From Camp to Career: A Process Model of Entrepreneurial Intention Formation Following a Youth Intervention

Abstract

Entrepreneurship Education (EE) scholarship relies heavily on the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), which assumes intention is a cognitive switch that flicks linearly into action. We challenge this individualistic ontology. In collectivist, resource-constrained economies, entrepreneurial agency is not solitary but dynastic, negotiated within the family unit to mitigate failure. Using a 12-year longitudinal narrative inquiry (N=63) of alumni from a prominent Indian entrepreneurship institute (2007-2022), we track camp-to-career trajectories. We identify a Latency Loop, a decade-long period of Strategic Dormancy where alumni do not launch firms but instead accumulate capital and legitimacy. Four active mechanisms sustain this dormancy: alumni reconstruct their self-efficacy, embody sociocultural rituals (Somatic Anchors), professionalize their family standing, and forge independent social capital. We explicitly contrast Strategic Sleepers (who actively accumulate assets) with Professional Drifters (who succumb to corporate inertia). We modify the TPB by inserting a Resource Accumulation Phase that must precede behavior. We demonstrate that in the Global South, inaction is not a failure of intention but a strategic necessity to overcome the Liability of Newness.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, Sociocultural Embodiment, Dynastic Professionalization, Social Capital, Latency Loop.

1. Introduction

Universities and policymakers around the world often view Entrepreneurship Education (EE) through a pipeline metaphor. They operate on a simple assumption: if we pour resources into students (the input), new ventures should flow out the other side (the output). Consequently, scholars and donors tend to evaluate these programs by a single, rigid metric: the creation of *immediate* startups (Nabi et al., 2017).

This immediacy bias dominates the field. It assumes that if an educational intervention is successful, behavioral change must be visible right away. The theoretical backbone of this assumption is the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). In the standard TPB model, intention acts like a cognitive switch; once flipped, it is expected to lead linearly to action (Ajzen, 1991). When a graduate expresses high intention but fails to launch a firm immediately, the literature codes this as an intention-action gap. Researchers often interpret this gap as a failure of nerve, a failure of the curriculum, or a failure of the student.

We challenge this diagnosis. By viewing the entrepreneurial journey through such a short-term, individualistic lens, the field misinterprets the strategic reality of young graduates.

This logic of immediate action collapses when applied to the Global South. In resource-constrained economies like India, a 19-year-old boot camp graduate rarely possesses the independent capital, legitimacy, or networks to launch a viable venture immediately. In this context, entrepreneurial agency is not a solo sport; it is dynastic.

Major career decisions are negotiated within the family unit because the family controls the critical assets required to survive the liability of newness (Chakraborty et al., 2016). For these students,

attempting to launch a business immediately without family backing is often reckless. Instead, high-potential graduates enter a period of Strategic Dormancy. They do not abandon their intentions; they incubate them.

To capture this invisible phase, we conducted a 12-year longitudinal narrative inquiry. We followed 63 alumni from a premier Indian entrepreneurship institute, tracking their lives from their initial training (2007–2010) through to their mid-careers (2022). By reconstructing their camp-to-career trajectories, we uncover a Latency Loop.

This is a decade-long process where alumni intentionally pause their startup plans to accumulate the financial, human, and social capital necessary to unlock family support. We demonstrate that what TPB scholars often code as inaction is actually a rigorous, covert phase of resource accumulation.

2. Literature Review

For over three decades, the scholarship of Entrepreneurial Intention (EI) has been theoretically anchored, and perhaps tethered, by the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991). As the dominant cognitive framework in the field, TPB has provided researchers with a robust variance model, successfully explaining the immediate antecedents of intention through three canonical pillars: *Attitude toward the Behavior* (personal desirability), *Subjective Norms* (social pressure), and *Perceived Behavioral Control* (feasibility).

The utility of this framework is undeniable for Miner-style research (Breslin & Gatrell, 2020), which seeks to refine established variables and maximize reliability. Hundreds of empirical studies have validated TPB's ability to predict intention at a specific point in time (T_0), typically

immediately following an educational intervention. In this orthodox view, entrepreneurship education acts as a treatment that alters the variables (e.g., increasing self-efficacy), thereby flipping the intention switch from *off* to *on*.

However, applying the Ahistorical Check (Wadhwani, 2016) reveals a critical limitation in this hegemony. TPB was originally conceptualized in social psychology to predict proximal behaviors**,** actions where the temporal gap between *intention* and *execution* is measured in days or weeks (e.g., voting in an upcoming election, adhering to a diet, or quitting smoking). In these contexts, the stability of intention is relatively high, and the external environment is relatively static.

Yet, in the context of youth entrepreneurship interventions, specifically camps or pre-incubation programs targeting adolescents or undergraduates, the temporal horizon is not proximal but distal**.** The gap between the formation of intention (at the camp) and the enactment of behavior (launching a career) often spans a decade or more. This creates a Methodological Bias (Akerlof, 2020): we are using a short-range ballistic tool to measure a long-range intercontinental journey. As the temporal gap widens, the predictive validity of the static TPB framework erodes, unable to account for stochastic shocks and incubation periods that characterize the early career trajectory.

In recent years, a conversation of critique has emerged within the literature, effectively challenging the binary switch assumption of the orthodox view. This emerging school of thought argues that intention is not a static state achieved at graduation, but a dynamic, fluctuating waveform susceptible to decay, hibernation, and reactivation.

The first major crack in the variance-based foundation is identified by Suh and Hsieh (2016), who argue that standard behavioral models suffer from a temporal myopia. They posit that designing

for future behaviors (which entrepreneurship invariably is for youth) requires a fundamental shift in understanding motivation. In their critique, they note that variance models fail to accommodate the latency between the stimulus (education) and the response (venture creation).

Suh and Hsieh suggest that when the reward is distant, the cognitive mechanism is not planning (as in TPB) but sustaining. Standard TPB measures the *intensity* of intention at T_0, but it fails to measure the *durability* of that intention over time. This explains the false positive phenomenon often seen in Entrepreneurship Education (EE) evaluations: students report high intention immediately after a camp, which variance models interpret as success, yet these students often disappear from the entrepreneurial radar for years.

Building on this temporal disconnect, Freel et al. (2024) observe that the entrepreneurial decision-making process is inherently protracted**.** Unlike consumer choices or health behaviors, which are often binary and immediate, venture creation is a complex, multi-stage process influenced by volatile external conditions that variance models cannot capture.

Freel et al. argue that during this protracted period, intention is not frozen; it is actively interacting with the environment. If the environment is hostile (e.g., lack of capital, family pressure), the intention does not simply vanish; it may enter a state of dormancy. Variance theories, which rely on cross-sectional snapshots, mistake this dormancy for non-intention.

This is empirically supported by Hanage et al. (2020), who provide evidence for the Fluctuation Hypothesis. Their longitudinal tracking suggests that EI is susceptible to decay or hibernation when confronted with the realities of early-career friction. Their work implies that the half-life of

an educational intervention is shorter than previously thought unless specific mechanisms are in place to sustain it. This introduces a critical distinction:

- Static View (TPB): Intention is a fixed outcome (R^2)
- Dynamic View (Hanage/Freel): Intention is a decaying stock that requires constant replenishment.

This synthesis reveals a profound Knowledge Void (Müller-Bloch & Kranz, 2015) in the current literature. While we have saturated the field with studies confirming *that* education influences intention (what), we lack Prospector studies (Breslin & Gatrell, 2020) that explain *how* that intention survives the "Valley of Death" between the intervention (T_0) and the venture launch (T_10).

Current scholarship suffers from a distinct Survivor Bias. By focusing predominantly on those who launch immediately or on active entrepreneurs, the field ignores the Sleepers, individuals for whom the intervention unlocked latent potential that required years of incubation to manifest.

Ye et al. (2022) attempt to bridge this gap with an event-oriented approach. They argue that entrepreneurial endeavor is transmitted through nonlinear pathways, often triggered by specific events (e.g., job dissatisfaction, inheritance, market shifts) rather than a steady accumulation of planned behavior. Ye et al.'s work pushes the field toward Process Theory**,** examining the *sequence of events*, rather than Variance Theory. However, even their model focuses primarily on transmission from leaders to employees, leaving the specific "camp-to-career" latency among youth alumni largely unexplored.

The limitations of the Western-centric TPB framework are exacerbated when applied to the Global South, particularly in collectivist cultures like India. In these contexts, the individual agency assumed by TPB is often an illusion.

Wibowo et al. (2021) and Simanihuruk et al. (2025) suggest that, in collectivist settings, individual intentions are often subordinated to family obligations, social norms, and religious values. Simanihuruk et al. (2025) highlight the moderating role of education, but note that social context acts as a powerful gravity well.

In the Indian context, this manifests as Dynastic Professionalization. Unlike the Western garage entrepreneur mythos, where the individual breaks free to start a new venture, the Global South entrepreneur is often entangled in a web of family business obligations. Intention here does not just wait; it must actively negotiate with family hierarchies.

- The Brake: Family pressure to seek stable employment (safe careers) can force high-EI individuals into a latency loop where they suppress their entrepreneurial drives for years to gain social legitimacy.
- The Accelerator: Conversely, family resources can eventually trigger the reactivation of intention, but often in a form different from what was envisioned at the camp.

Silva et al. (2024) attempt to develop an integrated framework to account for these nuances, yet most models still treat these cultural forces as mere antecedents (inputs) rather than active, friction-generating forces that elongate the incubation period.

Consequently, the field faces a Practical-Knowledge Conflict (Müller-Bloch & Kranz, 2015). Educational practitioners in institutes like the EDII observe long-term alumni success and often

speak of planting seeds. Yet our theoretical lenses (TPB) view seeds that don't immediately sprout as failures.

This necessitates a paradigmatic shift from *Variance Theory* (predicting levels of intention at a single point) to *Process Theory* (explaining the temporal evolution of intention). We must move beyond asking "Did the camp increase intention?" to asking "How did the intention hibernate, mutate, and reactivate over the decade following the camp?"

A critical challenge in the family business literature is distinguishing between Stewardship (maintaining the firm) and Entrepreneurship (innovating). Lindebaum calls for avoiding proxies. Therefore, in this study, we strictly define Dynastic Professionalization not as merely joining the family firm, but as Strategic Renewal (Sirmon & Hitt, 2003).

- Managerial Action: Maintaining current revenue streams.
- Entrepreneurial Action: Launching new verticals, digitizing operations, or expanding exports (e.g., growing revenue by $10M). We posit that the Latency Loop is active only when the agent is engaged in the latter.

This study answers the call for a "longitudinal reconstruction" of the entrepreneurial journey. By adopting the critique of temporal myopia (Suh & Hsieh; Freel et al.) and acknowledging the sociocultural friction of the Global South (Wibowo et al.), we aim to map the latency loops that sustain intention during the critical incubation years.

3. Methodology

To capture the longitudinal evolution of entrepreneurial agency and address the research question, we adopted a qualitative, inductive research design using a narrative inquiry approach (Creswell, 2013; Saunders et al., 2019).

3.1 Research Context

The study is situated within the "National Summer Camp on Entrepreneurship," a recurring intervention organized by the Entrepreneurship Development Institute of India (EDII). To understand the impact, one cannot view this merely as a course. Following Johns' (2006) framework for contextualization, we must describe the *Discrete Context*, the sensory reality of the intervention.

The camp is a 6 to 10-day residential simulation designed to disrupt standard behavioral patterns. It is not a leisure retreat.

- Isolation: Participants (aged 16-22) are removed from their familiar social networks, parents, school friends, and smartphones (restricted use). They are thrown into dormitories with strangers from different states, languages, and social strata.
- High-Intensity Physical Rituals: The daily regimen is non-negotiable. It begins at 5:00 AM. Before the sun rises, participants are on the field for compulsory physical conditioning and yoga. This is followed by a relentless schedule of academic theory, strategy games, and simulations that runs for 12-14 hours daily, often ending with late-night strategy sessions.
- Somatic Stress: The design deliberately induces fatigue. The logic is to simulate the physical and mental volatility of startup life. Participants are forced to make decisions

while tired, to collaborate with people they initially dislike, and to push past their perceived physical limits.

3.2 Data Collection

We employed a Qualitative Survey Design (Jansen, 2010; Braun & Clarke, 2013) to collect data from a sample size of N=63 alumni (2007-2022). The instrument was a Structured Open-Ended Questionnaire using Narrative Prompts to elicit detailed, chronological accounts.

Sampling Strategy: We utilized purposeful sampling, targeting alumni who attended the camp between 2007 and 2022. The sample characteristics are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 Goes here

Veracity and Triangulation (The Validity Check): A primary threat to validity in retrospective studies is *Recall Bias* (Miller et al., 1997). Participants may romanticize the past or exaggerate their success. To mitigate this, we employed a rigorous Veracity Protocol, detailed in Table 2.

Table 2 Goes Here

3.3 Data Analysis: The Gioia Methodology

We employed the Gioia methodology (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2012) to ensure inductive rigor. The analysis proceeded in three recursive stages.

Table 3 Goes Here

3.4 Establishing the Warrant: The Critical Incident Technique

To bridge the causal gap between a 6-to-10-day camp in 2007 and a career move in 2022, we utilized the Critical Incident Technique (Flanagan, 1954). We did not simply infer causality; we demanded it. Participants were asked to trace specific current behaviors (e.g., How has it contributed to your personality development? “) back to their origin.

The causal link is established via Somatic Anchors. Participants explicitly cited the 5 AM Regimen and Camp Simulations as the *origin point* of their current resilience. When Respondent UT cites the camp's changing teams’ protocol as the reason for his current ability to navigate US academia, he provides the Backing required to link the distal intervention to the proximal outcome.

3.5 Narrative Sensemaking and Retrospective Limitations

We acknowledge the risk of *retrospective attribution bias* inherent in longitudinal narrative inquiry. Participants may subconsciously reconstruct their past to align with their current success (Golden, 1992). A hostile critique might suggest that the 5 AM Anchor is merely a war story used for alumni bonding rather than a driver of resilience.

To mitigate this, we focused our coding on Functional Utility rather than nostalgic recall. We did not code general statements like "The camp was inspiring." We only coded instances where the participant described utilizing a specific camp protocol (e.g., changing teams, physical rigor) to solve a *contemporary* professional problem. Thus, whether the memory is historically precise is secondary to its current function as a cognitive scaffold for resilience.

4. Findings: The Four Pillars of Latency

The analysis reveals that the camp did not function as a factory producing immediate startups.

Instead, it functioned as an Identity Incubator. The narratives reveal that the intervention drove four deep-seated transformations that sustained entrepreneurial potential over the long term.

4.1 Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (ESE) Reconstruction

The first aggregate dimension is the reconstruction of the self. Participants described a fundamental shift in their belief systems. This was not merely learning business, but learning capability.

UT (2018 Cohort) provides the clearest evidence of ESE Reconstruction. Before the camp, he was driven by external validation (Relatives sent me). Post-camp, his locus of control shifted internally. When asked about his biggest takeaway, he didn't mention a business plan, but a mindset:

> *"Don't think about others opinion, how other's might feel. Just Do it, if you think you should... I have started believing in Thrive for Excellence, don't worry about the results."*

This shift, from Results Oriented (fear of failure) to Excellence Oriented (mastery), is a hallmark of high Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (Bandura, 1997). The camp reconstructed his identity from a passive student to an active agent. UT is currently in the US pursuing a Master's degree, actively planning a venture, proving that the ESE reconstruction survived the 5-year gap since the camp.

4.2 Sociocultural Embodiment

The second dimension moves beyond the mind to the body and culture. Participants frequently cited the physical rigor (5 AM Yoga) and the cultural values of the camp as enduring anchors. We term this Sociocultural Embodiment, the physical enactment of cultural values.

SS (2015-16 Cohort), now a QA Business Analyst, reflects on the camp's enduring impact. When asked about the most valuable learning, she explicitly links the physical regimen to her current professional balance:

> *"Camp had a lot of things to learn... Knowing valuable insights about life... Knowing the Balance between work and enjoyment."*

The insights about life in the context of the camp's 5 AM regimen suggest an internalization of discipline. For many alumni, the memory of completing the rigorous 6 to 10-day schedule serves as a Somatic Anchor. When they face professional burnout in their 30s, they recall the physical endurance they displayed at 18. This embodiment allows alumni to navigate the stress of corporate or entrepreneurial life by reverting to the physical and cultural habits learned at the camp.

Figure 2: The Mechanism of Sociocultural Embodiment

4.3 Dynastic Professionalization

A unique finding relevant to the Indian context is the path of Dynastic Professionalization. For 40% of the sample, Entrepreneurship did not mean starting a *new* startup; it meant transforming a family legacy.

RR (2007 Cohort) is the archetype. He explicitly stated that he joined his family business *"to gather business acumen."* He did not view this as settling or a failure to launch a startup. He viewed it as a strategic internship.

> *"I worked here for 5 years... brought in incremental business of USD 10 million."*

RR used the entrepreneurial mindset from the camp to professionalize the exports division of a

legacy firm. This validates the theory that in collectivist economies, Intra-family Entrepreneurship is a primary outcome of EE interventions, often missed by studies that only count new venture creation.

4.4 Social Capital Formation

The final dimension is the formation of a survival network. The Forced Socialization protocols of the camp (changing teams daily) broke down barriers.

An alumnus noted: *"The idea of changing teams at every point so one can get a chance to interact with almost all the members."* This created Bonding Social Capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002). This network acts as a Vicarious Validation mechanism. When an alumnus sees a campmate succeed, their own ESE is reinforced, sustaining their intention through the Latency Phase.

Figure 1: (The Latency Phase Process Model) goes here

5. Discussion and Verification

This study extends the Theory of Planned Behavior by demonstrating that the gap between Intention and Behavior is bridged by these four mechanisms.

1. ESE Reconstruction ensures the *desire* persists.
2. Sociocultural Embodiment ensures the *stamina* persists.
3. Dynastic Professionalization provides the *vehicle* (family firm) for practice.
4. Social Capital provides the *safety net*.

The primary objective of this study was to investigate how early-stage entrepreneurship interventions sustain entrepreneurial agency across prolonged periods of professional inaction. By

reconstructing the 12-year trajectories of alumni, our findings challenge the static assumptions of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) often employed in EE research (Fayolle & Liñán, 2014). We propose the Latency Loop Model, demonstrating that effective youth interventions do not necessarily trigger immediate behavioral change but rather install mechanisms that enable Strategic Dormancy.

5.1 Theoretical Implications: Rethinking the Intention-Action Gap

Our findings do not merely add time to the TPB; they alter its causal logic for collectivist contexts.

Western TPB Logic: Intention →Behavior.

Collectivist Latency Logic: Intention →Legitimation (Family Permission) → Resource Accumulation → Behavior.

In this model, the Latency Loop is a mediator. Without the intervention (Camp), the student lacks the Self-Efficacy to endure the Latency Loop. They succumb to corporate comfort. The camp acts as the battery that sustains intention while the agent negotiates with the family structure.

The prevailing literature frequently identifies a significant intention-action gap in entrepreneurship, where high intentions do not translate into venture creation (Bogatyreva et al., 2019; Kautonen et al., 2015). Through the lens of standard variance models, the decade-long gaps observed in our participants' trajectories would be coded as "attrition" or intervention failure.

Our findings offer a critical counter-narrative to this "immediacy bias." Aligning with recent calls to view entrepreneurship as an evolving journey rather than a discrete event (McMullen & Dimov, 2013; Salhi, 2018), we argue that for youth, immediate action is often irrational due to a lack of

necessary capital and legitimacy.

The Latency Loop supports the emerging dynamic view of entrepreneurial intention, suggesting that intentions are not stable traits but states that fluctuate over time (Donaldson et al., 2021; Wood et al., 2021). Our study contributes empirically by identifying *how* this state is maintained during dormancy. The intervention functioned as an Identity Incubator, providing the ESE Reconstruction and Sociocultural Embodiment necessary to keep the entrepreneurial identity salient even while the individual was employed elsewhere.

5.2 Strategic Dormancy vs. Attrition (Defining Boundaries)

To ensure theoretical rigor, we must define the Point of Failure. If every outcome is latency, the theory is non-falsifiable. We distinguish between:

1. Strategic Dormancy (The Latency Loop): The agent is *actively accumulating* tangible resources (e.g., RR acquiring export knowledge; UT acquiring a Master's degree). The Entrepreneurial Intention remains the governing cognitive frame.

2. Professional Drift (Failure): The agent settles into a role *without* accumulation or strategic intent. The Employee Identity supersedes the Entrepreneurial Identity.

In our data, we observed drift. However, the Latency Loop Model specifically explains the trajectory of those who used the camp's Social Capital and Somatic Anchors to resist drift and convert dormancy into eventual action.

To ensure theoretical rigor, it is vital to distinguish the Latency Loop from mere attrition. If all inaction is labeled latency, the concept loses analytical power. Drawing on Klyver et al.'s (2018)

conceptualization of entrepreneurship as a career path involving periods of dormancy, we define the boundary condition of our model.

Inaction constitutes a Latency Loop only when accompanied by active Resource Accumulation. Our findings highlight two primary accumulation pathways:

1. Dynastic Professionalization: Where inaction in the startup space is traded for apprenticeship and capital accumulation within a family firm.

2. Social Capital Formation: Where the period of employment is used to co-opt the network formed during the intervention for future validation and resource acquisition.

Therefore, the theoretical contribution is not merely that "time passes," but that effective interventions equip participants with the resilience to engage in *strategic waiting*. In resource-constrained environments, this capacity for dormancy, waiting until skills, capital, and opportunity converge, is perhaps a more critical entrepreneurial capability than immediate, high-risk action.

A challenge to process theory is predictive power: *Can we distinguish a Sleeper from a Drifter in Year 3?* Our data suggests that while both appear behaviorally inactive (i.e., employed in corporate roles), they are cognitively distinct.

The Sleeper (Latency) engages in Dual-Track Accumulation; they perform their corporate role while simultaneously acquiring specific assets for future independence (e.g., earning a specific Master's degree, building a side-project, or negotiating equity in the family firm). The Drifter (Attrition) engages in Single-Track Optimization; they focus solely on climbing the corporate ladder of their current employer. Thus, Latency is characterized by the accumulation of *transferable* assets, whereas "Drift" is characterized by the accumulation of *firm-specific* assets.

5.3 Boundary Conditions

While the Latency Loop Model explains the trajectories of our cohort, it is vital to establish its boundary conditions regarding socioeconomic status. Strategic Dormancy is, largely, a resource-dependent capability.

Drawing on Chakraborty et al. (2016) regarding family capital, we posit that the Latency Loop is an affordance of the middle-to-upper class. Alumni from resource-constrained backgrounds may face Necessity Entrepreneurship pressures that force immediate, often survivalist, entry into markets, precluding the luxury of a 10-year accumulation phase. Therefore, as visualized in Figure 1, the Latency Loop is bounded by a Family Capital Buffer, a structural safety net that allows the agent to privilege long-term legitimacy over short-term cash flow.

6. Conclusion

Ultimately, this study suggests that in collectivist economies, the unit of entrepreneurial analysis should shift from the Individual to the Dynastic Unit. The Latency Loop is not merely a psychological pause; it is a structural negotiation where the aspiring entrepreneur trades immediate autonomy for long-term family legitimacy. Recognizing this transforms our understanding of inaction from a failure of pedagogy to a triumph of strategic patience.

Finally, these findings emphasize the critical role of context in moderating the intention-behavior link (Shirokova et al., 2016). In the collectivist, high-stakes environment of India, the social permission to be an entrepreneur is often contingent on proven professional legitimacy. The Latency Loop is therefore not just a psychological phenomenon, but a structural necessity imposed

by the environment. The intervention succeeds by providing the somatic and cognitive tools required to navigate this compulsory waiting period without abandoning the ultimate entrepreneurial goal.

6. References

1. Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40.
2. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
3. Akerlof, G. A. (2020). *Sins of omission and the practice of economics*. Journal of Economic Literature, 58(2), 405-418.
4. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191.
5. 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.
6. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.
7. Breslin, D., & Gatrell, C. (2020). Evolving management research: The role of the miner and the prospector. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(1), 1-4.
8. Chakraborty, S., et al. (2016). The impact of family capital on the enactment of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(4), 1131-1151.

9. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.
10. Donaldson, C., Hossain, F., & Nga, J. K. H. (2021). An Inquiry into the Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 30(1), 9–42.
11. Fayolle, A., & Liñán, F. (2014). The future of research on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 663-666.
12. Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*. (Use this to defend your Warrant).
13. Freel, M., et al. (2024). Time and the entrepreneur. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 21, e00451.
14. Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2012). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15-31.
15. Golden, B. R. (1992). The past is the past—or is it? The use of retrospective accounts as indicators of past strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*. (For the Attribution Bias defense).
16. Hanage, R., Scott, J. M., & Davies, M. A. (2020). [Title regarding fluctuation of intention]. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
17. Jansen, H. (2010). The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 11(2).
18. Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of*

Management Review, 31(2), 386-408.

19. 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.
20. Klyver, K., Steffens, P., & Lomberg, C. (2018). Entrepreneurship as a career path: The role of dormancy. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(5), 651-668.
21. Liñán, F., & Fayolle, A. (2015). A systematic literature review on entrepreneurial intentions: citation, thematic analyses, and research agenda. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(4), 907-933.
22. McMullen, J. S., & Dimov, D. (2013). Time and the entrepreneurial journey: The problems and promise of studying entrepreneurship as a process. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(8), 1355-1372.
23. Miller, C. C., et al. (1997). Methodological issues in firm-level empirical research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(1), 1-25.
24. Müller-Bloch, C., & Kranz, J. (2015). A framework for rigorously identifying research gaps in qualitative literature reviews. *International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS)*.
25. Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277-299.
26. Salhi, B. (2018). The entrepreneurial journey: A review of the literature. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(2), 1-14.
27. Saunders, M. N., et al. (2019). *Research methods for business students*. Pearson.

28. Shirokova, G., Osiyevskyy, O., & Bogatyreva, K. (2016). Exploring the intention–behavior link in student entrepreneurship: Moderating effects of individual and environmental characteristics. *European Management Journal*, 34(4), 386-399.
29. Silva, H., Pushpakumari, M., & Nishantha, B. (2024). Development of an integrated conceptual framework for the entrepreneurial intention. *The Bottom Line*, 37(4), 434-453. https://doi.org/10.1108/bl-05-2023-0157
30. Simanihuruk, P., Syaifuddin, S., & Toni, N. (2025). Analyzing the moderating role of entrepreneurship education. *Lex Localis*, 23(10), 1365-1389. https://doi.org/10.52152/801447
31. Sirmon, D. G., & Hitt, M. A. (2003). Managing resources: Linking unique resources, management, and wealth creation in family firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(4), 339-358.
32. Suh, M., & Hsieh, G. (2016). Designing for future behaviors. *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems*, 1084-1096. https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858591
33. Wadhwani, R. D. (2016). Entrepreneurship, time, and history. In *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
34. Wibowo, A., Widjaja, S., Utomo, S., et al. (2021). Does Islamic values matter for Indonesian students' entrepreneurial intention? The mediating role of entrepreneurial inspiration and attitude. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 13(2), 242-263. https://doi.org/10.1108/jiabr-03-2021-0090
35. Wood, M., Long, W., & Hindle, K. (2021). The dynamism of entrepreneurial intentions: A Markov chain analysis of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Business Venturing*,

36(4), 106122.

36. Ye, Q., Wang, D., & Zeng, K. (2022). An event-oriented approach to the transmission of ex-leaders' entrepreneurial endeavor to employees' entrepreneurial intention. *Human Relations*, 76(7), 1108-1134. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221084495

Table 1: Participant Demographics and Trajectory Types

Data Source: Longitudinal Survey (2007-2022)

Trajectory Type	**Sample Share**	**Representative Profile (from Data)**	**The Latency Phase Activity**	**Primary Outcome**
Type A: Dynastic Successors	40% (n=25)	RR (2007): "Joined family export biz to gather acumen" →$10M Growth →MBA.	Apprenticeship: Spending 3-7 years accumulating Family Capital and market knowledge before innovating.	Dynastic Professionalization: Used camp discipline to prove competence to elders.

Type B: New Venture Creators	35% (n=22)	UT(2018): "Discovering anything is possible" → Masters in USA → Planning Venture.	Credentialing: Spending 4-6 years acquiring global degrees (Masters/PhD) to mitigate the "Liability of Newness."	ESE Reconstruction: Used camp's changing teams' protocol to validate self-efficacy.
Type C: Corporate Intrapreneurs	25% (n=16)	SS (2015): School Student → QA Business Analyst (IT) → Corporate Leader.	Resource Gathering: Using high-salary corporate roles to build a personal financial safety net.	Sociocultural Embodiment: Used the discipline learned during the camp to manage corporate volatility.

Table 2: The Veracity Protocol

To ensure the integrity of these narratives, we applied a strict triangulation protocol.

Participant (Anonymized in	**Narrative Claim in Survey**	**Verification Method**	**Outcome**

Analysis)			
RR	VP of Exports, $10M Growth	LinkedIn Check: Verified role tenure at Family Firm.	Verified
UT	Planning for Masters in USA	LinkedIn Check: Verified current status as Grad Student in USA University.	Verified
SS	QA Business Analyst	LinkedIn Check: Verified employment at [IT Company Name redacted].	Verified

Table 3: The Gioia Data Structure (Inductive Coding Trail)

Mapping 1st Order Concepts (Raw Quotes) to Aggregate Theoretical Dimensions

1st Order Concepts (Informant Terms)	2nd Order Themes (Theoretical Concepts)	Aggregate Dimensions

"Discovering anything is possible but yeah terms and conditions apply." (U. T.)	Mindset Reframing: Shifting from fear to agency.	1. ESE RECONSTRUCTION *(Psychological Dimension)*
"Don't think about others opinion... Just Do it."	Locus of Control: Internalizing responsibility.	
"Waking up at 5 AM... compulsory physical conditioning."	Somatic Discipline: Physical habits as mental anchors.	2. SOCIOCULTURAL EMBODIMENT *(Physical/Cultural Dimension)*
"Knowing valuable insights about life... balance between work and enjoyment." (S S.)	Value Internalization: Adopting a balanced work ethic.	
"To gather business acumen, I joined my family business... brought in incremental business of USD 10 million." (R R.)	Next-Gen Innovation: Modernizing legacy firms.	3. DYNASTIC PROFESSIONALIZATION *(Family Dimension)*
"Joined dad's business to learn the ropes."	Apprenticeship: Learning within the dynasty.	

"The idea of changing teams at every point so one can get a chance to interact with almost all members." *"Growing my friends circle."*	Network Density: Breaking isolation. Vicarious Learning: Seeing peers succeed.	4. SOCIAL CAPITAL FORMATION *(Social Dimension)*



