modes of financing. This, therefore, calls for venture and informal capital markets to cater for high risk capital with the innovative firms. The homogeneous image of liquidity is said to lose its setting in this context, as it gets coupled with advise, changing levels of involvement and knowledge taking place in the form of business angels, incubators, etc. (Audretsch, Grilo, and Thurik, 2007). The understanding of an entrepreneurial economy is an important aspect in the context of entrepreneurial flair development. The entrepreneurial economy, as depicted in this presentation, is of great importance and can ameliorate the challenges faced by both small business, as well as entrepreneurial ones, to a certain degree. Small business will need to develop an entrepreneurial spirit in order to gain from an entrepreneurial economy; otherwise, their survival will be threatened by the new environment.

3. Suggested way forward

Based on the understanding of the background that has led to entrepreneurial changes, suggestions shall be advanced in this section. The competitive advantage of large firms has been eliminated through technological advances permitting small business to be as competitive as large business. This has been possible regardless of the size of the business (Thurik, Stam, & Audretsch, 2013). It can be understood that distance that was one of the separating factors has been done away with through technological innovation permitting the use of internet and phone in transacting business. This, therefore, needs to be encouraged by the states as part of resources required by small and big businesses alike (Varian, 2011). Through the use of ICT, the members of the Soviet Union were enlightened over the benefits of capitalism and, therefore, it guided in changes that led to emulation of a new order of doing business (Kedzie, 1997). This calls for policy changes that enable the creation of a liberalized trade environment in creating an atmosphere that benefits entrepreneurial ventures in states. The need to capacitate businesses in terms of technological usage is, therefore, important.

References

1. Acs, Z. J., and Audretsch, D. B. (1993). Conclusion. In Acs, Z. J. and Audretsch, D. B. (eds.) *Small Firms entrepreneurship: An East-West Perspective*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
2. Acs, Z. J., Fritzoy, F. R. and Smith, I. (2002). High Technology employment and R&D in Cities: heterogeneity vs. specialisation. *Annals of regional science*, 36, 373-386.
3. Audretsch, D. (2012). Entrepreneurship research. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 755-764.
4. Audretsch, D. B. and Thurick, A. R. (2001a). What is new about the new economy: sources of growth in the managed economy and entrepreneurial economies. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19, 795-825.
5. Audretsch, D. B. and Thurick, A. R. (2004). A model of the entrepreneurial economy. *International journal of entrepreneurship education*, 2, 142-166.
6. Audretsch, D. B., Grilo, I. and Thurik, A. R. (2007). *The Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship Policy*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton. MA: US, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
7. Bennett, R. (2008). SME policy in Britain since the 1990's: what have we learnt? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 26, 375-397.
8. Bork, R. H. (1978). *The Antrust Paradox: A policy at war with self*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

There is a need for countries to increase trade for imports and exports, international capital flows, as well as the inter-country labor mobility (Thurik, Stam, & Audretsch, 2013). Since knowledge is foundational to entrepreneurial success, states need to incentivize the innovation of knowledge in all venues of learning, as well as places that are not traditionally learning places such as workplaces. The budgetary support given to research institutions should be further heightened. The inter-country mobility can be enhanced by flexible migration policies that will open opportunities for individuals that want to establish ventures in various settings. There is a need to understand the role of occupational choice that is majorly responsible for the supply side of entrepreneurship and which needs to be permitted in the states policies (Millan et al., 2011; Lange, 2012). Policy makers need to create an atmosphere where occupational choice is, thus, encouraged. The freedom accorded to individuals is, thus, important in enhancing creative opportunities that may benefit the states.

Conclusion

It is without doubt that most people have an understanding that the support towards small business is the same as the support to an entrepreneurial economy. This understanding occurs in the absence of the distinction ascribed herein towards the two economies in question: the managed and an entrepreneurial one. Obviously the benefits of an entrepreneurial economy are most enjoyable by the managed economy, as well as the entrepreneurial one, yet, the sustenance of such benefits; nevertheless, require an economic shift from a managed economy to an entrepreneurial one. With the distinction in view can the policy makers or small business owners aspire for such a difference in their contexts. This will demand a relook through an appropriate study beyond the scope of this submission. It is particularly recommended that future research, especially in developing economies, will investigate the proportion of a managed economy to an entrepreneurial one with a view to enhancing the latter.

9. Brook W. A. and Evans, D. S. (1983). Small Business Economics. *Small Business Economics*, 1, 7-20.
10. Carland, J. W., Hoy, F., Boulton, W. F., & Carland, J. C. (1984). Differentiating Entrepreneurs from Small Business owners: a conceptualisation. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 354-359.
11. Carlsson, B. (1989). The evolution of Manufacturing technology and its impact on industrial structure: an international study. *Small Business economics*, 1, 21-38.
12. Caves, R. (1982). *Multinational Enterprise and Economic Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Chandler, A. D. (1977). *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
14. Chandler, A. D. (1990). *Scale and Scope: The dynamics of industrial Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
15. Chaston, I. (2008). Small creative Industry firms: a development dilemma? *Management Decision*, 46(6), 819-831.
16. Coarse, R. H. (1937). The Nature of a firm. *Economica*, 4, 386-405.
17. Emergent Dictators. The F.S. Pardee RAND Graduate School dissertation series.
18. Erken, H., Donselaar, P., and Thurik, R. (2008). *Total Factor productivity and the role of entrepreneurship*. Jena Economic papers #2008-019. Jena: Friedrich Schiller University and Max Planck Institute of Economics.
19. Foer, A. A. (2001). Small Business and Antitrust. *Small Business Economics*, 16, 3-20.
20. Galbraith, J. K. (1967). *The New Industrial State*. Houghton, Mifflin, Boston, MA.
21. Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., & King, W. (1997). Some Research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: a ten literature review.
22. Gray, C. (1998). *Enterprise Culture*. Routledge, London.
23. Herenkson, M., and Sanandaji, T. (2014). Small business activity does not measure entrepreneurship. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the United States (PNAS)*, 111(5), 1760-1765.
24. Jones, C. I. (1995). R&D based models of economic growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103, 759-784.
25. Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
26. Lange, T. (2012). Job Satisfaction and Self-employment: Autonomy or Personality? *Small Business Economics*, 38(2), 165-177.
27. Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development, *Journal of monetary economics*, 22, 3-29.
28. McKelvie, A. and Wiklund, J. (2010). Advancing firm growth research: a focus on growth mode instead of growth rate. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34, 261-288.
29. Millan, J. M., Hessels, J., Thurik, A. R., Aguado, R. (2011). Determinants of Job Satisfaction across the EU-15: a Comparison of Self-Employed and Paid Employees. *Small Business Economics*, DOI 10.1007/s11187-011-9380-1.
30. Nelson, R. R. and Winter, S. G. (1982). *An Evolutionary theory of economic Change*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 56-78.
31. Nieman, G., Hough, J., and Nieuwenhuizen, C. (eds.). (2008). *Entrepreneurship: South African Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
32. Nieuwenhuizen, C., Machado, R., Jacobs, H., Conradie, W., Fourie, W., Lubaschgne, M., Ferreira, E., Cassim, S., Steyn, J., Le Roux, E. (2004). *Basics of Entrepreneurship*. Cape Town: Juta&Co Ltd.
33. Pate, L., and Wankel, C. (Eds). (2014). *Emerging research directions in social entrepreneurship*. USA: Springer Science and Business Media Dordrecht.
34. Reylands, P. L. and Lancaster, G. (2007). Predictive Strategic Management decisions in small firms: a possible Bayesian solution. *Management Decision*, 45(6), 1038-1057.
35. Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technical Change. *Journal of Political Change*, 98, 71-101.
36. Romer, P. M. (1986). Increasing returns and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94, 1002-1037.
37. Scarpetta, S., Hemmings, Ph., Tressel, T., and Woo, J. (2002). *The role of policy and institutions for productivity and firm dynamics: evidence from micro and industry data*. OECD Economics working Paper 329, Paris: OECD.
38. Scheepers, M. J., Solomon, G., and De Vries, A. (2009). Global University Entrepreneurial Spirit Students' Survey: *South African Report 2008-2009*. *Entrepreneurial Intentions and Behavior Of South African University Students*, South Africa, University Of Stellenbosch: Department Of Business Management.
39. Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Harper and Row, New York, NY.
40. Solow, R. (1956). A contribution to theory of economic growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70, 65-94.
41. Solow, R. (1957). Technical change and the aggregate production function. *Review of economics and statistics*, 39, 312-320.
42. Spiropoulos, R. (2014). Experts breakdown differences between Entrepreneurs and Small Business Owners. Retrieved from <http://www.blackenterprise.com/small-business/small-business-owners-vs-entrepreneurs-which-one-are-you/>. (Accessed on 18/1/2016).
43. Stephens, H. M., Partridge, M. D. and Faggian, A. (2013). Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth In Lagging Regions. *Journal of Regional Science*, 53(5), 778-812.
44. Stevenson, H. H. and Gumpert, D. E. (1991) The heart of entrepreneurship. In Salmon, W. A., and Stevenson, H. H. (Eds), *The entrepreneurial venture*. McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.
45. Tees, D. J. (1993). The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism: Perspectives on Alfred Chandler's "Scale and Scope". *Journal of Economic Literature*, 31, 199-225.
46. Thurick, A. R., and Wennerkers, A. R. M. (2001). Entrepreneurship, economic growth and significance of the GEM project. In Reynolds, P. D., Camp, S. M., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., and Hay, M. (Eds). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, Summary report London Business School and Babson College*, 109-190.
47. Thurick, R., and Wennerkers, S. (2004). Entrepreneurship, small business and economic growth. *Journal of Small*

- Business and Enterprise Development*, 11(1), 140-149.
48. Thurik, A. R., Stam, E. and Audretsch, D. B. (2013). The rise of entrepreneurial economy and the future of dynamic capitalism. *Technovation*, 33(8-9), 302-310.
 49. Varian, H. (2011). Micromultinationals Will Run the World. *Foreign Policy*, 188, Sept/Oct
 50. Venter, H., Urban, B., and Rwigema, R. (2011). *Entrepreneurship: Theory in Practice*. 2nd ed. South Africa, Oxford University Press.
 51. Vernon, K. (1970). Organisation as a scale factor in the growth of firms. In Markham, J. W. and Papanek, F. W. (eds.), *Industrial Organisation and economic development*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 47-66.
 52. Watson, C. H. (2001). Small Business verses entrepreneurship revisited. In: Brockhause, R. H (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship Education: A global view*. Burlington: Ashgate.
 53. Wennerkers, A. R. M. and Thurick, A. R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13, 27-55.
 54. Wickham, P. (2008). *Strategic Entrepreneurship*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: PrenticeWilliamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: The Free Press.
 55. Young, A. (1998). Growth without scale effects, *Journal of Political Economy*, 106, 41-63.